Unit 1 — Globalisation and the Self — Teacher copy

Track E · Klasse 13 · Niveau E (Basisfach / Leistungsfach) · Abitur year

Niveau E

1. Vocabulary

Match each item to its meaning or use it in a sentence.

Term	Your note
plural identity	
rooted cosmopolitanism	
hospitality	
the moral horizon	
situated identity	
contributory belonging	
essentialism	
identitarian	
the politics of recognition	

2. Reading

Read the text and use it for the activities below.

Reading — three frames (paraphrased)

Sen — plural identity: No human being is reducible to a single belonging. The illusion of singular identity is the precondition of identitarian violence.

Appiah — rooted cosmopolitanism: We can be loyal to a particular place AND committed to a general moral horizon at the same time. Both loyalties are real.

Lahiri — language and self: To write in a second language is to undertake a small, voluntary self-displacement that produces a third version of yourself.

Vocabulary — cosmopolitanism

plural identity, rooted cosmopolitanism, hospitality, the moral horizon, situated identity, contributory belonging, essentialism, identitarian, the politics of recognition.

3. Practise

Niveau E — controlled

1. Match: Sen → plural identity; Appiah → rooted cosmopolitanism; Lahiri → language-as-self.
2. T or F: rooted cosmopolitanism rejects local loyalty; plural identity is the same as multiple passports.

Niveau E — productive

3. Build 4 sentences applying cosmopolitan vocabulary to one of the three frames.

4. Your turn

Position essay, 400 words. Argue your own position on identity-and-globalisation. Use 5 cosmopolitan vocabulary terms + 6 academic discourse markers + 1 cleft + 1 integrated quote from one of the three writers.

Sample

The most useful framework I have read this year for thinking about identity-under-globalisation is Kwame Anthony Appiah's rooted cosmopolitanism, partly because it refuses the easy choice between local loyalty and a general moral horizon. The available evidence — anthropological, historical, and personal — suggests that human beings have, in practice, always held more than one belonging at once. Accordingly, what Sen calls the *illusion of singular identity* is, in my reading, less a mistake than a political construction; the illusion is useful to actors who require an enemy. By contrast, Appiah's frame asks something harder: to hold local and general loyalties simultaneously without collapsing one into the other. It is precisely this dual loyalty that the politics of the 2020s has been bad at. More specifically, Lahiri's *In Other Words — "a small, voluntary self-displacement"* — names the personal version of the Appiah claim: writing in a second language produces a third self that is neither hyphenated nor synthetic but situational. In this regard, the three frames converge. Plural identity (Sen) is the *fact*; rooted cosmopolitanism (Appiah) is the *political stance*; the third self (Lahiri) is the *practical experience*. My own position, after a year reading these three, is that the most useful civic skill of the next decade is the willingness to hold two loyalties without resolving them. Caution is warranted; identitarian movements work by demanding a singular belonging that the human evidence does not actually support. Appiah's argument is, finally, an argument for everyday moral patience.

5. Further reading / listening

- Amartya Sen, *Identity and Violence* (2006).
- Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (2006).
- Jhumpa Lahiri, *In Other Words* (Italian 2015 / English 2016).

6. Teacher answer key

Controlled. 1. all true.

2. F (it accepts both local and general loyalties), F (plural identity is conceptual, not documentary).

Productive. 3. Open.