**Gatenteksten**

**Instructies:**

* Kijk niet naar de mogelijke antwoorden!
* Lees de tekst rondom het gat aandachtig door, waarbij je goed moet kijken naar hoe de tekst verder loopt na het gat.
* Als er woorden in de buurt van het gat staan die je niet kent, zoek die dan op.
* Probeer dan voor jezelf te bedenken wat er op de plek van het gat zou kunnen staan, in het Nederlands of in het Engels.
* Pas dan kijk je naar de mogelijke antwoorden: vergelijk het antwoord dat je zelf verzonnen met de antwoorden die gegeven zijn en beslis welk antwoord het beste past.

VWO
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**The Economist Asia**

Ideology in China

**Confucius makes a comeback**

BEIJING

“STUDY the past”, Confucius

said, “if you would define

the future.” Now he himself has

become the object of that study.

Confucius was revered –

indeed worshipped – in China for

more than 2,000 years. But

neither the Communist Party, nor

the 20th century itself, has been

kind to the sage. Modern China

saw the end of the imperial civilservice

examinations he inspired, the end

of the imperial regime itself and the

repudiation of the classical Chinese in

which he wrote. **9** , during the

Cultural Revolution Confucius and his

followers were derided and humiliated by

Mao Zedong in his zeal to build a “new

China”.

Now, Professor Kang Xiaoguang, an

outspoken scholar at Beijing’s Renmin

University, argues that Confucianism

should become China’s state religion.

Such proposals bring Confucius’s **10**

into the open. It is another sign of the

struggle within China for an alternative

ideological underpinning to Communist

Party rule in a country where enthusiasm

for communism waned long ago and

where, officials and social critics fret,

anything goes if money is to be made.

Explicit attacks on Confucius ended

as long ago as 1976, when Mao died, but

it is only now that his popularity has

really started rising. On topics ranging

from political philosophy to personal

ethics, old Confucian ideas are **11** .

With a recent book and television

series on *the Analects*, the best-known

collection of the sage’s

musings, Yu Dan has tried to

make the teachings accessible

to ordinary Chinese. Scholars

have accused her of

oversimplifying, but her

**12** has clearly struck a

chord: her book has sold

nearly 4m copies, an

enormous number even in

China.

Further interest is evinced by the

Confucian study programmes springing

up all over the Chinese education system.

These include kindergarten classes in

which children recite the classics,

Confucian programmes in philosophy

departments at universities, and even

Confucian-themed executive education

programmes offering sage guidance for

business people.

But perhaps the most intriguing –

albeit ambivalent – adopter of

Confucianism is the Communist Party

itself. Since becoming China’s top leader

in 2002, President Hu Jintao has

promoted a succession of official slogans,

including “Harmonious Society” and

“*Xiaokang Shehui*” (“a moderately welloff

society”), which have Confucian

undertones. **13** , says one scholar at

the party’s top think-tank, the Central

Party School, official approval is

tempered by suspicions about religion

and by lingering concern over the

mixture of Buddhism and other religious

elements in Confucian thinking.

The relevance of Confucian ideas to

modern China is obvious. Confucianismemphasises order, balance and harmony.

It teaches respect for authority and

concern for others.

For ordinary Chinese, such ideas

must seem like an antidote to the

downside of growth, such as widening

regional disparities, wealth differentials,

corruption and rising social tension. For

the government, too, Confucianism seems

like **14** . The party is struggling to

maintain its authority without much

ideological underpinning. Confucianism

seems to provide a ready-made ideology

that teaches people to accept their place

and does not challenge party rule.

As an additional advantage,

Confucianism is home-grown, unlike

communism. It even provides the party

with a tool for **15** abroad. By calling

China’s overseas cultural and linguistic

study centres “Confucius Institutes”, the

party can present itself as something

more than just an ideologically bankrupt

administrator of the world’s workshop.

Yet despite this, Confucianism is not

an easy fit for the party. It says those at

the top must prove their worthiness to

rule. This means Confucianism does not

really address one of the **16** , that

while all will be well so long as China

continues to prosper, the party has little

to fall back upon if growth falters.

Writing last year, Professor Kang

nevertheless argued that a marriage of

Confucianism and communism **17** .

He argued that the party has in reality

allied itself with China’s urban elite. “It

is”, he wrote, “an alliance whereby the

elites collude to pillage the masses,”

leading to “political corruption, social

inequality, financial risks, rampant evil

forces, and moral degeneration.” The

solution, he argued, was to “Confucianise

the Chinese Communist Party at the top

and society at the lower level.”

But Stephen Angle, a Fulbright

scholar at Peking University and a

philosophy professor at Wesleyan

University in America, argues that

Confucianism may not be as useful to the

party as it thinks. For a start it has little

to say about one of the party’s biggest

worries, the tension in urban-rural

relations. More important, a gap in

Confucian political theory should alarm a

government seeking to hold on to power

in **18** . “One big problem with

Confucianism”, says Mr Angle, “is that it

offers no good model for political

transition, except revolution.”

*The Economist, 2007*

1p **9**

**A** Even more curiously

**B** Harsher still

**C** Paradoxically

**D** To be fair

1p **10**

**A** degradation

**B** rehabilitation

**C** vulnerability

1p **11**

**A** gaining new currency

**B** highly controversial

**C** opening up new fields of study

**D** seen as outworn clichés

1p **12**

**A** ideology

**B** popularity

**C** response

**D** treatment

1p **13**

**A** After all

**B** For this same reason

**C** Indeed

**D** Moreover

**E** On the other hand

1p **14**

**A** a blessing

**B** a new religion

**C** a risky gamble

1p **15**

**A** advancing commercial interests

**B** gaining goodwill

**C** promoting the study of Chinese

**D** re-establishing Confucianism

1p **16**

**A** government’s main worries

**B** most widespread misconceptions

**C** principles of Chinese ideology

1p **17**

**A** could be made to work

**B** had already proved results

**C** was out of the question

1p **18**

**A** a country with many religions

**B** a fast-changing situation

**C** an era 2500 years after Confucius

**D** an industrialised country such as China
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Common sense abducted

**Aliens: Why They Are Here**

by Bryan Appleyard

IN NOVEMBER 1974 the giant Arecibo

radio telescope in Puerto Rico

broadcast a special message to M13, a

distant cluster of 300,000 stars, some

of which might be orbited by lifebearing

planets. The message contained line drawings of a human being, together with details of the molecular structure of DNA and other such useful information, and it endedwith the cosmically fatuous word “Hi!”

As Bryan Appleyard

points out, although this

message has now been

travelling at the speed of

light for more than 30 years,

it is still roughly 25,070

light years from its

destination. “It will arrive in

the vicinity of M13 in the

year 27,074, so we could

expect a response in 52,174,

assuming they return the

call at once.”

The combination of

**19** in this story deserves

a moment’s notice. A group

of astronomers had decided,

on the basis of their

scientific knowledge, that

there was a reasonable

chance that intelligent life

existed somewhere else in

the universe. Their science also told

them that they would have to wait

more than 50,000 years for a radioed

response ― just as it told them that a

physical spacecraft sent from M13

would take much longer, since no solid

object can be accelerated to the speed

of light. **20** they went ahead and

made the broadcast, complete with its

geeky greeting.

The most reasonable position to

take on the question of extraterrestrial

life is that while it is quite

possible that such life exists

somewhere, it is very unlikely that

humans will ever encounter it. This is

an issue which should therefore rest at

the outermost fringes of our

imaginations. Yet modern cultural

history tells a very different story:

aliens now populate so many

novels, films and television

programmes that no

imagination can **21**

them.

The title and subtitle of

Bryan Appleyard’s new book,

*Aliens: Why They Are Here*,

might best be described as a

bit of a tease. Appleyard, a

respected journalist and

commentator, is not

claiming that aliens have

landed; his “here” means

here in our mental world and

popular culture. But the fact

that many people do believe

that aliens are literally here

(or close enough, at any rate,

to snatch humans from time

to time) is, of course, part of

our culture too. This is what

distinguishes **22** from Tolkien’s orcs and elves, which many people may

have imagined but few claim actually

to have met.

**23** . George Adamski for

instance, author of the classic text*Flying Saucers Have Landed*, met

Orthon, a long-haired young man from

Venus, in the Californian desert in

1952. Adamski could tell he was an

alien because he wore reddish-brown

shoes and “his trousers were not like

mine”. Orthon spoke to him

telepathically, and arranged for him to

be taken on a tour of the solar system

which included a visit to Venus, where,

as it turned out, the late Mrs Adamski

had been reincarnated.

According to Appleyard, there are

three possible ways of talking about

experiences of aliens. First comes the

“nuts and bolts” position, which treats

them as literal descriptions of physical

reality. Then there is the “third realm”

approach, which says that aliens may

be real, but not in a physical sense ―

like angels, they exist as some other

kind of being, **24** . And the third

approach is “psychosocial”: this

assumes that aliens are illusory, but

tries to account for the human origins

of the illusion.

The best parts of this book take the

psychosocial approach, offering a

variety of explanations. Appleyard

summarises recent research on the

neurological origins of these illusory

experiences; he also shows how **25**

we should treat the so-called

“recovered memories” of abduction

produced under hypnosis. And his

account of the cultural origins of

modern ufology and alien-mania is rich

and rewarding, fortified by a detailed

knowledge of science fiction and

marred only by a tendency towards

hectic prose.

Yet Appleyard cannot leave it at

that. He wants to suggest that we

should look at the claims of the

abductees with more respect; he argues

that the differences between **26**

should be “blurred”, on the grounds

that whatever happens is, in the end,

just happening in someone’s head. This

is a surprisingly mushy conclusion,

coming from such a clearheaded

thinker and writer.

Unfortunately, the blurring has

also got into the facts. In order to build

up respect for those who believe in real

encounters with aliens, Appleyard has

copied historical claims from their

books and websites, presenting them

to his readers as if they were genuine.

Thus we are told about “ **27**

sighting of a UFO in 1493 by the

German scholar Hartmann Schaeden”;

this is a garbled reference to Hartmann

Schedel’s description of a meteorite

which landed at Ensisheim in Alsace

and which can still be seen in the

Ensisheim Town Hall.

Most seriously, Appleyard

reproduces, in a list of mysterious

disappearances, a story about an entire

regiment of the British Army being

carried away by a hovering cloud at

Gallipoli in 1915. The story (originally

about a battalion, the 1/5 Norfolks)

was investigated and **28** years ago:

the soldiers were killed by Turkish

forces, and their remains now lie in the

Azmak cemetery. The suggestion that

they had been carried off into the sky

was made for the first time by three

confused veterans in 1965; it was then

included in a famous faked document,

the so-called First Annual Report of

“Majestic 12” (an alleged top-secret US

Government committee on contacts

with aliens), which purported to date

from the early 1950s.

the so-called First Annual Report of

“Majestic 12” (an alleged top-secret US

Government committee on contacts

with aliens), which purported to date

from the early 1950s.

That Bryan Appleyard should treat

this document as genuine is, alas, like

the 13th stroke of the clock: it **29**

everything that has gone before.

Noel Malcolm in *The SundayTelegraph*

**19**

**A** art and science

**B** facts and figures

**C** nerdiness and fanaticism

**D** past and present

**E** seriousness and absurdity

1p **20**

**A** Eventually

**B** Instead,

**C** Moreover,

**D** So

**E** Yet

1p **21**

**A** begin to comprehend

**B** lay claim to have created

**C** remain untouched by

1p **22**

**A** earthlings

**B** extra-terrestrials

**C** rational minds

**D** serious science fiction

1p **23**

**A** But some meetings with aliens have all the trappings of realism

**B** Not all writers, however, have been so successful as Tolkien

**C** Some of the witnesses here do not inspire much trust

1p **24**

**A** beyond the dimensions we know

**B** in a pseudo-intellectual sense

**C** in the next world

**D** in the world of myths

1p **25**

**A** conscientiously

**B** sceptically

**C** sympathetically

1p **26**

**A** old and new research

**B** our minds and emotions

**C** the three approaches

**D** the various memories

1p **27**

**A** a controversial

**B** an imaginary

**C** a significant

1p **28**

**A** authenticated

**B** discredited

**C** dramatised

**D** hushed up

1p **29**

**A** exceeds

**B** lends credibility to

**C** mirrors

**D** puts in doubt
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**Materialism damages well-being**

*By Richard Tomkins*

Is it going too far to suggest that, until

very recently, the leitmotif of human

history had been misery? It is easy to

imagine the past as some kind of bucolic

idyll, but only by ignoring the perpetual

visitations of war, pestilence and famine.

In between, you might have hoped to

avoid living too much in the shadow of

fear, superstition or religious persecution

but **21** what the economist John

Maynard Keynes described as the

permanent problem of the human race:

want, or the struggle for subsistence.

It is one of the **22** of recent

economic history that, in the advanced

industrial world, this seemingly

permanent problem has been solved. For

the most part, people in developed

countries live in a state of surfeit, not of

want. They no longer worry whether they

can afford to put food in their children’s

bellies or keep a roof over their heads,

but which cable channel package they

should subscribe to, where to spend their

holidays and which designer labels they

should wear.

But some people are **23** . Even

though they are richer, healthier and

safer than ever before, and even though

they enjoy more freedoms and

opportunities, they continue to moan:

about rising depression and suicide rates,

about crime, about the decline of civility,

about obesity, road rage and drug abuse,

about hyper-competition and rampant

materialism and, above all, about spam.

The fact is that, in the West, increases in economic output and consumption are no longer **24** by increases in people’s reported levels of happiness. And as the gap widens, it is close to becoming an obsession. This week, I received reports on the pursuit of happiness from two think-tanks on the same day: one from the London-based New Economics Foundation and another from the Canberra-based Australia Institute. Last week, the Royal Society, Britain’s top scientific academy, held a

two-day conference on the science of well-being. Last month, New Scientist magazine

devoted a two-part series to the subject.

And so on.

You can sum up the main findings of

happiness research in a few sentences.

Although more money delivers big

increases in happiness when you are

poor, each extra dollar makes **25** once

your basic needs have been met. Much

more important are non-material things

such as a good marriage and spending

time with loved ones and friends.

However, money and material goods do

matter in one respect: people tend to seek

status, and therefore judge themselves

against the visible signs of **26** .

Unfortunately, as the New Economics

Foundation report remarks, this is a

never-ending competition because the

bar simply gets raised all the time. One

house used to be a sign of status; now

only two will do.

If people could only overcome their

worries about status, their route to

happiness would be clear: they should

downshift, trading less pay for more time

with their families and friends. It will

never happen, you may say. But

according to Clive Hamilton, author of

the Australia Institute report and a

visiting scholar at Cambridge University,

an astonishing 25 per cent of Britons

aged 30-59 have done just that in the

past 10 years, voluntarily taking a cut in

earnings to improve the quality of their

lives.

If I were in advertising, I think I would

be starting to worry a bit about findings

like these. Our whole economic system,

with its targeted annual increases in

gross domestic product, is founded upon

the concept of satisfying the desire for

**27** ; and advertising exists only to help

generate that desire. But what if people

became convinced that acquisitiveness,

rather than adding to their happiness,

was standing in its way?

People have always been equivocal

about advertising, worrying that it

hoodwinks them into buying things they

do not need. Perhaps that explains the

paradox that, as society has grown more

liberal, attitudes towards advertising

have gone **28** . It is no longer the case

that you can market any goods that can

be legally sold. People are demanding

that advertising should operate within

the parameters of social, even moral,

objectives. Bans on tobacco advertising

are now being followed by calls for

restrictions on the advertising of other

“undesirable” products such as alcohol

and fast food. And there is a rising

clamour for bans on marketing to

children, much of it driven by fears that

they are being brainwashed into

consumerism from birth.

From there, it is quite a short step to

argue that advertising to adults should be

banned on the grounds that it makes

them unhappy. It will never happen, of

course; people will always require –

indeed, desire – material goods, even if

they give them a lower priority, so

advertising will **29** . But is it possible

to imagine a day when every

advertisement will have to be

accompanied by a government health

warning such as: “Danger: materialism

may damage your sense of well-being”?

Acquisitiveness, after all, is a lot like

smoking: harmful, addictive and much

easier to quit if everyone else does so at

the same time. So the greater happiness

of the many would best be served if social

policy were directed towards

marginalising status-seekers and turning

them into pitiful pariahs, leaving the rest

of us to **30** , in the comfortable

knowledge that we were not only in the

majority but also doing the right thing.

Convinced? I am. Tell you what, I’ll

agree to stop being a greedy selfmaximiser

if you will, then we’ll both be

much happier as a result. Ready? One,

two, thr . . . Hey! What do you think

you’re doing? Get your hands off my

credit card RIGHT NOW.

*Financial Times*

1p **21**

**A** there was no escaping

**B** this was more of a nightmare than

**C** this was nothing compared to

1p **22**

**A** controversial issues

**B** few lasting illusions

**C** most startling achievements

1p **23**

**A** fed up with all this

**B** just unfortunate

**C** never satisfied

**D** too easily misled

1p **24**

**A** affected

**B** compensated for

**C** explained

**D** matched

1p **25**

**A** less difference

**B** life easier

**C** life more complicated

**D** you want another

1p **26**

**A** others’ appreciation

**B** others’ success

**C** their country’s economic growth

**D** their sense of well-being

1p **27**

**A** happiness

**B** independence

**C** more

**D** power

1p **28**

**A** completely over the top

**B** in the opposite direction

**C** much the same way

1p **29**

**A** be of an entirely different nature

**B** fulfil a necessary role

**C** lose some of its impact

1p **30**

**A** carry on as usual

**B** downshift

**C** keep up our status

**D** save up for later
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JAMES LAMONT

A battered faith in the new South Africa

**BEYOND THE MIRACLE**

**By Allister Sparks**

Profile Books, £12.99,

published August 28, 2003

Even now, nearly 10 years after

the end of apartheid, Allister

Sparks still feels twinges of

disbelief when he sits in the

press gallery of South Africa’s

parliament in Cape Town.

Earlier in his career as a journalist

on the Rand Daily Mail, he listened in

the same gallery to Hendrik Verwoerd,

the architect of apartheid, defending

**24** . “It sounded so plausible in that

isolated, all-white chamber, cut off like

an ocean liner from the pulsating

polyglot reality of the society outside,”

Mr Sparks recalls.

Today, Mr Sparks peers down on a

diverse throng of parliamentarians,

rubbing shoulders good-humouredly.

Racial division has given way to an

open, tolerant society. A closed

economy, rooted in mining and

agriculture, has opened its borders and

is hungry for foreign investment.

Can the change from white minority

rule to multiracial democracy have

**25** , the veteran journalist asks

himself. And is it as good as it looks?

Mr Sparks’s latest book, *Beyond the*

*Miracle,* is among the first of what will

be many appraisals of South Africa in

the coming months, marking 10 years

since the end of apartheid. In April

next year, a decade will have passed

since Nelson Mandela took power in

the country’s first fully democratic

elections. It is a passage of time that

many consider sufficient to gauge to

what extent he and his African National

Congress government have **26** the

inequalities of apartheid.

Journalistic scorecards will come

out. But South Africans themselves will

be able to pass judgment on the ANC’s

performance at the ballot box.

Parliamentary elections are expected in

the first half of the year.

Mr Sparks’s own comprehensive and

readable assessment of the new South

Africa is generous. He reminds us that

South Africa’s miracle transition

achieved the **27** that other parts of

the world still find so elusive. Its

people stood at the brink of civil war

and stepped back.

His book, the third in a trilogy,

begins with Mr Mandela’s swearing-in

as president and ends with the

prevailing debates about how to tackle

the HIV/Aids pandemic, narrow the

wealth gap and deal with Zimbabwe’s

President Robert Mugabe.

On the way, he takes in many of the

**28** the post-apartheid era. He

explains how the government

transformed its economic policy,

ditching nationalisation for a liberal

economy with privatisation at its core.

He recounts episodes of the Truth and

Reconciliation Commission, where

victims’ families confronted their

torturers. And he draws sympathetic

portraits of two very different leaders:

Mr Mandela and Thabo Mbeki, his

successor.

Mr Sparks writes as **29** . He

admits to Mr Mbeki drinking him

under the table in Lusaka; he arranges

meetings to break the logjam between

Afrikaners and the liberation

movement; and he shares car rides

with community leaders before they are

assassinated by hit squads.

The book captures both the **30** of

liberators who found – once in

government – how impoverished South

Africa had become in the last days of

apartheid, and the pragmatic spirit

with which they have set about taking

the country forward.

“There was a feeling that if you dealt

with apartheid a lot of other things

would automatically fall into place, but

that has not been the case. It is much

harder than we expected,” Gill Marcus,

deputy governor of the Reserve Bank,

tells the author.

Some of the book’s most striking

chapters illuminate that **31** . Mr

Sparks’s own efforts to reinvigorate the

news operation of the South African

Broadcasting Corporation – formerly

an apartheid propaganda organ – show

some of the shortcomings of

transformation. The SABC’s new

management is dogged by indecision

and in-fighting. The same tensions are

to be found in many South African

businesses.

Mr Sparks’s visits over the years to a

once all-white suburb adjoining a

squatter camp on the outskirts of

Johannesburg **32** . White people

build a wall to keep the blacks out. The

wall fails to do so. Black people move

in. White people leave the

neighbourhood. But some stay behind.

People, irrespective of colour, lose their

jobs. Overall, the cameos convey a

battered optimism.

*Beyond the Miracle* sums up the

challenge that the ANC faces as it

approaches its third election with an

analogy of a double decker bus. The top

deck – the middle class – is

increasingly multiracial and getting

along just fine. Downstairs is filled to

bursting with black people for whom

little has changed. But there is no

stairway that joins the two.

*The reviewer is the FT’s former South*

*Africa correspondent*

*Financial Times*

1p **24**

**A** African integration

**B** social equality

**C** white supremacy

1p **25**

**A** been a passing fancy

**B** been misunderstood

**C** done any good

**D** happened so fast

1p **26**

**A** broken down

**B** tolerated

**C** underestimated

1p **27**

**A** ideal society

**B** popularity

**C** prosperity

**D** reconciliation

1p **28**

**A** conflicts characterising

**B** milestones reached in

**C** promises made in

**D** traditions born in1p **29**

**A** a diplomat

**B** an author of fiction

**C** an insider

**D** a typical white South African

1p **30**

**A** disappointment

**B** excitement

**C** ruthlessnes

1p **31**

**A** determination

**B** difficulty

**C** sense of pessimism

1p **32**

**A** are equally telling

**B** present a different picture

**C** provide little information
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Trust me, I’m a patient

A few years ago, my friend Jack went home to

Cornwall for his father’s funeral. His father

had been the local GP and the church was packed.

Afterwards, the mourners queued to express their

condolences to Jack and his sister: one man

explained that he had come because the doctor had

delivered his three children and four grandchildren;

a woman told them that she owed their father her

life because he’d made her stop drinking; a couple

remembered how the doctor had climbed out of bed

one Christmas Eve to rush to their infant’s bedside

because they feared a chest infection had turned

into pneumonia.

Jack’s father was **18** . The once familiar

figure of the beloved GP whose skills have cured

generations and whose devotion to his patients

(never clients) meant he spent his life rushing from

housecall to housecall has become a memory.

Equally, few GPs today would expect the respect

and veneration which Jack’s father enjoyed among

his peers. Today’s GP, and the relationship he or

she has with their patients today, is altogether

different.

A survey published last week by *Reader’s Digest*

casts some light on how doctors **19** their

patients. Of the 200 GPs who took part, half said

they would like to tell their patients to wash before

coming to see them; two-thirds want to tell them

that they’re too fat and about half do not believe

their patients take the medication they recommend.

It’s not exactly heartwarming: GPs sound

seriously frustrated and disillusioned in their

dealings with us. Are we, the patients, to blame? Or

are we finally reacting to centuries of their superior

attitude towards the layman? Did the rot set in

when the medical profession was forced into a

marketplace mentality, with our health as the

product, doctors the providers, ourselves the

**20** ?

Commercialisation can go too far. A doctor’s

surgery is not a shop. When we buy a gizmo at

Dixons, we give nothing more than our money. But

when we visit a doctor, she cannot heal us unless

we **21** about our symptoms (the embarrassing

itch, the persistent cough) and our habits (how

much we smoke or drink and just how much butter

we like to spread over our toast), nor can she help

us unless we are committed to following the

treatment she prescribes.

The consumer**, 22** , has obligations: politeness

or at least civility, cleanliness, and the willingness

to try the treatment administered. As one GP in an

NHS practice in south London says: ‘I am here to

treat any patient on my list. But it is a lot easier to

do it properly if they keep their side of the bargain.

I expect them to be punctual, sober and clean, to

answer my questions politely and honestly and then

to take my advice seriously.’

Some patients take their health very seriously

indeed. They step into the surgery armed with

facts, figures, and Lancet articles. Few doctors can

keep up with them. One woman I know, after her

hysterectomy, asked her doctor about post-op

treatments available. He shrugged and coughed and

could think of nothing. That same day, she got onto

the internet and found a self-help website, with

post-op advice and treatments, and tips from other

women who had had hysterectomies. One entry,

she noticed, had been contributed by a nurse who

worked in her GP’s practice, and yet he had not so

much as taken notice of **23** .

This new breed of patient must prove daunting to

GPs. When the doctor was seen as a wise

paterfamilias, whose role was to scold and support

the recalcitrant child-patient, too many of us

dropped our intelligence and spirit of inquiry when

we set foot in the surgery. The healers were

sacrosanct, their prescriptions **24** . Mute and

docile as children cowed by father’s caning,

patients did their medic’s bidding.

Today, this blind trust in authority has given way

to wary suspicion. Whether it be the doctor, the

teacher, the priest, we question those who **25**

any aspect of our life. What right has my doctor to

say my snoring is a result of heavy smoking and

obesity?

This rejection of authority can prove as harmful

as blind obedience to every dictate issued by the

doctor. If we discount everything our GPs tell us, if

we treat them with dislike or disrespect, can we

expect them to have our well-being at heart? Yes,

we, the patients, need to take an active part in our

health – we can no longer approach medical terms

as if they were an obscure Cantonese dialect and

our bodily functions as if they were obscenities at a

tea party. But in establishing active interest in

**26** , we cannot elbow out those trained to

safeguard it.

*The Observer*

**18**

**A** one of a dying breed

**B** one of the best

**C** one of the lucky few

**19**

**A** are misunderstood by

**B** are seen by

**C** deal with

**D** view

**20**

**A** consumers

**B** outsiders

**C** patients

**D** victims

**21**

**A** are honest

**B** have done something

**C** know

**22**

**A** ironically

**B** nevertheless

**C** similarly

**D** therefore

**23**

**A** his patient’s information

**B** his patient’s weak condition

**C** the nurse’s criticism

**D** the website’s existence

**24**

**A** familiar

**B** infallible

**C** numerous

**D** useless

**25**

**A** are disrespectful of

**B** claim control over

**C** know all about

**26**

**A** a good relationship with our GPs

**B** our physical welfare

**C** the medical profession

**D** the patient’s behaviour

Tekst 6

**GLOBALISATION**

**Local must replace global**

**Colin Hines** argues that globalisation cannot be

tamed; it must be stopped in its tracks

We have seen them on the streets in

Seattle, London and Melbourne. We

shall soon see them in Prague. But it is

time for the anti-globalisation protesters to

move from opposition to proposition. What is it

that will achieve all the goals – job security, a

less polluted planet, the relief of poverty –

sought by the disparate coalition that mounts

the protests? The answer, I believe, is to

replace globalisation with localisation.

This alternative insists that everything that

can sensibly be produced within a nation or

region should be so produced. Long-distance

trade is reduced to supplying what cannot come

from within one country or geographical

grouping of countries. Technology and

information would still be encouraged to flow,

but only where they can strengthen **14** .

Under these circumstances, beggar-your-neighbour globalisation would give way to the

potentially more co-operative better-you-rneighbour localisation.

Globalisation cannot be tinkered with.

Campaigns for labour standards or “fair trade”

or voluntary ethical codes **15** the nature of

the trade liberalisation beast. These attempts

are like trying to lasso a tiger with cotton. We

should aim, instead, to return the tiger to its

original habitat.

International trade was originally a search for

**16** ; Europeans went to India for spices and

other exotics, not for coal. That is precisely the

“localisation” approach, but without the

disastrous social effects of colonialism. Longdistance trade should be only for acquiring

what cannot be provided within the region

where people live.

We must play the **17** at their own game.

They have a clear goal: maximum trade and

money flows for maximum profit. They frame

policies and trade rules that will achieve this.

Those who want a more just, secure,

environmentally sustainable future must have

an equally clear goal and equally detailed

policies for achieving it.

The policies for localisation **18** the

reintroduction of protective safeguards for

domestic economies (tariffs, quotas and so on);

a “site here to sell here” rule for manufacturing

and services; the development of local

currencies so that more money stays within its

place of origin; local competition policies to

eliminate monopolies from more protected

economies; increased democratic involvement

at local level; the introduction of resource

taxes.

This will not be the old-style protectionism

that seeks to protect a home market, while

expecting others to remain open. The global

emphasis will be on **19** . Any residual longdistance trade will be geared to funding the

diversification of local economies.

All opponents of aspects of globalisation

should recognise that this is the only way

forward. It is no use their fighting the specific

issues that concern them. Trade unionists must

recognise that “labour standards” are an

impossibility under globalisation, because

countries have to lower standards to compete.

And **20** should see that globalisation, and

its commandment that every nation must

contort its economy to outcompete every other

nation, blocks any chance of dealing with

climate change, the greatest threat to the

planet. High taxation on fossil fuels will

always be trumped by threats from big business

to **21** . Under localisation, that would not be

an option, for companies would not be allowed

to sell their goods in a region they had

deserted.

The 20th century was dominated by conflict

between the left and the right. The big battle of

the 21st century should be fought between the

globalists of today’s political centre on one

side, and an alliance of localists, red-greens

and “small c” conservatives on the other. Only

if the latter win will we have any chance of a

fairer, greener world.

*The writer’s* Localisation: a global manifesto *is*

*published by Earthscan (£10.99)*

*New Statesman*

**14**

**A** clean production processes

**B** international trade

**C** local economies

**15**

**A** fundamentally mistake

**B** irreparably change

**C** seriously harm

**D** warmly embrace

**16**

**A** expansion

**B** novelty

**C** prestige

**D** profit

**17**

**A** globalisers

**B** local entrepreneurs

**C** protesters

**18**

**A** counterbalance

**B** include

**C** replace

**D** undermine

**19**

**A** international competition

**B** local trade

**C** long-term effects

**D** removing trade barriers

**20**

**A** anti-globalisation protesters

**B** environmentalists

**C** multinationals

**D** the rich countries

**21**

**A** cut wages

**B** move away

**C** raise prices

Tekst 7 **Patents and patients**

Why are pharmaceuticals

companies so often the object of criticism? After all, they are in the business of discovering the medicines that help save and improve the lives of millions. They employ some of the most gifted scientists on earth, who strain at the very limits of existing human knowledge to discover the medical treatments of tomorrow.

**15** , a campaign launched this

week by Oxfam, the UK aid agency, which accuses drug companies of using patent rights to deny millions of people life-saving medicines – particularly to treat Aids – has struck a chord. It has unleashed a fury of media coverage in which pharma-ceuticals companies are branded as grasping and ruthless – even evil.

Paul Herrling, the quiet and

thoughtful head of research at

Novartis, a giant Swiss pharma-ceuticals company, concedes that his industry **16** . “It’s absolutely true that the pharma industry, like any other human under-taking, has excesses and does things that you or I would not condone,” he says, pushing his bicycle through the research campus he runs in Basle. “But the biggest motivation when you talk to our scientists is that they can use their science to save lives.”

Mr Herrling believes the

pharmaceuticals industry has a

fundamental contract with society –to deliver new medicines. “We are the only element of society that can efficiently contribute new pharma-cological therapies to society. Nobody else can do it.” But the **17** to which he alludes lies at the heart of public disquiet about the industry. For while the public, through its representtatives in government, has implicitly signed up, many elements of the agreement make it feel uncomfortable.

At the heart of public disquiet is the industry’s monopoly status – the foundation of its fabulous wealth. The top 10 pharma-ceuticals groups have a

combined valuation of $1,200bn and sales of $150bn a year. The contract with society is as follows. Drug companies are encouraged to spend huge amounts of money on discovering new medicines. **18** , they are awarded a monopoly, known as a patent. While the patent lasts, for an average of about 10 years after a medicine is launched, no other company can produce cheap copies of the same drug.

The disadvantage of the arrangement is that the price of patented medicines bears no relation to the cost of manufacturing them. Drug companies claim that they operate in a competitive environment. But when a medicine finally goes off patent, generic manufacturers can charge a tenth of the price and still turn a handy profit.

Furthermore, the industry’s claim that it needs “super-profits” to undertake risky research investments is **19** by the huge amounts it lavishes on marketing. Glaxo- SmithKline boasts that it spends $500,000 an hour on research and development. But it invests nearly twice as much in sales and marketing. It employs 10,000 scientists – and 40,000 salesmen.

None of this sits well with the

image conjured up in Oxfam’s report of patients in the developing world dying for want of medicines. By defending its **20** in poor countries, it says, the industry puts the price of vital drugs beyond millions of poor people. Through its vast lobbying power, Oxfam accuses it of exploiting World Trade Organisation rules to “conduct an undeclared drugs war against the world’s poorest countries”.

The charity says patented

medicines cost far more in countries that **21** international patent norms than in those that allow generic manufacturers to flourish.

“We know that making life-saving drugs more affordable isn’t the whole answer,” says Justin Forsyth, Oxfam’s director of policy. Mr Forsyth concedes the industry’s point that poverty and lack of healthcare infrastructure are

even more to blame, as evidenced by a continuing lack of access in those countries to drugs that have long since lost patent protection. “However, the balance has skewed too far towards corporate wealth rather than public health,” he says.

Some in the industry are genuinely bemused at such accusations. One executive from Merck, a respected US company remarked recently that food companies were not held responsible for world famine, nor

water utilities for the absence of

drinking water in poor countries.

“Why is it the **22** of the pharma-ceuticals industry to fund treatment of Aids in Africa? Since when?” echoes Joe Zammit-Lucia of Cambridge Pharma Consultancy.

The problem for the industry is

that not even Oxfam is asking it to fund such an endeavour. Pharma-ceuticals companies are being challenged to do something far more risky: to renounce their patent rights in certain markets. That is a frightening prospect for an industry for which patents are its very lifeblood. If it budges, even **23** , it fears its prices will be undermined in the west.

The industry’s traditional line of thinking has been that abuse of patents, wherever it occurs, is theft. “Companies that make generic copies are like pirates on the high seas,” Sir Richard Sykes, non-executive chairman of GSK, told the BBC last week.

But that hardline view may be

giving way to a more pragmatic

approach. This week, Glaxo-

SmithKline told concerned investors that it was **24** its policies on pricing and patent enforcement. Even before the Oxfam campaign broke,

Jean-Pierre Garnier made it clear to colleagues that the access issue was high on his agenda. He was not happy, he said, being head of a company that sold 80 per cent of its medicines to only 20 per cent of the world’s population.

At Novartis, Dr Herrling believes the industry should help repair its image by devoting a specified percentage of profits towards research into non-

commercial diseases, such as malaria and dengue fever. If the industry continues to arouse public scorn, he says, it runs the risk of no longer being able to attract the

finest scientific talent. “That would have disastrous consequences for society.”

*David Pilling in the ‘Financial*

*Times’*

1p **15**

**A** Even so

**B** In fact

**C** In short

**D** Therefore

1p **16**

**A** does not bother about ethical issues

**B** focuses on profitability

**C** has a credibility problem

1p **17**

**A** contract

**B** element of society

**C** science

1p **18**

**A** In return

**B** In spite of this

**C** On top of that

1p **19**

**A** reflected

**B** strengthened

**C** undermined

1p **20**

**A** expansion

**B** patents

**C** research

1p **21**

**A** disregard

**B** fall below

**C** respect

**D** rise above

1p **22**

**A** exclusive right

**B** first priority

**C** responsibility

1p **23**

**A** at the cost of new research

**B** in insignificant markets

**C** with the promise of future profits

**D** with this threat of global disease

1p **24**

**A** going to stick to

**B** reviewing

**C** toughening

**D** willing to make publi

c

Tekst 8

**THE BIG ISSUE: RUGBY UNION GETS THE NEEDLE**

**Drugs and the generation gap**

By Eddie Butler

I THINK IT IS the fault of my

generation, those people who played their games back in the Seventies and Eighties. We all knew that, behind a closed iron curtain, doctors were at work, still trying to manufacture the master race. If the East Germans felt like turning out spotty women with beards who could run like cheetahs because they were flush with the hormones extracted from that particular feline, then there was nothing we could do

except give thanks that we **28**  .

This was the Cold War and the

sight of a Bulgarian shot putter

strapping her lunch pack into the

Frankenstein fold of her upper thigh before taking to the circle was a reminder that it was good to belong to the free West. Sebastian Coe and Steve Ovett – with rare affection we knew them simply as Seb and, er, Ovett – didn’t get on particularly well, but they were  **29** and could beat the Commies.

And we all liked Liverpool FC

because they were the best and were rumoured to drink like fish. Rugby was amateur and even more boozy. And if someone did a little speed to get them through the afternoon, then it was a laugh because it only went to show that he was a hell of a boy who’d had a skinful the night before.

**A YEAR BEFORE** the fall of the

Iron Curtain, at the Seoul Olympics, it was clear that drugs had **30**  . But even then it didn’t seem quite so bad. Oh, I know there was a right stink when Ben Johnson failed his test, but, let’s admit it, no one liked Carl Lewis and to see his smile wiped out by a chap from the Commonwealth was damn good sport while it lasted. If there was one thing worse than a hairy East German fraulein, it was a smug Yank.

But now, of all people, the Irish

are taking drugs. Michelle Smith

was bad enough, but now it seems

that lads who didn’t marry dodgy

Dutch discus throwers are up to

their overdeveloped pecs in the

mess. It’s like finding out that one of

the Von Trapp children grew up to

become an arms dealer, that Coe

became a Conservative MP. Somehow, drugs have come into our own back yard, where the children play.

They’ve always been here,

though. In the course of doing some

casual research on the extent of

noxious-substance abuse back in

**31** , I was reliably informed that

there were a lot of pills doing the

rounds even when there was no

money in rugby.This, I retorted with

admirable patriotic zeal, would have

been a peculiarly Welsh weakness.

Body-building gyms seem to

abound in Wales. Must be the

weather.

No, I was informed, drugtaking

was, without being commonplace,

evident across the board. In

changing rooms **32**  players

have been doing stuff for years.

**IT’S QUITE UPSETTING** really.

All those watering eyes and

determined stares in the changing

room may not have been the result

of the power of my oratory after all.

Those rides acrest waves of natural

passion turn out to be nothing more

than trips down billowing cloud

nine.

I’m sorry if I sound  **33**  about

the whole thing, but I suspect that at

some imprecise time around the fall

of the Berlin Wall, I began to fear

that corruption in sport was not just

confined to the institutes and

laboratories of the Eastern Bloc.

Such a fear predates the arrival of

absurd sums of money in the arena

of sport, but there’s no question that

the lure of huge rewards has **34**

the basic human instinct to cut

corners in the competitive pursuit of

victory. Hell, we cheat. As much as

we can and as often as we can. The

spirit of competition relates, according to that same session of

casual research, to our primeval

hunting instincts. Who cares if the lion is engaged in noble chase up hill and down dale until the spear is cleanly driven through its noble heart? Much safer to creep up on it in numbers **35** a good session

on the narcotic home-brew and rip it to pieces before it has a chance to stir.

**THE SAFE ASSUMPTION** to

make is that everyone in every form of athletic endeavour is on drugs. Sport is the playground of dopeheads. Only from such a startingpoint do we stand a chance of being surprised by romance, when somebody bucks the trend and wins  **36** .

Absurd sums of money are

washing around sport. How can it be that at a time when footballers rank among the richest people in Britain, the drug-testing agencies complain of lack of funds? The most dangerous narcotic on earth –  **37** – should be used to keep all the growth hormones, steroids, caterpillar excreta and ladyshaves in some sort of check. Everybody is cheating, but let’s try to keep our competitors free from permanent mutation for as long as possible.

The Irish are on drugs. It is

enough to put you off sport for

good. Such was the consensus

around the table of our informal research group. Among the generation who had played their games in the Seventies and Eighties, and who felt that they were somehow to blame for not doing enough at the time, heads drooped. But not for long. Luckily somebody had brought a little pick-me-up. Spirits were raised and hair began to sprout in strange places.

*‘The Observer’*

**28**

**A** had been born elsewhere

**B** had won the fight against drugs

**C** were safe from East Germans

**29**

**A** clean

**B** politically acceptable

**C** popular

**D** tolerant enough

**30**

**A** become a serious health risk

**B** gained territory

**C** got into criminal hands

**D** proved their effectiveness

**31**

**A** the age of apparent innocence

**B** the era of fierce nationalism

**C** the years of global competition

**32**

**A** all over Wales

**B** throughout the Eastern bloc

**C** up and down the land

**33**

**A** confused

**B** flippant

**C** indifferent

**D** optimistic

**34**

**A** altogether undermined

**B** merely suppressed

**C** only increased

**35**

**A** after

**B** before

**C** in favour of

**D** in the hope of

**36**

**A** by fair means

**B** by sheer luck

**C** without being found out

**D** without being sponsored

**37**

**A** ambition

**B** fame

**C** money

**D** sports
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