

# Bijlage HAVO

# 2008

tijdvak 2

**Engels**

Tekstboekje

## Tekst 1

---

### Auto makers grapple with longer-lasting cars

Some people buy cars because they fall in love with the style. Others buy vehicles for the same reason they buy a dishwasher: they need a machine to do the job. There's good news for the latter group: cars are lasting longer. Because of that, car makers have to create cars that don't break down and 1 develop models so compelling that customers will buy them even though their existing rides may have four or five years left.

*The Wall Street Journal*

## Tekst 2

---

### Population spread

Sir: Your article "Overpopulation is 'principal threat to planet'" (7 January) is misleading. If the entire population of the world were transported to the USA and spread evenly, population density there would be not much greater than it is now in the Netherlands. Furthermore, the quantity of the earth's natural resources consumed by the average English child in terms of, say, energy usage, is eight times that of an average child in India or China. The most fundamental problem is not overpopulation, but the unsustainable lifestyles of the affluent West.

DAVID L. GOSLING

CLARE HALL UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

<http://comment.independent.co.uk>

### *Letters*

## Downloading trouble

It is not just multi-millionaire rock stars who are affected by illegal downloads from the internet (Letters, June 22), but a multitude of lesser-known artists whose record sales mean they barely scrape an income. Avant-garde and cult artists are further impoverished by this mean-spirited form of theft. It also makes it increasingly difficult for them to continue to create and continue with their music. Such illegal downloading helps to further marginalise the non-mainstream arts, thus constricting creativity and promoting cultural conformity with mass tastes.

While it may be that record companies are greedy, brutal and ugly, it is also true that some of their arguments against illegal downloading are both legally, morally and aesthetically correct.

**Eric Longley**

Media division, Assets Ltd

● Sylvia Price is paying an unfair and heavy price for her daughter's music file-sharing and downloading habit (Mother faces music, June 21) – £4,000 and the criminalisation of her daughter is a “bully boy” response from a music industry caught napping by advancing technology. Every wave in that advance – from CDs to downloading – has been resisted by an industry more interested in its own preservation than in serving the needs of consumers. Greater willingness to embrace new technology and run with its implications for the future of music distribution could have avoided expensive and pointless actions against consumers.

**Ed Mayo**

National Consumer Council

*The Guardian*

### **Risk-taking boys do not get the girls**

WHETHER it's driving too fast, bungee-jumping or reckless skateboarding, young men will try almost anything to be noticed by the opposite sex. But a study of attitudes to risk suggests that the only people impressed by their stunts are other men.

- 5 Futile risk-taking might seem to have little going for it in evolutionary terms. So why were our rash ancestors not replaced by more cautious contemporaries?

- 10 One idea is that risk-takers are advertising their fitness to potential mates by showing off their strength and bravery. This fits with the fact that men in their prime reproductive years take more risks. To test this idea, William Farthing of the University of Maine in Orono surveyed 48 young men and 52 young women on their attitudes to risky scenarios. Men thought women would be impressed by pointless gambles, 6 women in fact preferred cautious men.

- 15 Reckless thrill-seekers might be trying a more subtle route to women's affections. Men say they prefer their same-sex friends to be risk-takers, and women prefer high-status males ... . "So if he has higher status among other men, women might like him for his status, even though they don't like the risk-taking in itself,"  
20 Farthing says.

*www.newscientist.com*

# Trials on TV? Don't hold your breath

Marcel Berlins



There was a brief flurry of media activity last week - not joined by The Guardian - suggesting that the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer, has decided to allow the filming of trials in the courts of England and Wales. The impression given by some reports was that viewers would be able to follow substantial parts of high-profile trials on their television screens.

That is not going to happen. The Lord Chancellor has not yet made up his mind, but when he does reveal his decision in a month or two it will considerably restrict the filming that will be permitted.

Of course, even the limited presence of cameras in court is better than none at all, which is the present position. But no one should think that coverage here will in any way come close to resembling what Americans can regularly see on their screens.

Criminal trials are what most people would be most interested to watch; those are precisely the trials which the cameras would be least allowed to film. The Lord Chancellor has often made clear his firm - and justifiable - opposition to the filming of witnesses, defendants or jurors. It

is highly unlikely that he will accept the suggestion that a defendant's or witness's face could be hidden by a moveable blob covering it. I remember watching a televised trial from Florida where the blob was unable to keep up with the witness's movements; every now and again we saw the face that was supposed to be hidden from us. So what will be left to televise, if the actual evidence is



forbidden? Certainly the judge's sentencing of an accused found guilty; perhaps the judge's summing up to the jury and the final speeches of the prosecution and defence lawyers. Libel cases, which usually involve celebrities, whom the public would want to see in the witness box, would be subject to the same restrictions. There will be no sensational bits.

*The Guardian*



## Flirting

**I**F YOU have ever sat alone in a bar, depressed by how good-looking everybody else seems to be, take comfort—it may be evolution playing a trick on you. A study just published in *Evolution and Human Behavior* by Sarah Hill, a psychologist at the University of Texas, Austin, shows that people of both sexes reckon the sexual competition they face is stronger than it really is. She thinks that this is 10: it makes people try harder to attract or keep a mate.

Dr Hill showed heterosexual men and women photographs of people. She asked them all both to rate how attractive those of their own sex would be to the opposite sex and how attractive the members of the opposite sex were. She then compared the scores for the former with the scores for the latter, seen from the other side. Men thought that the men they were shown were more attractive to women than they really were, and women thought the same of the women.

Dr Hill had predicted this outcome thanks to error-management theory—the idea that when people make errors of judgment, they, understandably, tend to make the error that 11 in terms of damage. The notion was first proposed by Martie Haselton and David Buss, two of Dr Hill's colleagues, to explain a puzzling quirk in male psychology.

As studies show, and many women will attest, men tend to misinterpret innocent friendliness as a sign that women are sexually interested in them. Dr Haselton and Dr Buss reasoned that men who are trying to decide if a woman is interested sexually can err in one of two ways. They can either 12 she is

not interested, in which case they will not bother trying to have sex with her; or they can erroneously conclude she is interested, try, and be rejected. From an evolutionary standpoint, trying and being rejected comes at little expense, except for hurt feelings. Not trying at all, by contrast, may mean the loss of an opportunity to, among other things, 13.

There is an opposite bias in women's errors. They tend to 14 signs that a man is interested in a committed relationship. That, the idea goes, is because a woman who guesses wrongly that a man intends to stick around could end up raising a child alone.

On looks, 15, men and women make the same error. So go on, pluck up your courage: you may think the competition is frighteningly hot, but then so does she.



*The Economist*

# The bottom line

Book Reviews

### **The Wal-Mart Effect**

Charles Fishman

*Allen Lane, the Penguin Press, 294pp, £12.99*

**Reviewed by Martin Vander Weyer**

Salmon used to be a luxury for the average American family, but nowadays it is a weekly staple – because Wal-Mart sells fillets of it for as little as \$4.84 (£2.66) a pound. The fish are farmed by the millions in the fjords of southern Chile, processed in low-wage factories there, and freighted unfrozen to arrive pink and gleaming, within 48 hours of being killed, on the counters of thousands of Wal-Mart superstores across the US. The price per pound, Charles Fishman points out in this well-researched book, is less than the postage it would cost you to mail the fish back to Chile.

The impact of that price on American grocery bills and eating habits, on the economy of Chile and on the ecology of a distant corner of the Pacific polluted by industrial quantities of fish food and faeces, is what Fishman calls the “Wal-Mart effect”. It is, in his view, neither wholly bad nor wholly good – but it is very, very big. The Arkansas-based chain, founded by Sam Walton in 1962, is not simply the biggest private-sector employer and the biggest retailer in the US. Its low-price strategy, so influential that other stores follow suit even when they are not direct competitors, plays a principal role in holding down US inflation; its relentless demand for low prices from suppliers has been a major driver in the disappearance of US manufacturing jobs to China and elsewhere.

But it is a relief to find that Fishman is not just another journalist on a mission to expose Wal-Mart as a monstrous conspiracy against the little guy. Fishman is clearly troubled by Wal-Mart, but he exercises an open mind. He recites the long list of cases against Wal-Mart for using and abusing illegal immigrant labour, and for buying goods from cruel third-world factories, but he acknowledges that the company now has a clear code of conduct for suppliers and a – relatively small – team of inspectors trying to make it stick. He repeats accusations that Wal-Mart is excessively secretive and that its employees and suppliers speak to the press at their own risk, but he accepts that there would be no profit for the company in giving away valuable commercial data.

He reminds us that other supermarkets and vast numbers of downtown grocery stores have gone bankrupt because of the arrival of Wal-Mart’s soulless giant sheds. But he observes that Wal-Mart is not simply a predator. It does not just lower its prices until the competition has been destroyed, then raise them again: it keeps them low, as its slogan says, “always”. And that is why even customers



35 who declare themselves in surveys to be “conflicted” – actively disliking Wal-  
Mart for its impact on communities and jobs – still shop there more than once a  
week, spending almost as much as those who declare themselves to be Wal-  
Mart’s “champions”.

40 In effect, Fishman concludes, Wal-Mart does nothing more sinister than sell a \$3  
item of merchandise for \$2.97. The frugality and determination that have  
enabled Wal-Mart to do this consistently for 44 years are largely to be admired,  
even if they include forcing suppliers to install toll-free phone lines so that Wal-  
Mart does not have to bear the cost of calling for deliveries. Sam Walton himself,  
an authentic American hero of capitalism, drove a dog-chewed pick-up long after  
he became a billionaire.

45 Yet Wal-Mart today is no longer the company that Walton left behind when he  
died in 1992. It has multiplied in scale and reach at home and abroad, acquiring  
unprecedented market power – and this angers unions, environmentalists and  
journalists. 22, its managers do not have a secret plan to rule the world; they  
just sell as much cheap stuff as they can. If there is anything sinister in that, it is  
50 the hypnotic effect it has on American shoppers. They happily bought Wal-Mart’s  
\$2.79 gallon jars of pickled cucumbers even though they could not possibly eat  
them all. When the price of underpants was slashed, they bought astonishing  
quantities and stockpiled them.

55 In an era of excessive over-consumption, don’t blame Wal-Mart for the “Wal-  
Mart effect”: blame its customers, especially the “conflicted” ones.

*Martin Vander Weyer, a former investment banker, is a British journalist and  
business editor, regularly contributing to national newspapers and magazines.*

*<http://www.newstatesman.com>*

# So, Should You Buy a Diamond?

By TOM ZOELLNER

1 Jewellers know the look, the shy mixture of hesitation and happiness that crosses a man's face when he buys an engagement ring. He wants this piece of clear carbon to embody all the love he feels for his intended and to represent the new life they're embarking on. I felt it five years ago when I became one of the 1.7 million American men who buy a diamond ring each year. Later, my engagement unravelled and I began to think again about that ring and about the diamond trade that produced it. I realized there were questions I should have been asking about that diamond beyond the carat size and the price. Primarily, should you even buy a diamond?

2 The answer depends on whom you ask. The diamond trade would say yes. Watchdog groups like Global Witness would say no. Eight years ago, Global Witness produced damning evidence of jewel-related slaughter in several African nations. It caused an international scandal and gave rise to a policing mechanism called the Kimberley Process, which requires diamond-

exporting nations to seal their stones in a tamperproof container, with a document stating they were not mined in a war zone.

3 Has this worked? To research my book, *The Heartless Stone*, I travelled to Africa, where diamonds are mined in conditions that range from the orderly to the horrific, and found virtually no oversight of the violence-prone alluvial-mining sites. Many stones have made their way out



of the jungle and into suburban malls via somebody's lower intestinal tract. 28 the diamonds are not smuggled or traded for guns, the wages for the miners can be outrageously unfair. I met a team of

diggers in the Central African Republic who were routinely paid \$200 for large-carat diamonds that would easily retail for \$40,000 in the U.S.

4 There is persuasive evidence that the supply chain is easily infiltrated. A September U.S. report<sup>1)</sup> said flatly, "U.S. control systems cannot help deter illicit rough diamonds from entering the legitimate trade." Another disturbing finding: the U.S. reported exporting more diamonds

than it received in 2003; 29 trade imbalance for a nation without a single working mine. The GAO said, with bureaucratic dryness, that such figures were “not plausible”.

5 The Kimberley Process has two loopholes that can't be easily plugged. The first, as the U.S. report's findings indicate, is that it would be difficult to design a better tool for money laundering, arms dealing and cross-border smuggling than a diamond - all that liquidity in such a tiny space. Diamonds can be bought with dirty money, moved across African borders with relative ease, given false paperwork and then sent onward to the trading centres of Europe.

6 The second is that Kimberley concerns itself only with nations that are in a state of war as defined by the United Nations. This essentially 31 all kinds of miserable deeds in places like Angola, which is still recovering from a grinding 30-year war and where murder and robbery are facets of daily life in the diamond fields. I was told that miners have been gutted if they were suspected of having swallowed a stone.

7 The diamond industry deserves credit, however, for taking the first steps toward ending the diamond-related slaughter. And, yes, the gems can be used to build up a nation's

infrastructure rather than tear it apart. While the nascent democracy of Botswana does not have a diversified economy (65% of export income comes from diamonds), its calm political climate proves that these stones are not always corrosive to the places they come from. Namibia is taking steps toward creating a home-grown polishing industry, adding a long-overdue value-added layer to the extraction process. A sudden collapse of the diamond trade would spell disaster for these countries and cause starvation and chaos in other diamond zones in Africa.

8 It will not be a movie such as *Blood Diamond* or even the Kimberley Process that determines whether America's favourite gemstone can be purchased ethically. That's up to the consumers, who should insist that jewellers show them proof that their suppliers have a System of Warranties statement on their invoices, demonstrating compliance with the Kimberley Process. Even if this doesn't prove that a diamond is clean, it proves that customers care about the source of their icons of love.

Tom Zoellner is the author of *The Heartless Stone*

*Time*

noot 1 from the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO)

# Taking our leaders at face value

**A new study suggests that how we respond to a candidate's face could determine who we vote for**

**KURT KLEINER  
SPECIAL TO THE STAR**

- 1 The qualities that voters think they can discern in a candidate's face have a surprisingly strong influence on how they vote. In fact, if you take the new research at face value, how much voters like a candidate's face is the only thing that will decide who wins or loses. What matters to voters isn't so much whether a candidate is attractive or not. Instead, voters look for facial cues for personality traits like aggressiveness, intelligence, honesty, friendliness and competence.
- 2 The surprising thing is not that people look for these cues – it's that judgments about a candidate's face all by themselves seem to predict whether he or she will win or lose the election. It seems to be the very features of the face that attract or repel voters. It's hard to untangle how actual voters, faced with a live candidate, are affected by the face, partly because their feelings about a candidate's policies and personality might affect their perceptions. So Anthony C. Little, a psychologist at the University of Stirling in Scotland, decided to use computerized "morphing" techniques to examine the phenomenon. In research he used the faces of candidates from eight real elections, including candidates George W. Bush and John Kerry from the 2004 U.S. presidential election. Then he used a computer-imaging technique to combine each face with a nondescript male face that had been created by averaging the faces of 10 university students. The result was a pair of faces that was not recognizable as either candidate, but nevertheless bore a sort of family resemblance to the originals – young, unblemished; they could have been the candidates' college-age nephews. So, the altered Bush still has narrow-set eyes and a slightly heavy brow, the altered Kerry wide-set eyes and a long face.
- 3 Then Little asked people to look at the faces and say who they would vote for. In all eight rounds, the votes based on composite faces gave the same results as the actual elections. That bears emphasizing. Sitting at a computer screen, with nothing to go on but a face, a majority of the hundred or so volunteers consistently chose the same candidates as did the millions of voters who had been exposed to newspaper articles, television reports, and intense campaigning. Although the percentages weren't exactly the same for each round, the volunteers always chose the same candidate who ended up winning the popular vote in the actual election.

- 4 In a second experiment, Little's researchers looked in detail at what people saw in the faces, and whether circumstances would change their choices. First people were surveyed about what they thought they saw in the altered Bush and Kerry faces. The Bush face was judged as more masculine and dominant. The Kerry face was rated as more attractive, forgiving, likeable and intelligent. Then researchers asked people to choose which face would be a better leader in a time of war, and which in a time of peace. Bush won 74 per cent of the war-time vote, while Kerry won 61 per cent of the peace-time vote. 37, people will choose a candidate they perceive as dominant if they think he'll have to handle a war, but prefer intelligence and likeability as long as there's no shooting going on.
- 5 But how likely is it that people are really making their decisions based solely on faces? Even Little doesn't really believe it. After all, large chunks of the electorate still vote for a strong party line, and are going to vote for their party's candidate no matter what he or she looks like. On the other hand, undecided voters are more likely to base decisions on their judgment of individual candidates. Those are the ones who could be heavily influenced by a candidate's face, whether they realize it or not.
- 6 The problem is, despite our specialized cognitive machinery for dealing with faces, it turns out that faces aren't a very good guide for judging other people. Studies show that people think they can read all sorts of things about people based on their faces, including intelligence, basic character and personality traits. Unfortunately, the same studies show that we're not as accurate as we think we are.
- 7 Like everyone else, I know that I shouldn't judge a book by its cover. And like everyone else, I do it all the time. I'm usually pretty confident I'm right, but I'm also probably wrong. Misjudging someone at a party based on his face is one thing. Misjudging the leader of a country for the same reason is another, much more serious thing. Faces and gut feelings are no way to choose a leader.

*Kurt Kleiner is a freelance science writer based in Toronto*

*[www.thestar.com](http://www.thestar.com)*

## **Tekst 10**

---

### **Too many mistakes: black list for medication errors?**

#### **A tragedy**

A decade ago in a Denver hospital, a physician's illegible handwriting led a pharmacist to prepare an antibiotic prescription that was 10 times too strong. The dosage killed an infant. The tragedy exemplified how easy it is for such devastating blunders to occur.

#### **The Facts**

A report released last week by the Institute of Medicine, which advises the government on health issues, revealed that such medication errors still occur far too often — particularly considering that technology can reduce them substantially.

Medication errors kill an estimated 7,000 people a year and injure at least 1.5 million, nearly one-third in hospitals. On average, a hospital patient is subject to one medication mistake per day, the Institute said. The extra costs of treating such injuries occurring in hospitals alone amount to \$3.5 billion a year.

At the root of many mistakes: poor communication among health professionals and patients, plus faulty systems for distributing and dispensing medication.

#### **The Fix: Electronic Prescribing systems**

What can be done? Perhaps the most encouraging development is technology. Electronic prescribing systems can overcome problems of bad handwriting and can warn against drug allergies, adverse reactions and excessive doses. The Institute recommends that all health providers and pharmacies install the systems by 2010.

Tech-savvy hospitals that have already done so report dramatic improvements. LDS Hospital in Salt Lake City has reduced adverse drug events by nearly two-thirds since 1996. Patients who received computer-recommended medications had shorter stays. At Boston's Brigham and Women's Hospital, a computerized system reduced medication errors by more than 55%.

Only one in seven of the nation's hospitals, however, has such systems fully operational. The initial cost is high — about \$5 million for community hospitals and up to \$20 million for large urban medical centres. Hospitals mainly get paid by volume of services, rather than outcomes, so there's little immediate financial return for improving patient care. In the long run, however, investing in technology will pay for itself in more efficient care, better reputations, fewer patient injuries and deaths and fewer malpractice suits.

Technology alone won't eliminate medication errors. Doctors and nurses need to communicate better with patients. Patients who are capable of doing so must become active participants in their own care. If you usually get a blue capsule and a nurse hands you a red one, ask questions and demand answers.

Being in a hospital is stressful enough without having to worry that your pills are going to kill you.

*USA Today*

### What happens to... **most old wedding dresses?**



*By Laura Barton*

This week, it was announced that Diana's spare wedding dress (in case of some mishap on the day apparently) is up for sale. Designed by Elizabeth and David Emanuel, it is expected to fetch around £50,000 at auction.

It is not an altogether surprising outcome; many women sell their wedding dresses - indeed there are currently 3,011 available for purchase on eBay alone, and dress-selling has become a competitive market. One internet messageboard provides the following sales tip: "Have your husband or a tattooed male do the photo shoot wearing your dress and give a sob story about divorce and women will go bonkers bidding on it."

For some, flogging their frock is a

rite-of-passage after a divorce, for others it is a matter of financial prudence. After all, realistically, are you ever going to wear your wedding dress again? Although some brides do dye them a different colour and wear them out on the razzle, this is not really an option if yours was a great big frou-frou taffeta meringue with a 6,000ft train, like Diana's.

For her wedding, my friend Lizzie chose a full-skirted dress with a separate corset top. "The woman at the bridal shop told me that I could wear my corset with a black trouser suit for a dinner dance. It seemed to me a bit weird, because surely everyone would be wondering 'Why is that woman wearing half a wedding dress?' Strangely, she didn't come up with anything to do with the skirt."

Some women like to keep their wedding dresses to pass down to their own daughters. If you wish to do this, it is perhaps best to make sure it is properly stored rather than folded up in a drawer where it can be eaten by mice. Like my own mother's. The vast majority of wedding dresses, however, remain in their owners' wardrobes, occupying an offensive amount of space. They are the SUVs of the closet. It is a little-known fact that all the remaining wedding dresses are sent to the knacker's yard where they are melted down to make glue.

*The Guardian*