

**TEXT 1:**

**Read the article; match each heading to the paragraph. There are two extra paragraphs:**

*Paragraph Headings*

- A** A CASE FOR REJOICING?
- B** ENGLISH: A UNIVERSAL LANGUAGE
- C** A DIVERSE SOLUTION
- D** THE LANGUAGE EXTINCTION RATE
- E** LANGUAGES EVOLVE
- F** LANGUAGE IS MORE THAN SIMPLY COMMUNICATION
- G** SOME IN DANGER, SOME GONE FOREVER – EXAMPLE
- H** MY OWN ENDANGERED LANGUAGE
- I** ONE WORLD, ONE LANGUAGE

**Are Old Languages Worth Saving?**

**EXAMPLE: G**

*Right now, somewhere in the world, the last speaker of an ancient language is breathing his or her last breath. When this person dies, so will another language. Ever heard of Jiwari? No? It's no surprise: The last native speaker died in Australia in 1976. Or Chinook? It used to be the language of trade in the Pacific Northwest, as many of the region's Native American tribes spoke it as a second language. Now, not even the Chinook speak Chinook.*

• **Passage 1:**

For many centuries the world has been losing languages, but they do seem to be disappearing at an incredible rate more recently. Roughly 6000 languages are spoken in the world today, it is staggering to hear linguists predict that half of them will vanish in this century, and 90 percent will be gone by the next.

• **Passage 2:**

A disaster? Not to everyone. John Miller, writing in The Wall Street Journal, asserts that every time a language dies, it is time to celebrate because another "primitive" tribe has joined the modern world. Although Miller fails to describe what he considers so great about the modern world, perhaps he has a point: it's only a language. Terms like "extinction" and "endangered" put language disappearance on the same footing as the disappearance of a species. But there is a difference.

• **Passage 3:**

A single species cannot survive alone; a decrease in numbers of one species affects others around it. A single language, however, can do just fine. Calling the disappearance of languages "extinction" introduces the notion of catastrophe: one which can, and should, be averted. Yet fewer languages means more people sharing a common language. What's wrong with everyone in the world being able to understand one another?

• **Passage 4:**

Yet every language has subtle distinctions and allusions of its own which cannot be fully expressed in another language. It's not just about literal translation or grammar. A language reflects its culture, from the vocabulary it contains to its style and literary traditions. Not everything can be translated into English or any of the other major languages: it might retain its meaning but it will surely lose its spirit.

• **Passage 5:**

When people integrate, a language is often lost or adapted. Whenever newcomers have settled in a new land they and the local people have usually ended up speaking the same language. English was born when Germanic-speaking Angles, Saxons, and Jutes invaded the Celtic-speaking islands. Romans gave that form of German a shot of Latin and this became Old English. Later French-speaking Normans conquered England but were defeated by its language. Instead Old English absorbed French words and became Middle English. The process of change continues, thankfully more peaceably, to this day.

• **Passage 6:**





For purely interactive purposes, one language may be all the world needs. There is no end to the things that can be expressed in English-- or in any other language. But language is an expression of culture and perhaps the bilingual, multicultural, integrated society is where we are heading. Then we can tell each other about our own special cultures - and language.

**TEXT 2:**

**You will read an article about the film maker Peter Gaetano. Below are 3 questions about the text. Answer each question with as FEW words as possible. The write answers are not going to be indicated as I WILL CHECK YOUR ANSWERS MYSELF!**

- 1) What inspired Gaetano to become a film director?
  
- 2) How does the author group Gaetano's films thematically?
  
- 3) Who is Gaetano compared with today?

**Peter Gaetano - the Filmmaker**

Born on November 17th 1942 in Flushing, to Sicilian parents, Peter Gaetano grew up in the vibrant Italian quarter of New York. His childhood was a deeply formative period, shaping the distinctive and characteristic vision of the world that we recognise instantly in his films. As a young boy he suffered from several illnesses including asthma, which meant that he was excluded from the world of sports and games his classmates enjoyed. Instead he spent his time devouring films in his local cinema. This instilled in him a burning desire to make his life in the movie world.

Many of the films he saw during this period ostensibly depicted the New York he was growing up in, but to the young Gaetano there appeared to be a gap between the world he saw represented on screen and the world in which he lived. Everything on the screen seemed artificial; the streets were too clean, the curbs too high, because what he was really watching was an idea of New York, filmed on the back lots of Hollywood studios. However, rather than rejecting this idealised view of his hometown, the young Gaetano fused it with the day to day reality of his existence.

When he left the cinema he would find himself in an intense and violent world on the streets of New York which seemed more vivid than the version he had seen represented on the screen.

This childhood later had a powerful influence on the dark, dreamlike fluidity of Gaetano's work which consistently returns to the city of his birth and major source of inspiration. He grew up determined to impose his vision of New York on the public consciousness.

Another factor that drew Gaetano to his lifelong passion was the renewed interest in American film in the early 1960's. Gaetano enrolled at the New York University Film School where the emerging Italian and French New Wave schools were in vogue. This was a period of enormous political and cultural change and Gaetano came into contact with a number of directors who would shape American cinema over the coming decades – Francis Ford Coppola, Steven Spielberg, George Lucas and Brian De Palma amongst others, including, crucially for Gaetano, John Cassavetes.

These were the first generation of film students to be influenced both by the Golden Age of Hollywood movies and international independent cinema. The thriving counterculture of America in the sixties fed their ambition, which was to effect major changes in the way films were made.

Gaetano became good friends with Cassavetes and the older director came to have a profound influence upon him and his films. Changes in technology were revolutionising the way films were being shot. Lightweight camera equipment allowed directors like Cassavetes and Godard to realise much more fluid looking films than had previously been imaginable. Gaetano's films took full advantage of this new found freedom. The way a Gaetano film is shot





is remarkably distinctive and visually striking, his camera swooping in and out of the action like a bird in flight.

Cassavetes's work also influenced Gaetano's thematically. Both directors favoured actors above all else, preferring character exploration over traditional narrative storytelling in order to explore the human condition.

After producing a number of short films during the sixties, Gaetano finally made the move to Hollywood in 1970 and directed his first full feature, a low budget film called *Jump the Wagon*, two years later. Gaetano showed it to his mentor, Cassavetes, and asked for his opinion. Cassavetes let him know in no uncertain terms that he thought the film was completely worthless and encouraged him to pursue a more deeply personal vision of filmmaking than before. This response represented a pivotal moment in Gaetano's career. Shortly afterwards he began shooting the film which was to make his name, *Flying High* (1974). It was a deeply autobiographical film set on the streets of Little Italy where he had grown up and it set the thematic pattern for the films that established his reputation over the next three decades.

Gaetano's films are frequently obsessive, intense affairs featuring a hero struggling to find redemption in a violent world. They are directed with operatic verve and driven by emotive, pulsing soundtracks. His major films include: *Around the Corner* (1976) - a harrowing urban morality tale, *First Round* (1979) - a study of the savage world of boxing, *The Oath* (1990) - an exploration into the brutalities of mob life and *Our World* (2002) - a violent epic centred on Manhattan's 19th century slums. Gaetano's films have often been criticised as morally bankrupt because of their sheer visceral intensity but he has argued that such criticism misses the point of his work.

Gaetano's films reflect the frontier ethic upon which so much American history has been forged.

Although he has never directed a Western, his films often reflect the central concerns of the genre: the action and conflicts that force his characters together portray a world on edge, where the decisions they make have a life and death intensity. Physical death isn't always the subject of his films so much as spiritual death. Before going into film-making he seriously considered becoming a catholic priest and this is reflected at times in his choice of themes.

Now in his sixties he has become an icon of American cinema and is frequently mentioned in the same breath as the legendary director Orson Welles. Though no comparisons has been made with directors such as Woody Allen, he is sometimes seen as the film equivalent of the author Rudolph Stein. Never receiving an Oscar or Golden Globe for any of his films, his work consistently receives enormous critical acclaim and actors compete for parts in his forthcoming projects. He seems set to remain a dominant force on the American movie scene for many years to come.

### TEXT 3:

**You will read two articles about transport. Answer the questions that follow each text.**

#### **Car-free cities**

Have you ever tried to get into or out of the centre of any big city in the rush hour? It is never easy. The options are less than enticing: sit in your car for hours, get choked with pollution on the pavement, squeeze onto public transport or cycle, with the added stimulus of being target practice for motorists.

I am beginning to think that the industrialised nations made a terrible mistake when they turned to the private motor vehicle as an instrument of improved urban mobility. The car brought with it many unforeseen consequences for urban life and is the cause of a plethora of serious problems. Our cars cause air pollution, foster urban sprawl, slaughter thousands every year, waste energy and natural resources, and exacerbate global warming.

The state of the global environment seems ever more perilous as the developing world seems eager to adopt Western patterns of car use. They should be aware of the financial, social and environmental costs and encouraged to think about better solutions. Whilst developed nations cannot deny developing nations the use of technology and resources that they have





enjoyed for so long themselves, they must surely take a lead in encouraging the design and building of car-free cities everywhere.

The problem is that private use of the internal combustion engine in urban centres will only be supplanted if a better option is available. What would happen if we designed a city without cars? Would anyone want to live or, perhaps more pertinently, work in it? Does it make social and economic sense? Is it possible to be free of the automobile while retaining the speed and mobility it offers?

Public transport is typically a disagreeable and slow alternative to the car. It needs to become a pleasant, or at least efficient, experience, getting you to your destination more swiftly than private transport ploughing through congested streets ever could. This can be achieved using proven technology and ideas. Some cities have already banned cars, at least for some parts of the day and at weekends. Only early morning, essential business traffic is allowed in, then the barriers come down.

We should strive for the atmosphere of a city such as Venice, which is an oasis of peace: a city without cars it's true; or roads for that matter. But one thing at a time.

**Q1. According to the author, in developed countries the motor car...**

- A was intended for town use.
- B gave rise to predictable problems.
- C prevents the expansion of cities.
- D is the main cause of global warming.

**Q2. According to the author, reducing car use...**

- A is only possible in a car-free city.
- B involves a major change in public attitudes.
- C depends on providing a superior alternative.
- D would require people to travel less.

**Q3. According to the author, public transport...**

- A should be modelled on the system in Venice.
- B needs to be faster than cars in the city.
- C cannot be based on existing technology..
- D must be as fast as the car on the open road.

### Fiend on the road

Something can happen to people when they get in the driving seat of a car. A normally easy-going, non-argumentative person may, at the slightest provocation from other road users and pedestrians, suddenly become a fiend, unable to consider anyone but himself or herself and be determined to get from A to B without "unnecessary" interruptions – and nothing will get in his or her way.

Take an old university pal of mine, Chris. Meet him at a party and he's the most laid-back person around. But behind a steering wheel Dr. Jekyll becomes Mr. Hyde. A traffic light turns to red.

Does he slow down and let people cross the road? No, he steps on the gas and zooms on regardless. Stopping could mean being a minute late for his appointment. Never mind pedestrians leap back, fearing for their lives. Anyway, they are used to it.

I know I certainly am: many a time I've been halfway over a crossing, in the middle of the road, and a car-driving monster still won't stop. "Do you want to murder me?" I shout, but to no avail. The culprit is up to the next crossing by then, terrorising others. Nor are cyclists safe, as the speed and closeness of the fiend's driving forces them onto the pavement.

If you have the misfortune, as I sometimes do, to be a passenger in the fiend's car, you hold onto your seat for dear life, instinctively searching for the brake with your foot, as he speeds round bends, shouting abuse at people like me who keep within lanes and speed limits, then jumps queues by tearing down tram lines. He barely escapes accident after accident and risks finishing his journey, and perhaps yours, in casualty. Why? To save two minutes on his journey. Home now, he steps out of the car and dusts himself down.



Attempting a smile, he is greeted by his wife. "Hello, dear, you look stressed. Roads busy were they?"

**Q1. Chris...**

**A** was taught by the writer at university.

**B** is normally a passive person.

**C** is a careful driver.

**D** has recently learned to drive.

**Q2. The writer...**

**A** hates all cars and car drivers.

**B** adheres to traffic regulations.

**C** recognises modern living forces drivers to take risks.

**D** thinks people are compelled to drive dangerously.

**Q3. In this article, the writer...**

**A** obscures her own feelings.

**B** avoids irony.

**C** appeals to the reader to agree with her.

**D** includes an element of self-parody..