

Tekst 4

First I was shocked, then I didn't feel charitable

1 The world offers no image more powerful than a new-born baby. It promises everything, this
5 little bundle of skinny limbs and squashed-up face. It holds hope for us all.

2 Hold that image in
10 your mind for a moment and add a new one. This is associated with filth and squalor and disease.

15 combine the two images. Thrust a giant cockroach into the mouth of that baby. Could anything be more loathsome, more repellent? Who would do such a thing?

3 The answer is a children's charity:
20 Barnardo's. Of course Barnardo's did not do it literally. It exists to protect children. Its advertising agency used a computer to create the image, then plastered it over the newspapers.

4 25 The first impression is that of abused babies, but the campaign is about poverty. Its message rests on the equation that poverty equals abuse. If the images are loathsome, the words are deceitful, patronising, foolish and
30 damaging. As the text puts it: "Poverty is waiting to crush Mary's hope and ambition and is likely to lead her to a future of drug abuse."

5 To the millions of people in this country
35 who, like me, were born into poor families, that is monstrous. It would be absurd to suggest there is no such thing as poverty. It is equally absurd to suggest that a child born into poverty will be crushed as a direct result
40 of it. It is true that a poor child has fewer opportunities than a rich one. But ask yourself who is the more fortunate: a child with loving caring parents and no money or a child whose rich parents couldn't care less. Poor children
45 end up as addicts; so do the children of the rich.

6 Now, let us accept for a moment the campaign's claim that poverty can crush a child. What are we meant to do about it? The
50 advertisements invite us to call Barnardo's



John Humphrys

and, implicitly, to donate some cash. And what will Barnardo's do? It is about 30 years since it ran the orphanages that carried its name. Now it runs a series of admirable
55 projects around the country helping youngsters with problems such as sexual abuse or homelessness. It is important work, but as Barnardo's would acknowledge, this is dealing with the effects of poverty rather than
60 its cause.

7 The stated purpose of the campaign is not to raise money but to challenge attitudes. Andrew Nebel of Barnardo's says child poverty is an issue "which the public is
65 almost in denial about. We needed to overcome public apathy". If that is true we must indeed change our attitudes and put pressure on the politicians – the only people with enough power to do something serious.

8 70 Is it true? Are we apathetic? In 1997 we elected a government committed to tackling child poverty and it is doing so. According to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation it is likely to hit its interim target of taking 1m children out
75 of poverty by next April. The Sure Start scheme aimed at helping the poorest children is widely acknowledged to be working, albeit more slowly than hoped. Child poverty is on the agenda and will stay there.

9 80 So £1m of charitable contributions is being spent on a shock campaign to alert us to something of which we are already aware and which is being tackled. You might think the money would be better spent directly helping
85 vulnerable youngsters.

10 Successful campaigns are meant to leave you with an unforgettable impression. Barnardo's has succeeded in my case. It is an image of a group of sharp-suited advertising
90 executives in their oak-panelled boardroom slapping each other on the back at the outrage they have created and the column inches they have filled. Champagne all round, no doubt.

11 As for me, I have given a little help to
95 Barnardo's over the years because they do good work. People who do my job often get asked. But next time they call I think I may be busy. If Barnardo's wants to outrage in this way it can do it without me.

The Sunday Times

Eindexamen Engels havo 2005-II

■ Tekst 4 First I was shocked, then I didn't feel charitable

- 1p 9 "Barnardo's did not do it literally" (regels 20-21)
Wat heeft Barnardo's niet letterlijk gedaan?
- 1p 10 ■ What does John Humphrys express in paragraphs 1-4?
A His disgust at some people's lack of hygiene.
B His horror at child abuse of any kind.
C His indignation at a recent charity advertisement.
D His irritation at tastelessness in the media.
- 1p 11 ■ What is John Humphrys' main point in paragraph 5?
A A poor background does not necessarily lead to failure in later life.
B Children from poor backgrounds are unlikely to become rich.
C On the whole, children in poor families are happier than rich children.
D Poor children are more likely to become drug addicts than rich children.
- 1p 12 ■ What does John Humphrys make clear about Barnardo's in paragraph 6?
A It can no longer motivate people to support its activities.
B It can support poor people on a very limited scale only.
C It does not spend the public's donations in a useful way.
D It helps victims of poverty instead of tackling poverty itself.
- 1p 13 ■ What is the "purpose of the campaign" (line 61), according to Barnardo's itself?
A To collect donations so that it can help poor children.
B To encourage poor parents to ask help for their children.
C To force the government to pay more attention to child poverty.
D To increase public awareness of poverty among children.
- 1p 14 ■ How does paragraph 8 connect with Andrew Nebel's statement in paragraph 7?
Paragraph 8
A contradicts this statement.
B describes the consequences of this statement.
C supports this statement.
- 1p 15 ■ What does John Humphrys imply about Barnardo's campaign in paragraph 9?
A It has already brought in a lot of money.
B It has led to several successful projects.
C It is a waste of charity money.
D It is well-meant but will not help.
- 1p 16 ■ How can the overall tone of paragraph 10 be characterised best?
A As enthusiastic.
B As factual.
C As rude.
D As sarcastic.
E As surprised.
- 1p 17 Welke slotconclusie verbindt John Humphrys aan zijn mening over de campagne van Barnardo's?