

— . In what's probably the craziest headline I've ever written, I've reported that ___26___ in livestock protection are happening with scientists painting eyes on the butts of cows. The experiment is based upon the idea that farmers who're protecting their herd from lions would shoot and kill lions in an effort to protect their livestock. While this makes a lot of sense, it results in many lion deaths that ___27___ would have been unnecessary. Researchers in Australia have been ___28___ and testing a method of trickery to make lions think they are being watched by the painted eyes on cow butts.

This idea is based on the principle that lions and other ___29___ are far less likely to attack when they feel they are being watched. As conservation areas become smaller, lions are increasingly coming into contact with human populations, which are expanding to the ___30___ of these protected areas.

Efforts like painting eyes on cow butts may seem crazy at first, but they could make actual headway(进展) in the fight for conservation. "If the method works, it could provide farmers in Botswana -- and ___31___ -- with a low-cost, sustainable tool to protect their livestock, and a way to keep lions safe from being killed." Lions are ___32___ ambush (埋伏) hunters, so when they feel their prey has ___33___ them, they usually give up on the hunt. Researchers are ___34___ testing their idea on a select herd of cattle. They have painted half of the cows with eyes and left the other half as normal. Through satellite tracking of both the herd and the lions in the area, they will be able to ___35___ if their psychological trickery will work to help keep farmers from shooting lions.

A) advances B) boundaries C) challenging D) currently E) determine F) devising G) elsewhere H) nevertheless I) otherwise J) predators K) primarily L) retorted M) spotted N) testimonies O) wrestle

二、 Questions 46 to 50 are based on the following passage.

While human achievements in mathematics continue to reach new levels of complexity, many of us who aren't mathematicians at heart (or engineers by trade) may struggle to remember the last time we used calculus (微积分) .

It's a fact not lost on American educators, who amid rising math failure rates are debating how math can better meet the real-life needs of students. Should we change the way math is taught in schools, or eliminate some courses entirely?

Andrew Hacker, Queens College political science professor, thinks that advanced algebra and other higher-level math should be cut from curricula in favor of courses with more routine usefulness, like statistics.

"We hear on all sides that we're not teaching enough mathematics, and the Chinese are running rings around us," Hacker says. "I'm suggesting we're teaching too much mathematics to too many people. . . not everybody has to know calculus. If you're going to become an aeronautical (航空的) engineer, fine. But most of us aren't."

Instead, Hacker is pushing for more courses like the one he teaches at Queens

College: Numeracy 101. There, his students of "citizen statistics" learn to analyze public information like the federal budget and corporate reports. Such courses, Hacker argues, are a remedy for the numerical illiteracy of adults who have completed high-level math like algebra but are unable to calculate the price of, say, a carpet by area.

Hacker's argument has met with opposition from other math educators who say what's needed is to help students develop a better relationship with math earlier, rather than teaching them less math altogether.

Maria Droujkova is a founder of Natural Math, and has taught basic calculus concepts to 5-year-olds. For Droujkova, high-level math is important, and what it could use in American classrooms is an injection of childlike wonder.

"Make mathematics more available," Droujkova says. "Redesign it so it's more accessible to more kinds of people: young children, adults who worry about it, adults who may have had bad experiences. "

Pamela Harris, a lecturer at the University of Texas at Austin, has a similar perspective. Harris says that American education is suffering from an epidemic of "fake math"—an emphasis on rote memorization (死记硬背) of formulas and steps, rather than an understanding of how math can influence the ways we see the world.

Andrew Hacker, for the record, remains skeptical.

"I'm going to leave it to those who are in mathematics to work out the ways to make their subject interesting and exciting so students want to take it," Hacker says. "All that I ask is that alternatives be offered instead of putting all of us on the road to calculus. "

46. What does the author say about ordinary Americans?

- A) They struggle to solve math problems.
- B) They think math is a complex subject.
- C) They find high-level math of little use.
- D) They work hard to learn high-level math.

47. What is the general complaint about America's math education according to Hacker?

- A) America is not doing as well as China.
- B) Math professors are not doing a good job.
- C) It doesn't help students develop their literacy.
- D) There has hardly been any innovation for years.

48. What does Andrew Hacker's Numeracy 101 aim to do?

- A) Allow students to learn high-level math step by step.
- B) Enable students to make practical use of basic math.
- C) Lay a solid foundation for advanced math studies.
- D) Help students to develop their analytical abilities.

49. What does Maria Droujkova suggest math teachers do in class?

- A) Make complex concepts easy to understand.
- B) Start teaching children math at an early age.
- C) Help children work wonders with calculus.

- D) Try to arouse students' curiosity in math.
50. What does Pamela Harris think should be the goal of math education?
- A) To enable learners to understand the world better.
- B) To help learners to tell fake math from real math.
- C) To broaden Americans' perspectives on math.
- D) To exert influence on world development.

三、 In order to “change lives for the better” and reduce “dependency,” George Osborne, Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced the “upfront work search” scheme. Only if the jobless arrive at the jobcentre with a CV register for online job search, and start looking for work will they be eligible for benefit-and then they should report weekly rather than fortnightly. What could be more reasonable?

More apparent reasonableness followed. There will now be a seven-day wait for the jobseeker's allowance. “Those first few days should be spent looking for work, not looking to sign on,” he claimed. “We're doing these things because we know they help people say off benefits and help those on benefits get into work faster” Help? Really? On first hearing, this was the socially concerned chancellor, trying to change lives for the better, complete with “reforms” to an obviously indulgent system that demands too little effort from the newly unemployed to find work, and subsidises laziness. What motivated him, we were to understand, was his zeal for “fundamental fairness”—protecting the taxpayer, controlling spending and ensuring that only the most deserving claimants received their benefits.

Losing a job is hurting: you don't skip down to the jobcentre with a song in your heart, delighted at the prospect of doubling your income from the generous state. It is financially terrifying, psychologically embarrassing and you know that support is minimal and extraordinarily hard to get. You are now not wanted; you support is minimal and extraordinarily hard to get. You are now not wanted; you are now excluded from the work environment that offers purpose and structure in your life. Worse, the crucial income to feed yourself and your family and pay the bills has disappeared. Ask anyone newly unemployed what they want and the answer is always: a job.

But in Osborneland, your first instinct is to fall into dependency —permanent dependency if you can get it — supported by a state only too ready to indulge your falsehood. It is as though 20 years of ever-tougher reforms of the job search and benefit administration system never happened. The principle of British welfare is no longer that you can insure yourself against the risk of unemployment and receive unconditional payments if the disaster happens. Even the very phrase “jobseeker's allowance” — invented in 1996 — is about redefining the unemployed as a “jobseeker” who had no mandatory right to a benefit he or she has earned through making national insurance contributions. Instead, the claimant receives a time-limited “allowance,” conditional on actively seeking a job; no entitlement and no insurance, at ?71.70 a week, one of the least generous in the EU.

6. George Osborne's scheme was intended to_____.

[A]provide the unemployed with easier access to benefits.

[B]encourage jobseekers' active engagement in job seeking.

[C]motivate the unemployed to report voluntarily.

[D]guarantee jobseekers' legitimate right to benefits.

7. The phrase "to sign on"(Line 3,Para.2) most probably means_____.

[A]to check on the availability of jobs at the jobcentre.

[B]to accept the government's restrictions on the allowance.

[C]to register for an allowance from the government.

[D]to attend a governmental job-training program.

8. What promoted the chancellor to develop his scheme?

[A]A desire to secure a better life for all.

[B]An eagerness to protect the unemployed.

[C]An urge to be generous to the claimants.

[D]A passion to ensure fairness for taxpayers.

9. According to Paragraph 3, being unemployed makes one feel_____.

[A]uneasy. [B]enraged.

[C]insulted. [D]guilty.

10. To which of the following would the author most probably agree?

[A]The British welfare system indulges jobseekers' laziness

[B]Osborne's reforms will reduce the risk of unemployment.

[C]The jobseekers' allowance has met their actual needs.

[D]Unemployment benefits should not be made conditional.
education.