

You are going to read an extract from an article. For questions 31–36, mark the appropriate answer (A, B, C or D) that you think fits best according to the text.

The Lost Art of Diplomacy

What it can do for you and why society needs to harness its values

The twentieth century has frequently been labelled as the age of opinion, and not necessarily in a positive way, as any quick glance at social media will demonstrate. In fact, look more closely into the insults traded on social media platforms and the sensationalist ways in which the media presents differing public opinions as polarising, and the situation starts to look even worse. The modern world can often feel rude, and people often behave as though they are totally unwilling to consider, or even listen to, views that are not aligned with their own. It appears that a change is long overdue, and perhaps diplomacy could be the answer to turning this situation around.

Developed over millennia as a way to mediate between grumpy leaders hell-bent on inflicting their own ideas on the world, diplomacy was once thought of as an art, in the same vein as public speaking, polite conversation and negotiation. It grew out of trade interactions in the Middle East, China and India, and incorporated a variety of skills, philosophies and cultural nuances as it went. Throughout the majority of history, the role of the diplomat was to convey information and messages and negotiate in less inflammatory ways than their leaders might have done. These leaders could quite easily justify starting wars in the heat of the moment due to a perceived personal attack from an enemy. In short, they sought to ensure any interaction with another state or power remained on an even keel and avoided conflict at all costs.

Although the word 'diplomacy' conjures up a long-gone age of stuffy meetings between politicians and civil servants in palaces and embassies, there is little difference in the goal of diplomacy nowadays. For example, in the complex relationships of modern society, whether in our personal lives, in the workplace or matters of international negotiation, bringing back the art of diplomacy could be invaluable. It is a highly specific skill that requires people to put aside their personal desires and work towards a common good. In this respect it is extremely challenging insofar as it involves putting forward a case for something strongly and effectively enough for it to be considered by another party, but not in such a way as to cause offence or irritation. As the British journalist and writer David Frost once said, "Diplomacy is the art of letting somebody else have your way."

We are inclined to view diplomacy as an innate ability, something that only a select few are blessed with. Yet, with some hard work and determination it is actually straightforward to learn. For people who make a special effort, the benefits will very soon become apparent. There are, as one would expect, certain tricks of the trade that can be useful starting places for novices. The greatest of these is the ability to understand the fragility of human nature and the need for acceptance and for an attentive audience. This is often the underlying cause of arguments as well as being a plausible explanation for much of the verbal abuse found online today. Being diplomatic means acknowledging the feelings of others, taking time to demonstrate empathy, and casting aside emotion for logic and reasonableness. It means being patient and versatile in interpersonal communication, and, above all, a commitment to agreement and collaboration rather than individuality and division.

Having said this, there are people who seem to naturally excel at diplomatic negotiation and perhaps they are the ones who can shed light on its benefits. These individuals are people who have already understood the human condition in all its frailty. Diplomats are in essence realists who know full well that relationships, families, jobs and nations will face countless problems. They have accepted this with an air of optimistic resignation and believe that compromise is the only antidote to an imperfect world. As such they represent an alternative route to happiness and shared understanding. Despite the outward appearance of pessimism and negativity, they aspire to create a better world and see great progress in small adjustments. They are the undeniable evidence that diplomacy has a lot to offer in illuminating a path to better communication for all of us.

31 What is the writer's purpose in the first paragraph?

- A To suggest that the media is manipulating people.
- B To provide examples of intolerance in modern society.
- C To outline the problems caused by social media.
- D To encourage better manners in public places.

32 In paragraph 2, what is the writer's opinion of diplomats?

- A Their influence used to be excessive.
- B They have become less important.
- C Their role is not easy to justify.
- D They have always been extremely valuable.

33 In paragraph 3, what does the writer imply about diplomacy?

- A It's beneficial for interpersonal communication.
- B It's an out-of-date mode of interaction.
- C It's not a worthwhile skill for modern society.
- D It's an effective technique for political negotiation.

34 In paragraph 4, the writer says that developing our diplomatic skills is:

- A easier for more emotional people.
- B something everyone should aspire to.
- C too time-consuming for modern life.
- D well worth investing the time and effort.

35 In paragraph 5, according to the writer, how do successful diplomats view the world?

- A They are optimistic about the human condition.
- B They believe that people should try to overcome suffering.
- C They approach life from a practical perspective.
- D They think that the search for happiness is pointless.

36 What is the main point that the writer wants to make in the article?

- A A reintroduction of the art of diplomacy would create a more equal society based on tolerance.
- B Diplomacy is probably the best approach to resolving the fractured nature of society.
- C Interpersonal skills related to diplomacy could have a positive impact on society.
- D While diplomacy has positives, people should be wary of its appropriateness in all contexts.

You are going to read an extract from an article. Seven paragraphs have been removed. Select from the paragraphs (A–H) the one that fits each gap (37–43). There is one extra paragraph that you do not need to use.

More to History than Books

Most young people are far more interested in their social circles and the latest fashion and technology crazes than they are about hearing about the past, but for me, local heritage has always been something I've found fascinating. It also, in my mind, holds great importance simply because if we don't make efforts to unearth experiences of the past from others, they will end up being lost in the mists of time.

37

"I remember it as if it were yesterday. There we all were, standing outside in our slippers and dressing gowns, watching the flames dance in the night sky over the rooftops. The whole area was lit up like a Christmas tree, and we could feel the heat from over a mile away. That night I watched the great building whose shadow I'd lived under all my life disappear before my very eyes. By morning, there was nothing."

38

Originally situated in Hyde Park, it was erected temporarily as a celebration of the Industrial Revolution, but, due to its overwhelming success, the exhibition was later relocated to a park in south London, where it remained until the great fire of 1936 razed it to the ground in just a few hours. Today, there are few signs that this incredible building ever existed.

39

Londoners in the 1800s had little time for such preoccupations, but the Crystal Palace gave people a wonderful opportunity to explore ideas of the past and future, as well as to experience the wonders of modern industry. Standing over 40 metres tall and around half a kilometre wide, the glass megastructure housed many different types of museum exhibits from around the globe as well as a music hall, a park and a theatre.

40

"That's not to say it wasn't an impressive sight. I think the upkeep was just too much to be honest. It's a shame really. I seem to remember there were plans to auction it off to whoever would pay the most, which kicked up quite a fuss at the time with local residents, as you can imagine."

41

For me, this is perhaps one of the saddest elements of all. Although added to keep the history of the palace alive, it attracts very few people and is located in a somewhat obscure area of the park. Apart from the odd school visit and a few local-history fanatics, this great treasure is frequently overlooked by locals and visitors alike.

42

In my mind, social first-hand histories are so important for this very reason. While even my grandmother can't recall the glory days of the Crystal Palace, her mother would have been alive to witness them, and if these recollections had been passed on and properly documented, we would be able to paint a more vivid picture of a place that was fundamental in the development of the local area.

43

After all, we can learn facts and figures from public records and textbooks, but these cannot convey what it was actually like to live through such events. Only with the people who experienced them, who for the first time could travel around the world without ever leaving home and could wonder at marvels of modern industry beyond their wildest dreams.

A The only remnants of this one-time marvel are the dinosaur replicas that still exist around the lakes within the park. Of course, these days they look a little quaint and aren't exactly true to life, but we have to remember that they were built around 150 years ago when relatively little was known of natural history.

B The cost of maintenance and depressed admission prices meant that in the 1900s maintenance was unattended to and the palace was in financial dire straits. It was restored by the Earl of Plymouth who bought the structure in the 1920s in order to preserve it. This brought back visitors and renewed profit, through events such as 'Thursday evening fireworks' and motor shows.

C Perhaps this is due to a lack of general awareness of the true scale and greatness of the palace. After all, it was thriving at a time when film was in its infancy, so we cannot even imagine what it might have been like inside, and still photos don't give us the sense of atmosphere that we can get from video and narratives.

D My grandmother's recollections were a far cry from this though: "All of that was long gone by the time I was little. We'd still go up there as a family, but the building and grounds were getting a bit run down. I think its prime was in the late 1800s, before I was born."

E Mindful of this, the long chats I had with my grandparents will always remain dear to my heart, specifically my grandmother's recollections of her youth. Despite being in her nineties by the time I was of an age to fully understand and ask about her life, she was still sharp as a pin and could answer in such a way that brought the past to life.

F Our parents and grandparents should be encouraged to tell their histories and to write them down. Historians are not just academics; they are everyday people like you and me. History books may tell us about dates, names and major events, but we maintain the richness of feeling that comes from personal accounts.

G Fortunately, the Earl of Plymouth acquired the palace and grounds in order to protect it and the site is now a public park, still used by many throughout the year for numerous sports events as well as much smaller-scale music and cultural festivals. Within the grounds there is even a small museum telling the history of the great palace.

H My entire family hails from a suburb that, by its very name, still brings to mind past glories and that fateful evening. These days, Crystal Palace is just like any other busy commuter area, swallowed up by the greater London sprawl, but it used to be home to one of the largest glass structures in the world, the Crystal Palace.

You are going to read an extract from an article about science awards. For questions 44–53, choose from the sections (A–E) using the separate answer sheet. The sections may be selected more than once.

In which section are the following mentioned?

New awards could have a more significant impact if they were given to scientists who have a greater need for financial investment.

44

Funding popular science communicators rather than prizes may be more worthwhile for society.

45

The new science awards are backed by a different type of elite.

46

Some scientists are unhappy about the unequal distribution of investment in science.

47

Scientists are suspicious of the principles underlying the new science awards.

48

New science awards have largely been funded by private rather than public enterprise.

49

The system of awarding scientists for their discoveries has not kept pace with changing scientific practices.

50

The impact that generous financial incentives will have on the direction of future research.

51

The newer science awards are rooted in cooperation rather than individuality.

52

The likelihood of prize-winning scientists needing substantial financial funding is low.

53

The New Science Awards Redefining Success

A challenge to tradition, but not without their problems

A

For a little over a century, in a somewhat staid and dull ceremony in Stockholm in January, the Nobel prizes have been awarded to worthy scientists by the King of Sweden. But, as in all walks of life, times change and science awards are no different. The new awards or 'new Nobels', as they have been dubbed, are no longer the preserve of prestigious institutions like the Swedish Academy. Instead, they are paid for by celebrity CEOs such as Mark Zuckerberg and other tech millionaires, with multimillion-dollar prizes and ceremonies that are glamorous affairs reminiscent of the Oscars. And this is something that scientists generally tend not to view in a particularly positive light. British astronomer Martin Rees says that many scientists are undecided about the new awards. He believes that these more recent awards are steered towards showcasing the wealthy donors as much as the scientists themselves. He is not the only award cynic and others have joined him in voicing concerns, including American physicist Frank Wilczek who wonders about the virtues of awarding large prizes in the advancement of science.

B

There are indeed some serious concerns about all this. The most worrying of which centres around the world view and associated power of the funders, be they individuals like Zuckerberg or large global corporations. The problem is that these elite minorities are predominantly Western with a specific shared world view of the value of knowledge, as well as the aspects of science that are deserving of investment, be that time-based or financial. Many people are anxious that younger researchers trying to cut their teeth in a world where funding is increasingly competitive could easily adapt their research to the visions held by the funders of these new awards, visions which may or may not have the interests of humanity as a whole at their heart. Oversight is a key aspect of research in a way that it is not seen in business, especially the tech giants who prize innovation over all other things. This shift in the motivations of those who are the guardians of science awards should raise alarm bells for us all.

C

The Breakthrough Prize in Life Sciences is an excellent example of this. The list of donors reads like a who's-who of celebrity tech CEOs and the price tag attached to each prize is \$3 million. Most winners are highly regarded scientists with glittering careers and enviable publishing records. These huge prizes tend to go to scientists who are already extremely well-funded, and it could easily be argued that they are the least in need of such exorbitant sums. Furthermore, if these new awards and their glamourous ceremonies are designed to bring a new breed of celebrity science to public attention, they may be wasting their time. A quick YouTube search will show that the world has

plenty of celebrity scientists boasting millions of followers worldwide, such as Brian Cox or Michio Kaku. Funding that aims to bring science to the general public should probably be diverted to the people who have proven track records in engaging people in science.

D

Despite the scepticism surrounding these new science awards, benefits do exist. In order to present a fair and balanced analysis of the positive impacts of such awards, these benefits should be highlighted. In recent times a key criticism of the original Nobel prizes has been the fact that they do not fully represent the way in which science is carried out in modern times. Nowadays most scientific inventions and discoveries are collaborative. This means that they rely on the cooperation and shared knowledge and expertise of dozens of scientists working in cross-cultural teams across several academic communities around the globe, rather than individuals working in isolation. Since the Nobel prizes can only be awarded to three people each year, many hard-working scientists go unnoticed, receiving little or no recognition for their contributions to research and discoveries that simply could not have happened without them. Contrary to this system, the Breakthrough Prize and others have been designed to reward entire teams and are therefore much wider in their scope and inclusivity.

E

However, there is a danger that these prizes could be seen as paying lip service to the principles of inclusivity and diversity. Although there are some non-Western prizes such as the Tang Prize, awarded to those working in Asian institutions, most winning teams are located in Western nations, and global inclusivity remains a challenge. Scientists such as Bob O'Hara, who works at a research centre in Frankfurt, warn of the widening gap between the rich and poor among the scientific community. Instead of talking about awards and large financial prizes, he cites as a concern the funding allocated to the search for treatments and cures for the diseases of the rich, rather than those that are widespread amongst developing nations. Many scientists strongly believe that the West must not just be allowed to dominate and marginalise other nations that have much to offer in terms of knowledge and research potential. These glamorous new science awards are a prime example of how scientists in developing nations might be able to benefit from the prize money far more than their western counterparts might.