

Part 5

You are going to read part of an article from a magazine. For questions 31-36, choose the answer (A, B, C or D) which you think fits best according to the text. Mark your answers on the separate answer sheet.

The Bloomberg Way

The mayor of New York on his soft drink ban, why he doesn't worry about approval ratings, and more.

You could look at Michael Bloomberg – astringent, profane, irritated by small talk, impatient with the politics of empathy – and see a plutocrat whose billions have given him the freedom to say and do whatever he wants, even to change the law to run for a third term as New York City's mayor. Or you could look a little further and see a more interesting pattern: a man who turned getting shunted off the fast track at Salomon Brothers into an opportunity, creating an entirely new approach to getting traders the data they needed; who took getting fired as a chance to gamble his payout on this idea; who then took the billions he made and chose not to embark on a lifelong vacation but to step into the least-forgiving political arena in the country; and who has since governed New York assertively, putting himself in the vanguard of a generation of mayors who, at a time when the federal government is paralysed, are testing new approaches to education, transportation, and public health. You begin to see a guy, in sum, who thinks for himself, but not only of himself.

I visited the mayor recently at the open bullpen that is his nerve centre at City Hall, where he works from a cubicle in the centre of the room. Howard Wolfson, one of his deputy mayors, was telling me how hard it was to close struggling schools, when Bloomberg joined us. Wolfson was saying that the administration had shut more than 100 schools. "Yeah, 140, I think," the mayor said briskly as he settled into a chair. Unlike most politicians or businessmen I've interviewed, he never once suggested he would make a comment off the record – it didn't seem to occur to him that he might – or even hesitated before answering, in a conversation that ranged from his plan to limit the size of soft drinks in order to combat obesity; to his approach to governing; to the future of journalism. What follows are excerpts.

On why he's tackling obesity:

"This is the first disease that has gone from a rich person's disease to a poor person's disease. Generally, it would go in the other direction. For the first time in the history of the world, this year, more people will die from the effects of too much food than from starvation. And there's one other answer to the question as to why. And that is, I like to take on those things that other people either are unwilling to take on for political reasons or unwilling to take on because it's just too complex, or they just don't care. That would include guns, for example. If you think about it, it is poor minorities that are the victims, and so most elected officials would not get involved – and I think we should".

On why he's trying to limit the size of soft drinks:

The correlation between the rise in obesity and the consumption of sugar is just up 100%, no matter what the beverage companies think or say. Look, the beverage companies aren't stupid. Coca-Cola is run by a very smart guy; PepsiCo by a very smart woman. They see this train coming down the tracks at them and that's why they're trying to get people to move over to Coke Zero or Diet Pepsi, because down the road, the public is going to say "No more. The cost of treating obesity is just out of control."

On his reaction to the widespread opposition, in public polls, to his soft drink restrictions:

To some extent, it's that everybody is resistant to change. Leadership is about doing what you think is right and then building a constituency behind it. It is not doing a poll and following from the back. If you want to criticise the political process – and it's probably true throughout history and certainly not just in the United States – I think it's fair to say, in business or in government, an awful lot of leaders follow the polls. And that's not the way to win. I happen to think it's not ethical, or right, and not your obligation. But I don't even think it's good business or politics, because people aren't good at describing what is in their own interest. What leaders should do is make decisions as to what they think is in the public interest based on the best advice that they can get, and then try and build a constituency and bring it along. The public, I believe – and I've always thought this – is much more likely to follow if they believe you are genuine. I think it's a losing strategy to not have values. I think the public wants you to have them and will respect you for them. They may carp a little bit, but in the end, that's the kind of person they want. They want somebody who has real conviction.

On why high approval ratings mean you're failing:

If I finish my term in office and have high approval ratings, then I wasted my last years in office. That high approval rating means you don't upset anybody. High approval rating means you're skiing down the slope and you never fall. Well, you're skiing the baby slope, for goodness' sakes. Go to a steeper slope. You always want to press. You want to tackle the issues that are unpopular, that nobody else will go after.

- 31 From the description in the first paragraph, what can we infer about Bloomberg?
- A His main motivation is generating controversy.
 - B He has scant sympathy for ordinary people.
 - C He is not inclined to choose the easy path.
 - D He has made unfortunate decisions in life.
- 32 Why does the author make the point that Bloomberg said everything on the record?
- A to paint Bloomberg in the best possible light
 - B to imply that Bloomberg has the press on his side
 - C to express surprise at Bloomberg's lack of subterfuge
 - D to demystify the tactics of politicians in general
- 33 What commonality does Bloomberg imply exists between obesity and guns?
- A Both are deadly.
 - B Both disproportionately affect the poor.
 - C Both are too complex for a political resolution.
 - D People just don't care about either.
- 34 According to Bloomberg, beverage companies know that soon
- A obese individuals will start suing them.
 - B they will be subjected to fines by the government.
 - C the public will hold them accountable.
 - D sugary drinks will be banned altogether.
- 35 Bloomberg doesn't mind criticism because he believes that
- A the public does not actually know what is best for them.
 - B people are always opposed to new things at first.
 - C he is not obliged to listen to his constituency.
 - D it is the public's prerogative to criticise politicians.
- 36 Why are high approval ratings unimportant to Bloomberg?
- A He sees them as a sign that a politician is not trying hard enough.
 - B He doubts that they reflect actual ability or skill.
 - C He believes that positive and negative attention is equally beneficial.
 - D He enjoys the power he has to upset people.

Part 6

You are going to read an extract from a book on architecture and society. Seven paragraphs have been removed from the extract. Choose from the paragraphs A-H the one which fits each gap (37-43). There is one extra paragraph which you do not need to use. **Mark your answers on the separate answer sheet.**

Disposable Buildings?

Look at a building, any building. What can it tell you? Few would dispute that architecture reflects the taste and style of the period that gave rise to it.

37

Today's architectural landmarks tend to be secular rather than religious. For the present purpose, however, it is less important to acknowledge a building's patronage than it is to carefully scrutinize its form. So, observe a contemporary building. What stands out? Discord? A hodgepodge of odd shapes and garish colours that jar? What about the next? The same? Seeing one modern building does little to prepare the viewer for the next one; uniformity is negligible.

38

In the larger scheme of things, these differences are minor and it is safe to say that uniformity of appearance is a major factor that differentiates between the buildings of the past and those of the present. Another important distinction and one so obvious that it may seem to go without saying, is that modern buildings do not look like old buildings, (unless they are built in imitation, like neoclassical architecture, for example).

39

This is more than a comment on the quality of the respective building materials. The pyramids were built to last; the Millennium Dome most assuredly was not. This is not to say that the intention for modern structures is that they should last a certain amount of time and then fall down – as a kind of disposable building. Nevertheless, they are undeniably designed and built with only the most immediate future in mind.

40

The people of the past, on the other hand, looked ahead. It is

clear that they intended a building to be there for future generations. This is corroborated by the fact that, in countries where the climate allows it, they planted trees. Consider this: planting a tree, especially one that will some day grow to be very big, is the ultimate in altruistic behaviour. When a man plants an oak sapling, he knows very well that he will not see the tree that it will become.

41

There is a third element particularly relevant to contemporary architecture – the aesthetic element. Aesthetics pose a challenge because they are inherently subjective. Beauty is, indeed, in the eye of the beholder; we all have likes and dislikes, and they are not the same. Even allowing for this, however, most would probably agree that 'beautiful' is not the most apt way to describe the majority of modern buildings.

42

With most modern buildings, we certainly are. Without interventions, these words inevitably take on a negative connotation, yet it can be constructive to be confronted with something completely different, something a bit shocking. A reaction is provoked. We think. All art evolves with time, and architecture, in all its varied manifestations, is, after all, a form of art.

43

As a result, we have been left with much material for study from past eras. What will we leave behind us, in turn? If our culture still places a value on the past and its lessons or a belief that we carry our history with us, in continuity, to the future, then this view has not been reflected in our architecture. The generations of the future may not be able to benefit from us as we have benefited from the generations of the past.

- A** The fact remains, though, that until the present day, art forms have been made to last. Countless paintings and sculptures, as well as buildings, bear witness to this. The artists and architects of the past strove to impart their creations with attributes that would stand the test of time. It was part and parcel of the successful execution. It was an expression of pride; a boast. It was the drive to send something of themselves to live on into the future, for reasons selfless and selfish both.
- B** For architecture, patronage has always been important. While this method of financing a work of art is as old as the idea of art itself, it gathered huge momentum during the Renaissance. During this period, wealthy and powerful families vied with each other in a competition for the creation of the breathtakingly beautiful and the surprisingly different. It was a way of buying into their own immortality, and that of the artist or the architect to boot.
- C** Indeed, it is rare to see a modern building that has worn well, that is free from leaks or rising damp, that is without bits of its outer structure falling off. It is hard to call to mind an edifice built in the last fifty years which is not like this or will not soon be. These days, we are not interested in posterity: if a building serves our purpose and that of our children, that seems to be enough.
- D** However, neither of these distinctions reveal much about the builders, apart from their aesthetic and their fondness for visual conformity. Now, take a look at some old buildings. The fact that you can see them at all, that they are intact and relevant, is what opens up the chasm between the present and the past. We do not know how long today's architectural heritage will last, but the chances are that it will not stand the test of time.
- E** Why is this? Do we not require our buildings to be beautiful any longer? Perhaps beauty has become architecturally superfluous, or just plain old-fashioned. It could be that the idea of beauty is too sentimental and sugary for the contemporary taste. Maybe the modern psyche demands something more stimulating and less easy than beauty. Perhaps we yearn to be challenged.
- F** Historic buildings from a common era, on the other hand, resemble each other. Take the example of the Gothic cathedral. To the non-specialist, one Gothic cathedral looks much like the next; if you've seen one, you've seen them all. This view, while extreme, is correct in the sense that there is a uniformity of style in every Gothic cathedral ever built. Anyone can see it. It takes an enthusiast, however, to spot and appreciate the myriad subtleties and differences.
- G** In contrast, any tree-planting that takes place today is largely commercial, motivated by the quest for immediate gain. Trees are planted that will grow quickly and can be cut down in a relatively short space of time. The analogy between tree planting and the construction of buildings is a good one; both activities today show thinking that is essentially short-term and goal driven; we want an instantaneous result and, on top of that, we want it to be profitable.
- H** Buildings, however, can reveal considerably more than that. They give us a unique insight into the collective mind and culture of those responsible for their construction. Every building was conceived with an objective in mind, to serve some purpose or assuage some deficiency, and someone was responsible for commissioning them. Throughout the course of history, buildings have generally been constructed at the instigation of the rich and powerful – products of politics, religion or both. This is what makes them so revealing.

Part 7

You are going to read an extract from a newspaper article about British immigrants in America in the 1800s. For questions 44-53, choose from the sections (A-E). The sections may be chosen more than once.

Mark your answers on the separate answer sheet.

In which section are the following mentioned?

the opinion that the settlers never got their priorities right	44
the fact the settlers wanted nothing less than a home away from home	45
the wish to maintain exclusivity in the British colonies	46
the inability of the settlers to become truly independent of Britain	47
the view that the English were naïve in their expectations of the USA	48
a difference in the locals' and settlers' cultural taboos	49
the view that the British settlers were victims of their own success	50
the fact that America offered a solution to a problem	51
a newspaper showing lack of perception	52
the disregard of the settlers for the locals' way of life	53

Prairie Fever

A new book chronicles the efforts of 19th century British aristocrats to create a corner of England in the American west.

- A How the British aristocracy was drawn to the frontier lands of 19th-century America is perhaps the most bizarre episode in the country's epic immigration story, and is revealed in a remarkable new book, *Prairie Fever*, by veteran BBC documentary maker Peter Pagnamenta. Lured by romantic tales of the American outdoors by writers such as James Fenimore Cooper, and the real-life gun-slinging escapades of Wild Bill Hickock, these eccentric newcomers wanted the U.S. on their own terms. In settlements with reassuringly British names, such as Runnymede and Victoria, the British aristocracy set about ensuring that there was one corner of America that was forever England.
- B The pioneers started arriving in the 1830s. Some were sportsmen drawn by the promise of unlimited buffalo to hunt, others true adventurers. They were led by Scotsman Sir William Stewart, a Waterloo veteran who spent seven years trekking through the Rockies, rubbing shoulders with mountain men, and fending off marauding bears and Indians. His companion, Charles Murray, son of the Earl of Dunmore, lived for a spell with the Pawnee Indians. The Old Etonian had to swallow his pride when his hosts ate his dog, but he impressed with rock-throwing contests in which he used skills honed in the Highland Games. Sadly, few of the lords that followed were nearly so adaptable. They often treated the locals and their customs with utter contempt. Sir George Gore – a classic example of the breed – went on a \$100,000, three-year hunting expedition beginning in 1854 in Missouri. American officials later accused him of slaughtering 6,000 buffalo, single-handedly endangering the Plains Indians' food supply. Later, the English settlers wound up the Americans even more because of their air of superiority.
- C By the 1870s, however, their American hosts had more to complain about than aristocratic rudeness – the British wanted to settle permanently. The British ruling classes had realised that the American West wasn't just a good place to hunt and carouse, but also the perfect dumping ground for younger sons with few prospects at home. America, desperate for new settlers to farm prairie states like Kansas and Iowa, welcomed them with open arms. Back in Britain, the Press followed the settlers closely. 'It was hot but everyone looked happy ... how much more sensible and useful lives they live there than they would live here at home!' the Times reported. Yet more astute observers noted that the British settlers never grasped the American work ethic. For them, running their farms came a poor second to hunting and enjoying themselves.
- D The prairie states were already dotted with 'colonies', each made up exclusively of workers from one part of America or one group of immigrants such as Danes or Russians. In 1873, an enterprising Scottish gentleman farmer named George Grant had a brainwave – a colony in western Kansas populated entirely by the British upper classes. By stipulating that they had to have at least £2,000 in funds and would each get no less than a square mile of land, he kept out the rabble. Victoria, as Grant patriotically called his settlement, was talked of back home as a 'Second Eden', but the new arrivals – many of whom had never farmed in their lives – soon discovered it was a hard place to play the country gentleman. No rain would fall for months and the temperature could soar to 105F in the shade. Worst of all, nobody had mentioned the dense clouds of grasshoppers that would suddenly arrive and eat everything. Despite their neighbours' derision at these 'remittance men' (so named because they relied on allowances from their parents), the two hundred or so colonists gamely battled on.
- E In general, the colonists' dreams came to nothing, and many headed home. But there was one event that definitively ended the British aristocracy's love affair with the West. Encouraged by the vast sums to be made from cattle ranching, some wealthy British investors bought huge tracts of land. One investor alone amassed 1.75 million acres and 100,000 cattle. Enough was enough. Tolerant when the British were buffoonish adventurers, Americans felt threatened once they became too rich. U.S. politicians stoked anti-foreigner resentment, aided by stories about ruthless British landlords turfing penniless widows out of their homes and rumours that some were so snobby they referred to their cowboys as 'cow-servants'. Congress passed the Alien Land Act limiting foreign companies to buying no more than 5,000 acres in future.