

Tekst 8

The Beckhams versus the Archbishop of York

- 1 Can charities use extravagant expenditure to raise funds? I think the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Sentamu, may have been guilty of populism in his criticism of the Beckham party. The facts, as reported by Ruth Gledhill in *The Times*, are these: David Beckham, who is the Captain of the England football team, planned to hold a party before the World Cup. The Beckhams decided to use the party to raise money for charity, and sold tickets to their friends, many of whom are highly paid footballers, for £2,000 each.
- 2 No doubt £2,000 is a large sum to pay for an evening party, but it is not a particularly large sum for wealthy people to give to a deserving charity. A pair of these tickets were then auctioned at another charity function. As the Archbishop will know, these charity auctions often achieve exceptional sums for good causes.
- 3 The bidders are not concerned with the object they are buying, but want to make a large donation to the charity involved. The pair of tickets were not being sold for their own value; they were sold as an opportunity for charitable giving. In the event, they sold for £100,000. This is indeed a much higher level of giving, but not uncommon with private charitable trusts.
- 4 The Archbishop might reasonably have praised the Beckhams for making an entirely appropriate party into a charitable occasion. There is nothing wicked about parties; there is much good about giving to charity. He might have praised those who paid £2,000 for a ticket. They may have had other motives, such as hobnobbing with celebrities, but they were helping deserving causes.
- 5 He might also have praised the generosity of the man who spent £100,000 on two tickets with a face value of £4,000, thereby giving £96,000 to another charity. The Archbishop — and this would be regarded as sensationalism by journalists — recast the story to make a quite different point. “For one person to spend £50,000 on an evening out while another earns £131 a week is just not right. Is that a fair and just society? I do not think so.”
- 6 The flaw in the Archbishop’s argument is that no one spent £50,000 for an evening out. A rich and generous man gave £50,000 to buy a £2,000 ticket for a social occasion he thought might be entertaining. His main concern was to give a large sum to charity, if in a way that would give him some additional enjoyment. He did not spend the money for an evening out. He spent the money primarily on charitable giving. We cannot be sure of the balance of his motives, but nor can the Archbishop.
- 7 The Archbishop must spend much of his time supporting charitable appeals. He knows how difficult it is for them to raise money, and how useful it can be to put a little jam on the pill. The Archbishop is perfectly entitled to criticise the unequal distribution of wealth in modern Britain, but he should not misrepresent the motive of charitable fundraising and givings on social occasions. Some of these parties can be dull, but that is another matter.
- 8 I would not, in any case, single out the earnings of footballers for criticism. Only a few of them become stars. They have relatively short professional lives, and a high risk of injury. Their lifetime earnings are not proportionate to 35. Very few footballers retire as wealthy men.

The Times Blog Posted by Lord Rees-Mogg

Tekst 8 The Beckhams versus the Archbishop of York

- 3p **32** Geef voor elk van de volgende kwesties aan of de schrijver van het artikel deze wel of niet aan de orde stelt.
- 1 Should charitable organisations make use of celebrities to raise money?
 - 2 Should there be a legal limit to public donations to charitable causes?
 - 3 Should the amount of money generated by charity events be publicised?
 - 4 Can donating money to good causes and pleasure seeking go hand in hand?
 - 5 Do footballers' earnings contribute to the widening gap between the rich and the poor in Britain?
- Noteer het nummer van elke kwestie, gevolgd door "wel" of "niet".
- (The Archbishop) "might ... have praised"
- 1p **33** Why is this phrase used repeatedly in paragraphs 4 and 5?
- A To impress upon the reader the enormous amounts of money involved in charity.
 - B To stress how blind the Archbishop was to the honourable motives of people contributing to charity.
 - C To stress the Archbishop's failure to check his information when commenting on the Beckham party.
- "to put a little jam on the pill" (paragraph 7)
- 1p **34** To which of the following does "a little jam" refer?
- A a charitable appeal
 - B a social occasion
 - C generous donations
 - D positive publicity
- 1p **35** Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 8?
- A the average income in Britain
 - B their peak pay
 - C their remarkable achievements
 - D their short careers
- "the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Sentamu, may have been guilty of populism" (alinea 1)
- 1p **36** Welk ander woord gebruikt de schrijver om het begrip "populism" in een vergelijkbare betekenis aan te duiden?