

NIVELL C1 ANGLÉS / NIVEL C1 INGLÉS
COMPENSIÓ ORAL / COMPRENSIÓN ORAL
GUIÓ / GUIÓN

ENGLISH – C1 – 2016

PISTA	CONTINGUT
1.	<p>English Listening Comprehension Test, C1 Level. Valencian Community, 2016.</p> <p>Now you will hear the instructions for the Listening test. You will have time to read all the questions for all the tasks in the exam. At the beginning of each listening you will hear this sound (BEEP). You can make notes or write your answers while you are listening, but remember that you will also have time to write your answers at the end of each exercise.</p> <p>Please read the instructions for each exercise carefully. If you have any questions, ask them now, as you will not be able to talk during the listening test. (30'') (ÉS L'ÚNIC MOMENT EN EL QUE ES POT PARAR EL CD)</p>
2.	<p>(PRIMERA ACTIVITAT PRIMERA ESCOLTA)</p> <p>Please, look at task 1.</p> <p>You will listen to an interview with Richard Pell, the director of the Center for Post Natural History in Pittsburgh. For questions 1-7, choose the correct answer a, b or c. Write your answers in the appropriate boxes below. Question 0 is an example. You will hear the recording twice. You now have one and half minutes to read the questions.</p> <p>(1'30'' silenci BEEP)</p> <p>POST NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM</p> <p>PRESENTER: There's a tiny museum in Pittsburgh, wedged in between an apartment building and a pizza joint. At first glance it looks like a natural history museum, and there are stuffed animals and dioramas. But the things on display are <i>not</i> your usual specimens. Instead there's a stuffed alcoholic rat, a transgenic tree leaf, and of course your average fish that glow in the dark. Welcome to the Center for Post Natural History where visitors come face to face with the organisms we humans create through breeding or genetic engineering. He's founder of the Centre for Post Natural History and associate professor of Art at Carnegie Mellon. Welcome to Science Friday, Rich.</p> <p>RICH: Hey! Thanks so much for having me on.</p> <p>PRESENTER: First, why do we need a Post Natural History Museum?</p>

RICH: Yeah, well, the idea really came, uh, from visiting a lot of, uh, natural history museums and just kinda noticing that they were missing stuff, uh, like, really common things like farm animals and pets you hardly ever see in a natural history museum. And so, it kind of occurred to me that the more the humans are involved, you know, like, the less likely you are to see them there, the less kind of natural they are. And then I got introduced to synthetic biology as a field by, uh, my friend Chris Boyd—who I think he's been on your show—

PRESENTER: Uhm.

RICH: —and, uh, that kinda pointed to me that, uh, there is this whole realm of laboratory organisms and genetically engineered organisms that you never see on public display. And so it just seemed, like, to be this kind of blind spot that we needed to fill. And then it was a matter of time before I started collecting them.

PRESENTER: Yeah, what are the rules for getting into your museum? What counts as post natural?

RICH: Right, yeah. So, I mean, at some level humans have influenced probably just about every living thing on the planet—you know, climate change or pollution or what have you. Uhm, so you gotta be more specific than that, so we chose to focus it on intentionality—uh, the changes that we've made on purpose, through breeding, domestication, genetic engineering... Uh, so it's the stuff we do on purpose that has kind of evolutionary consequences, inherited by the next generation.

PRESENTER: Uh huh. You've got a picture of a gigantic pumpkin in your collection. We've actually done videos of gigantic— people in Halloween contests—that is coming up— but they are, like, 2,000-pound pumpkins, right? Why a gigantic pumpkin?

RICH: These are one of the incredible post natural wonders of our age, as far as I'm concerned. Uhm, this really started as an American thing but now it's worldwide —people growing pumpkins for size—I mean, every decade they just get bigger and bigger, and now we are crossing the 2,000-pound line. Uhm, and these are grown only for size, not for feeding or anything like this. Uh, but all over the country—in fact this very weekend— uh, they are having giant pumpkin weigh-ins, where they bring these things on forklifts, and they announce the genetic history of these pumpkins. Uhm, they are not given any chemicals, they are not transgenic—uh, they are just bred and fed. I mean, these pumpkins are nothing if not obese pumpkins.

PRESENTER: Uh, we heard a little bit about, uh, Freckles, your biosteel goat.

RICH: Yes.

PRESENTER: Why was Freckles created?

RICH: Uh, well, Freckles is really special. She is, uh, a goat that was genetically engineered —and when I say that, I mean that she has DNA from a completely different species, in her DNA —she was genetically engineered to produce spider silk proteins in her milk. It turns out that spider silk is some of the strongest stuff we know of, uhm, but spiders themselves are kind of antisocial, so we can't farm them, they tend to eat each other. So the out-of-the-box thinking here was, uh, to use an animal that we already have kind of industrialized and get it to produce the spider silk in its milk. And that's what they're doing on this little research lab in Utah right now.

PRESENTER: Uhm. You only, uh, have one live specimen in the museum, and this is an aquarium of glowing fi- GloFish.

RICH: Yes.

PRESENTER: What are GloFish?

RICH: These are very charismatic. These are, uh, zebra fish mostly that, uhm, have been given a gene from coral or, uh, or jellyfish that make them fluoresce really brightly under black light —you know, just like if you're led up in a poster — and these are sold in pet shops, all over the country, uh, except in the state of California —or any other country in the world, I might add— uhm, but these are the only genetically modified animals that you can legally take home with you. And they originated as laboratory organisms but they are sold, uh, for purely esthetic reasons today.

PRESENTER: Uhm, while we were at the museum taking a tour, uh, we caught up with, uh, Matoshi from Delhi who was visiting the museum last week and we asked her whether the museum changed the way she thought about GMOs and this was her response.

MATOSHI: I mean, it's both ways —we definitely want to keep experimenting and finding out more of what is possible on this planet, but again, you know, who gives us the right to do this to other life forms? There was that flask with the human stencils which we figured out so we're not hurting any humans while we experiment, but we don't apply the same standards to other life forms, so it's a bit still open to question.

PRESENTER: Uhm, Rich, what role do you think the Center can play in controversial issues like, uh, GMO?

RICH: Well, well, what we do is we are very careful not to present a position. What we want is for people to come in —regardless of how they feel about these things— uhm, and leave really wanting to know more, like they learn a

	<p>few things they didn't know, they think about things a little bit differently. Uhm, what we want is for people to be thinking harder —uh,we're not trying to convince anyone that, uh, one idea is better than another. Uhm, and it's really a big field we're talking about—you have to remember we're talking about pet dogs at the same time that we're talking about, uh, you know, genetically modified corn— so it's too big an issue to have kind of one is good or bad sort of answer to.</p> <p>PRESENTER: Would you like to see your museum become part of a traditional national history museum one day?</p> <p>RICH: I mean, at some level of course. Just because I wanted to inhabit one of those places. I always imagined, you know, the door with the gilded letter saying, you know, "division of post natural history", you know, somewhere in the basement. But we also could equally exist in kind of any museum of culture, right? And these —<u>we are ultimately we're looking at these living things that have been shaped by human desire</u>, uhm, and they tell us all kinds of interesting things about us, not just about the organisms themselves. So we could be in a sports museums, and we could be in an agricultural museum, we could be in an art museum.</p> <p>PRESENTER: Rich Pell is the director of the Centre for Post Natural History in Pittsburgh. Thank you for joining us today.</p>
3.	<p>(PRIMERA ACTIVITAT SEGONA ESCOLTA) (+ 45'' silenci) Now listen again. (BEEP + REPETICIÓ)</p>
4.	<p>Now you have one minute to check your answers. (1' silenci)</p>
5.	<p>(SEGONA ACTIVITAT PRIMERA ESCOLTA) Please, look at the second exercise. <i>Listen to some extracts in which several people talk about the Syrian migration crisis, and match speakers 1-6 to the statement summarising what each one says (B-I). Speaker 0 is an example. There are two statements that do not correspond to any speaker. Write your answers in the boxes provided. You will hear the recording twice. You now have one and half minutes to read the questions.</i> (1'30'' silenci BEEP) SYRIAN REFUGEES Speaker 0 Turning to the question of refugees, Britain already works with the UN to deliver resettlement programmes and we will accept thousands more under these existing schemes. We've already provided sanctuary to more than 5,000 Syrians in Britain and have introduced a specific resettlement scene alongside those</p>

we already have to help those Syrian refugees particularly at risk. But given the scale of the crisis and the suffering of the Syrian people it is right that we should do much more. So, Mr Speaker, we are proposing that Britain should resettle up to 20,000 Syrian refugees over the rest of this parliament. In doing so we'll continue to show the world that this country is a country of extraordinary compassion, always standing up for our values and helping those in need.

Speaker 1

This country has a much longer tradition of accepting genuine refugees than any other European country, uh, and I have no difficulty or problem with that — far from it. But we ourselves —if we're gonna offer a refugee status to some people from Syria— and I said two or three years ago that I thought we should —I was the first party leader actually to say this— uh, to do that, firstly we must put our own house in order and get back control of our borders to make it more politically acceptable, uh, to take people, uh, but also, we must not encourage people who want to become refugees in Britain to come over the oceans.

Speaker 2

It's an enormous subject, multifaceted. As somebody said, it starts with how you tackle the problems of Syria and Iraq, Eritrea, and Somalia —now, that would take all evening— uh, where do you put people when they come out? How do you process them? How do you calculate who can cope? What we mustn't reduce it to, is everybody in panic and angry and saying, "Why don't they go to other countries?" We took 30,000 East African Asians into this country, and like the other migrants we've received, they actually make a very positive contribution to our economy. But it requires rational discussion, organisation, international agreement —which will take time— and then we will still find this enormous problem but you combine humanitarian instincts —which are uppermost in this country— with the practicalities.

Speaker 3

First of all, this is not an abstraction, this is people, this is human beings. So when you say, "Who's going to take them?" you're saying, "Who's going to take those children, those three five-year-olds over there, that ten-year-old and that baby?" —that's what you're saying. Secondly, displacement of people is always caused by wars and famine, and most --90% of all the displaced people in the world are in the third world —we've never seen them. It's a crisis to us now because they're coming to Europe, and one of the reasons they're coming to Europe is because of European and Western interference in the Middle East and in Middle-East affairs —whether is Libya or Syria— because Libya used to control this problem for us.

Speaker 4

Well, I think when we see those terrible pictures that we've seen today, uh, I

	<p>mean, <u>our immediate reaction is we want to be open-hearted, we want to take everybody in. But</u> the truth of the matter is that at the moment, uhm, you know, almost 500,000 people are coming to live a year, uh, to live, uh, in the UK—I mean, that's 300,000 when you look at net migration figures. Uh, that's an awful lot of people. And we're already seeing that—and I have to say that's the majority from the EU— but that's an awful lot of people, and we're already seeing how this is affecting our GP surgeries, A&E, our schools, our hospitals, and the fact that figures show that we are having to build one house every 7 minutes in order to provide housing, uh, for the migrants we already have, uh, never mind for, uh, future migrants. And <u>the really sad thing is that we are a small, overcrowded island with a finite amount of land.</u></p> <p>Speaker 5</p> <p>Actually, you can tackle the problem at source —be it Libya, be it Syria, and many other countries. Yes, you should do that: bring stability and peace to where there's conflict —but <u>that doesn't mean that you completely ignore people that are making this perilous journey to come to Europe on our doorstep.</u> And for, uh, every mother that drowns, for every child that is— whose corpse is washed up on a beach —that should weigh very heavily on each of our minds, and on the UK government's mind. <u>Every bit of inaction, every minute of inaction is gonna cost, uh, another life</u> —so I agree with Tim, I agree with Gary that there's got to be long-term solutions to this.</p> <p>Speaker 6</p> <p>I would be the first to say that of course we've got to help refugees, not least given our track record on unfortunately in causing, or at least contributing to instability— instability in some of the countries that these refugees are coming from, but we need to make a distinction between refugees and migrants. And unfortunately —in a lot of the, uh, coverage that we've had about this crisis—that distinction hasn't been made adequately enough. We know that only 1 in 5, uh, are actually coming from Syria. We know that <u>many others are clearly economic migrants who are coming from countries where they are not unsafe and that they have arrived in countries where they are safe, yet they seem to want to keep going on</u> and on to Germany, perhaps to come to Britain or to go to a country of choice.</p>
6.	<p>(SEGONA ACTIVITAT SEGONA ESCOLTA) (+ 45'' silenci) Now listen again. (BEEP + REPETICIÓ)</p>
7.	<p>Now you have one minute to check your answers. (1' silenci)</p>

8. (TERCERA ACTIVITAT PRIMERA ESCOLTA)

Please, look at the third exercise.

You will hear an interview with Nigel Sizer, the Global Director of World Resources Institute Forests Program. For questions 1-7 choose the correct answer a, b or c. Write your answers in the appropriate boxes below. Question 0 is an example. You will hear the recording twice. You now have one and half minutes to read the questions.

(1'30" silenci BEEP)

TOXIC HAZE

MICHAEL: They could use a big rainstorm in Indonesia because the country is on fire —big parts of it, anyway— lots of smoke and haze from wildfires. The effects can be felt over a lot of South East Asia —proof, an estimated half a million people in the region have developed respiratory problems since the fire began in July. The haze has also forced schools to shut down and airlines to cancel flights. Indonesian president Joko Widodo was in Washington today for a meeting with President Obama, but after that he's decided to cut short his US visit so he can fly back to deal with this crisis. And it's a big one, says Nigel Sizer.

NIGEL: It's hard for people to imagine how serious this is.

MICHAEL: Sizer is Forest Director for the World Resources Institute in Washington. He was in Indonesia this summer and is heading back next week.

NIGEL: The air quality levels in the central Kalimantan over the last six weeks have regularly been at about 10 times what the World Health Organization calls hazardous levels. So this is literally almost off the charts in terms of the air quality. It's like you staring through thick bonfire smoke, day after day. It's been going on now for about 6 weeks. It's an extraordinary situation, and it's affecting about 43 million people across the country.

MICHAEL: What is causing it? How did this all start? And why is it so bad this year?

NIGEL: Well, it's not the first time. We've seen this repeatedly but, uh, these are the worst fires that we've seen since 1997, when we saw the last very significant El Niño episode hitting Indonesia. And the El Niño is actually making it a lot drier than usual, so that's leading to an extended dry season. But what you've got here is a history —in these areas— of poor management of the land. A lot of these areas were grabbed by big palm oil and pulp and paper companies 20, 30 years ago under the Suharto authoritarian regime, local communities were kicked off of these areas. Uh, a lot of the land is peat —deep peat— which is very rich in organic matter and produces a tremendous amount of air pollution when it's burnt. These areas that really should not have been developed to start with —and now with the conflict over this land, lots of smallholders who are

	<p>occupying these areas, <u>an inability of the government to enforce the law and to properly plan the use of these areas</u> —all these factors coming together has led to this disaster.</p> <p>MICHAEL: Right, and, uh, looking into the future, I mean, right now there's human suffering because of these fires, and the smoke and the haze, but <u>these fires are also releasing a lot of carbon into the atmosphere</u>, right?</p> <p>NIGEL: That's absolutely right. When we ran the numbers together with some Dutch scientists last week we were absolutely shocked. We knew the emissions were substantial. What we didn't know is that <u>the emissions from Indonesia over the last few weeks have actually surpassed those of the entire Japanese or the entire German economy over the last year</u>. And even more striking is that on several days, when the fires are burning intensely, the daily emissions of greenhouse gases from Indonesia actually surpass those from the entire US economy—</p> <p>MICHAEL: Are you kidding? Wow.</p> <p>NIGEL: —that really puts in context for us —it's extraordinary. So this is a [sic] environmental catastrophe that is significant on a global scale. As we head into the Paris Climate Discussions in December, this needs to be higher up on the agenda. But I think, most importantly, <u>it's a disaster for, you know, the tens of millions of Indonesians who are having to choke on this air every day —the children, the old people, the asthmatics, who are literally dying as we speak— due to these air quality problems</u> and the acute issues that they are trying to deal with right now.</p> <p>MICHAEL: Nigel Sizer, with the World Resources Institute in Washington. Thank you very much.</p> <p>NIGEL: Thank you Michael. Good to talk with you.</p>
9.	<p>(TERCERA ACTIVITAT SEGONA ESCOLTA) (+ 45'' silenci) Now listen again. (BEEP + REPETICIÓ)</p>
10.	<p>Now you have 1 minute to check your answers. (1' silenci)</p>
11.	<p>This is the end of the English Listening Comprehension test, C1 Level. Valencian Community, 2016.</p>