



ESCUELAS OFICIALES DE IDIOMAS

DE LA REGIÓN DE MURCIA

PRUEBA TERMINAL ESPECÍFICA DE CERTIFICACIÓN

NIVEL AVANZADO





NOMBRE:	D1	U:
---------	----	----

DURACIÓN TOTAL: 90 minutos

INDICACIONES:

- Las tareas se desarrollarán en los espacios indicados.
- Debe emplearse tinta azul o negra. El uso del lápiz no es válido.
- Corregir tachando el texto. No usar correctores líquidos o cintas.
- No se debe escribir en las partes sombreadas.
- Puntuación total: 24. Calificación de "APTO": ≥ 12





TASK A. Read the text "The Hollande Affair and the End of Presidential Privacy in Fit Decide if the statements below are TRUE (T) or FALSE (F), quoting phrases from the testing support your decision. Write your answers spaces provided, as shown in example 0.	
8	points
0. It is a proven fact that many presidents of the Republic have had affairs.	
F "They have supposedly had affairs"	✓
They have <u>supposedly</u> had affall s	
1. Charles De Gaulle's wife was reported to have been involved in an extramarital love at	ffair.
2. The gutter press spread the rumor that Valéry Giscard d'Estaing had an affair with prin Diana of Wales.	ncess
3. A major change in public opinion about sex scandals started just after the press publi Jacques Chirac's affairs.	shed
4. President Sarkozy admitted in private that he had had a relationship with a former president's daughter.	
5. According to the writer, being unfaithful to one's wife is widely accepted because France a male-dominated society.	nce is
6. Before the scandal with actress Julie Gayet, President Hollande had tried to improve t image of the French presidency without success.	he
7. The public might have been more sympathetic with president Holland if the socioecon situation had been better.	nomic
8. After this last scandal, the political class and the media in France are questioning the the president of the Republic.	role of

TASK B. Find in the text "The Hollande Affair and the End of Presidential Privacy in France" words or phrases that correspond to the following definitions. Write your answers in the answer grid. The first one has been done for you as an example.

6 points

Ex. Represented as existing or as being as described but not so proved	allegedly	✓
1. (phrase) Established a particular mood or character for something		
2. (phrase) Being paid for by		
3. (verb) Changed slightly, moved		
4. (phrasal verb) Moving or going quietly or unobtrusively		
5. (phrasal verb) Understanding gradually		
6. (idiom) At risk		

TASK C. Read the text "A giraffe has been killed – why the fuss?". For each gap, choose the best answer (a, b, c or d). Write your final answers in the grid provided below, as shown in example 0.

10 points

0.	a) for	b) in	c) after	d) towards
1.	a) As long as	b) However	c) Even if	d) Despite
2.	a) unintentional	b) purpose	c) deliberate	d) standard
3.	a) equal to us	b) less like us	c) compared with us	d) the same as us
4.	a) stretch	b) scatter	c) supply	d) throw
5.	a) by ensuring	b) at protecting	c) while implementing	d) in widening
6.	a) regarded as	b) in terms of	c) in accordance with	d) compared to
7.	a) whether considering	b) its being	c) if there had been	d) had it been
8.	a) unlikely to be given	b) expected to have	c) collecting more and more	d) isolated with
9.	a) put forward	b) set up	c) give away	d) let out
10.	a) entail conserving	b) stand out for the preservation of	c) mean to erase	d) represent boosting

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Q										
✓										

TOTAL:	/ 24	APTO (≥ 12)	NO APTO (< 12)
IOIAL.	/ 24	AF 10 (2 12)	NO AP 10 (< 12)

A giraffe has been killed – why the fuss?

Humans do not regard all animals as equal. We conserve pet-like creatures such as Marius because we love them

Our attitude0non-human animals has changed greatly over the past century and
a half1 the Judeo-Christian tradition prevailed, the biblical account of the Creation was still a true myth, showing that other animals were brought into the world to be useful to
man, and subject to man's dominion.
The2 causing of pain to animals was never a justification for cruelty: Shakespeare knew that only wanton boys pulled the wings off flies. But it was a justification for killing animals for food or keeping them as domestic pets.
It was Darwin who closed the gap between humans and the rest of nature. And now that we know exactly how much of our DNA we share, not only with the great apes, but also with other animals in their appearance and behaviour, it is impossible to continue to treat human beings as a race apart. But it is important not to exaggerate this coming together. It remains true that we are the only animals who can 4 our imaginations to embrace the whole world, who can frame and enunciate moral principles and, in particular, can carry out systematic, impersonal science.
Only a human being could set up a zoo, and only human beings could pursue a pan-European policy of conserving a species of animal5 a variety of genes and not allowing it to be endangered by inbreeding. This was the motive for the euthanasia of Marius the giraffe, whose killing at Copenhagen zoo has caused outrage. Yet it was6 the agreed policy of many responsible zoos. So why the fuss? Well, the answer is pretty clear. We love giraffes. They are gently disposed herbivores, and amazingly fast
movers. It is doubtful whether such an outcry would have been raised7 a wild boar, or even a giant cobra.
We do not regard all animals as equal. Even those who oppose the use of animals in research are more hostile to the use of primates than of mice. Mice in laboratories are8names, and the naming of Marius is significant. We name our children and our pets and we love them both.
Some have argued that Marius had a right to life. But to appeal to animal rights seems to demonstrate yet again the hierarchy that we9 in the animal kingdom.
There is a further question for philosophers. Suppose we can accept the zoos' agreement to breed only from animals with rarer sets of genes, in order to conserve the species, giraffe: why do we want to do this? I have already given one answer: we love giraffes. Does this10 the species for ever? I suppose in a way it does, or at least for as long as the planet sustains life.
For mysetf, I was shocked not so much by the fact that Marius was killed as by the manner of his death. Why did he have to be dissected in front of a crowd, including children, used as a kind of teaching add? Think It is simply squeamishness, and this may not be a very lofty substitute for philosophy.
Source: http://www.theguardian.com/

The Hollande Affair and the End of Presidential Privacy in France

François Hollande joins a long tradition of French Fifth Republic presidents who have supposedly had affairs. Widespread attachment to France's privacy laws, and a press corps that generally agrees with them, combined with a generalized reverence for the office of the presidency have meant that rumors always remained largely rumors—until now.

In the past, gossip did no harm because there was always and still is a generally more indulgent attitude to affairs of the heart and tolerance of "liaisons" by both men and women. There has also been the conviction throughout French history that power is the strongest aphrodisiac both for those who exercise it and those fascinated by it.

The nearest Charles de Gaulle got to sexual scandal was his wife Yvonne being asked by an English reporter what was the most important thing in her life, to which she replied "a penis" (say "happiness" slowly with a French accent).

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing set the tone, and he encouraged it, seeing himself as a true Don Juan. Rumors still abound of many liaisons—did he and the soft-core star Sylvia Kristel have an affair in the Élysée? Who was the woman in the Ferrari he was with when, driving through Paris in the early hours, he hit a milk van? He even happily encouraged rumors about himself, for example, that a president just like him had an affair with a princess just like Diana.

François Mitterrand was also linked to many women, including the editor of *Elle*, Françoise Giroud, the singer Dalida, and many more. Rumor became fact when he revealed he had raised a second secret family, and a secret daughter Mazarine, at the state's expense.

The tone changed from the stylish and Romanesque to testosterone-fueled vulgarity with Jacques Chirac, known by his chauffeur (and then the world) as "Mr. 15 minutes, shower included." His highly popular and respected wife, Bernadette Chirac, started a sea-change in attitudes when, in her best-selling autobiography, she wrote touchingly and honestly about how painful that aspect of her marriage had been.

Hollande's predecessor Nicolas Sarkozy reportedly had affairs with journalists, including, allegedly, Chirac's daughter Claude, but his dalliances and his very public life with second wife Cécilia Sarkozy and later Carla Bruni were seen more as the uncontrollable passions of a (short) man with uncontrollable ambition, an uncontrollable temper, and an uncontrollable desire for attention and affection.

Even with that history, there are five things that make Hollande's alleged affair with the actress Julie Gayet sadly comical and politically dangerous. First is the sea-change mentioned earlier. Attitudes have shifted, not so much about sexual mores and the weaknesses of the flesh. But cheating on your wife or partner, with such intensity and frequency is seen as sexist and the sign of a patriarchal society, and of inequality and disrespect. And sending your partner, Valérie Trierweiler, into hospital in a state of nervous collapse is not seen as the act of a man of integrity.

Second, Hollande came in to stop all this stuff. He was "Mr. Normal" who was going to bring exemplary conduct to political life, and stop all the tabloid press gossip lowering the status of the presidency. He said so himself. In fact, his somewhat tortured relationships with former presidential candidate Ségolène Royal, Trierweiler, and now Gayet have never been out of the headlines.

Third, there is something comical and diminishing of the presidency in his slipping out not in a Ferrari but on the back of a scooter, the easy victim of *Closer* paparazzi, Sébastien Valiela, waiting, camera at the ready, across the street.

Fourth, there is the question of security. Why does he need bodyguards all around him in public when he takes such risks in private? It was fortunate there was not an al-Qaeda hit squad on the other side of the street.

Finally, even before this incident, he was the most unpopular president of the Fifth Republic to date. If he had had any success with the unemployment figures or the stagnating economy since he had been elected, perhaps the French might think he deserved a night off.

French commentators in the political class and the media seem to be catching up with the significance of all these things very slowly. There seems to be a severe case of cognitive dissonance on their part regarding what is at stake here because, of course, the president does not have a private life like everyone else. He's the president.

Besides, when things are going well, the "private life" is deliberately on display for all to see. That is how the French presidency thrives. Before his first press conference after the scandal broke he had three choices regarding his very public affair: say something before, say something during, or say nothing. Each would be consequential in its effects.

He chose the last, almost, saying he would not answer questions on issues of his private life, but would respond in the coming days.

It is clear that he, and all the commentators, and the political class are now thinking about redefining the status of the French first lady. It is as if virtually the whole country is in in denial. Politics would be far better served if, rather than redefine the role and status of the first lady, France were to redefine the role and status of the presidency itself.

Source: http://www.theatlantic.com