

Unit 1

4 a Jay's story

Track 1

Reporter: So today I'm back talking to another person affected by the Windrush scandal. As you're certainly aware, many senior Britons have been affected by this change in policy and have been threatened with deportation. However, thankfully very few have actually been put onto a plane. Though, really, every single one is one too many. Anyway, Jay's case is quite different. So, Jay, could you just briefly introduce yourself?

Jay: Yeah, my name is Jay and my mother is a part of the Windrush generation. I was born in the UK and lived here all my life and I'm recognized as a stateless citizen.

Reporter: A stateless citizen, although your mother is part of Windrush and as such must have some kind of right to stay. And you were born in Birmingham, but then placed into foster care as a baby.

Jay: Yes, and it was during that time when I noticed there was a problem when my foster family wanted to take us to the Continent for a week when we were children, and we couldn't go because we never had the right, relevant documents, even though I was in the local authority. They were taking care of me – I was, as you say, "in the system", because how else could I have had a foster family and how could they have, you know, claimed any money on my behalf?

Reporter: So wrong documents. Because they had to get permission as foster parents to take you abroad?

Jay: No, everything was fine on that side, but I had no passport and I still don't. My application was rejected due to a lack of information about my birth mother.

Reporter: But you didn't live with her at that time, so ...

Jay: No, I didn't, and I had no contact and still don't. We were and are estranged. She gave me up pretty much when I was born, and she was very young and then that was it. I don't know anything about her. There's no way for me to contact her.

Reporter: Let's get this straight: the government, local authorities, child welfare, whoever, some UK officer on your case knew enough about you and accepted responsibility for you to put you into foster care, but they didn't have enough information about your mother to get you the right documents. Which, if you ask me, is maybe even more important for foster children than children living with or knowing their birth parents. Because they can always call up and say, "Look I need this or that information or a signature".

Jay: Yeah, yeah, right. Absolutely.

Reporter: So how has this situation affected you?

Jay: It's hindered me quite a lot because I haven't been able to do as I wanted to complete certain business goals and competitions that I would have needed to have done in my career to me further. So, it kind of made me feel very stuck where I am and very isolated at times, very alone, depressed and erm ... that's how I feel.

Reporter: And then you said that things got worse in 2016, right?

Jay: Yes, I had applied for the third time, because I was just trying to explain my situation about not being able to contact my mum.

Reporter: And that's clearly not your fault or your responsibility ...

Jay: Yes, and the people I talked to in the offices were very understanding ...

Reporter: Right, but the law's the law, and so, basically, because your mother chose not to take care of you, putting you into foster care and not being in contact with you, that's had a massive effect on your life, not just as such, but also in terms of your citizenship.

Jay: Yes, yes it has. And it even got worse. At one stage they did say that if I didn't seek out as stateless, they were going to send me back to my home country of Jamaica, yes. I've never visited Jamaica; I've never been on a holiday to Jamaica.

Reporter: How did you react to that piece of news?

Jay: Oh, I phoned everyone. I was like "I'm going, guys" ... It was quite ... it was quite hard for me because you never know with these situations. And it was actually very hard. You know, I even think now with what's going on with the change of government – am I okay? Am I gonna be okay? And so, I was told that in order to remain in the UK I had to declare myself as "stateless".

Reporter: That sounds as if you're a refugee and your country of origin has, for one reason or another, ceased to exist.

Jay: Yeah, yeah, it does, and it feels quite embarrassing to be classed as a stateless person. It's almost degrading. If you don't sort something out you can be detained, you could be deported if you don't sort your papers out. So these things have worried me, you know, I've lost sleep ... depression ... and just been isolated because of it.

Unit 2

5 b When the price isn't right ...

Track 2

If you've ever seen a shopping haul or unboxing video, you know that people – and especially, Americans – love to shop, and shopping has never been easier.

We no longer have to go to a store during limited hours, stalk the aisles looking for a product, and then wait in check-out lines. Now, with the click of a button, we have the freedom to shop for anything, anywhere, and at any time. Every day is Christmas if you buy yourself stuff online. Also, products are cheaper than ever, despite having to travel across the world to get to us. Which means we often buy things without a second thought.

So, you get a dopamine hit when you buy something; it's kind of this pleasure of "oh I'm buying something, that's fun", but with online shopping you get that dopamine hit when it arrives, too, and when you open it – so it's kind of this double benefit. And so, biologically, it's actually more fun, in some ways, than buying things in a store.

The biological compulsion to shop is partly due to the way humans are wired. So, there is an evolutionary aspect to this ... The people that had the most stuff were most likely to survive, so you gather a lot of food for the winter, you gather a lot of wood for your shelter – and we still have that innate desire to get enough stuff, to make sure that we're going to survive.

Today, for example, the average American buys 66 garments a year, which is insane. And they're even spending more on electronics, which is really interesting, because electronics are cheaper than they used to be.

So, the dollar amount that they're spending is going up, even though the cost of things is going down. And now that we do a lot of our shopping online, returning things has become more of a hassle. One survey found that nine out of ten shoppers said they never or rarely return online purchases. And part of this is because things are so cheap, you think, is it really worth 5 minutes of my time to print out the label and go to the post office and send it back when I'm really not gonna get that much money back? Why not just keep this, and maybe I'll use it eventually ... but in the end, we mostly don't wind up using it.

So where does all this stuff go?

Well, a lot of it becomes clutter in our ever-expanding homes. The average square footage of houses in the US rose by 23% in the last two decades, while the number of storage facilities doubled. It's also become very easy to donate our unwanted goods to thrift stores, which makes us feel good about getting rid of our stuff. But it's estimated that most of the clothes we donate actually end up in landfills. The average American, for example, throws away an estimated 81 pounds of clothes and textiles each year.

Yet, consumers continue to want cheaper goods. This means that manufacturers have to cut costs and create lower quality products, mostly made from plastic, which is actually just oil. So, you know, you'll buy cheap clothes from H&M and they'll lose their shape after a wash or two, and you'll even buy appliances and where they used to last for up to ten years, they last for three years. This can't continue.

And we're on track to double the material resources we use by 2060. We're running out of places to put all this trash. It is estimated that by the middle of this century, the amount of plastic in our oceans will be greater than the number of fish.

So, where does that leave us?

The movie *Wall-E* predicted a bleak future where humans filled their planet with so much trash that they had to abandon it for another one. Some consumers are trying to reverse this trend, taking part in growing movements like zero-waste households, or capsule wardrobes. The rule of thumb for those is to go down to about 36 items in your closet. Or some who are doing a "year-of-no-shopping" which is about not buying things, unless you absolutely need them. Or minimalism. Also, some consumers are using their buying power to encourage companies to create more sustainable products. Another option is to simply wear your clothes longer. By wearing one item of clothing for nine months longer you can reduce your carbon footprint for that item by 30 percent. Other people see shopping at thrift stores and secondhand boutiques as a solution. By buying one used item instead of a new one, it could save about six pounds in CO₂ emissions, which is the equivalent to removing half a million cars off the road for a year.

But beyond individual choices we could look for a more encompassing solution. Right now, we make, use and then trash all of our materials, which can take a thousand years to biodegrade. Companies could design all of our goods for re-use and to have multiple life cycles before finally composting back into the earth. We could start with clothing: nearly 100% of our fabrics could be recycled into pulp and then turned into new textiles.

Otherwise, if nothing changes, let's hope we can make it to Mars in time.

Unit 3

1 c Global warming

Track 3

Emily: Planet Earth is more than four-and-a-half billion years old and we humans have only been in the picture for a few millions of those years, which is just about a finger snap in geological time. And yet, in that short finger snap, we may have caused more damage to our environment than

what was done in all the eons before we built our first fire. To learn more about this, we've turned to an expert in the field, climate scientist Dr. Radley Horton. Welcome.

Dr. Radley Horton: Thank you, it's good to be here.

Emily: What's the difference between climate change and global warming?

Dr. Radley Horton: Climate change and global warming are two terms for the same thing basically. But climate change is a better descriptor because as greenhouse gas concentrations are going up in the atmosphere due to our activities, our burning fossil fuels, we are seeing global warming, we are seeing temperatures go up, ... But we're seeing a lot of other things happening as well, which are better captured by the phrase climate change. For example, we're seeing sea levels rising, we're seeing ice – that's on Antarctica and Greenland especially – melting and making its way towards the oceans. We're seeing the upper oceans warm up. We're seeing plants blooming earlier in the spring as temperatures go up, leaves falling off the trees later in the fall due to higher temperatures. So global warming is happening, but climate change is a better term because it captures the fact that it's not just warming that we're experiencing as we increase greenhouse gases.

Emily: Okay, so what causes climate change?

Dr. Radley Horton: Climate change today is largely driven by human activities: burning of fossil fuels, also land-use changes, clearing vegetation, planting rice crops, and even some livestock are contributing to methane emissions. Those are the main things driving climate change right now. If we look at a longer period of time, if we go back to the Ice Ages, we can see that on very long-time scales things like the sun can have an impact as well. Volcanoes can have an impact. But right now, when we think about the climate of our future, the climate that you guys, the next generation, are going to be living with, the biggest climate change that we need to think about is caused by human activities.

Emily: What do you say to those who claim that climate change is a fact of nature and not influenced by what people do?

Dr. Radley Horton: We know that climate change is influenced by our activities. The leading scientists have gotten together and over 97% of them agree not only that climate change is happening, but that our activities, the carbon dioxide that we're putting in the atmosphere, is warming the planet, changing it in dramatic ways.

Emily: Whenever there's a particularly cold winter it fuels the argument that there really is no global warming. How do you respond to that?

Dr. Radley Horton: Well, we've got to remember that it's a very big planet. That's a lot of natural variability just from one year to the next, especially if you look at one place. So, we have had some cold winters in parts of the US in recent years. But if you actually look at the global averages for temperature, you can see that the last decade has been the warmest we've ever had when we average globally. So, you can still get a cold region, you can still get a cold season, but if we look at the long-term averages, it's like we've loaded the dice in a way that we get much more of the high numbers, the high temperatures and fewer of those very cold events.

Emily: So clearly, what you're saying is that climate change is a bad thing that's happening to our planet, right?

Dr. Radley Horton: Well, we need to keep in mind that not all aspects of climate change are going to be negative. But based on what we understand, our human society has been adapted for the climate of the past. As temperatures are going up, we're seeing sea levels rising in a way that's going to flood some of our coastal cities. We're seeing some stress on our plants. It's going to impact our agriculture and water availability. So, there may be some individual sectors, some individual regions that may benefit in the short term with climate change, but in general it's going to be a threat multiplier. It's going to put additional challenges on our agriculture and our ecosystems, as we move into the future.

Emily: Are you optimistic that this is something we can take action against and deal with?

Dr. Radley Horton: I am very optimistic. I think if we look at our history, we can see all these other huge challenges that we've had in the past when we rallied together, when we faced the problems before us. Better to address these problems now while we still can. And I think the younger generations can make the technological innovations, can stand up and work together to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, so we don't get that much warming in the first place. And also help protect our most vulnerable people. People in the cities suffering during heat waves, young children, people along the coast who are vulnerable to sea-level rise. Let's take the steps today so that they're less likely to suffer when we have a heat wave or when we have a big flood event.

Emily: Thank you so much for all the great information, Doctor. It's been a pleasure talking to you today.

Dr. Radley Horton: Thank you.

Unit 3

3 b How to make a sustainable fashion statement

Track 4

My vision for the future is for empathy to inform our decisions. I'm the founder of Novel Supply Company. It's conscious apparel for the urban adventure. My vision goes beyond just a clothing line. I wanna make sustainability cool.

No one really thinks about their \$ 5 T-shirt and how that became \$ 5. People are getting paid lower than liveable wages and there are terrible working conditions. We have this fast fashion problem. It's made people think that they're going out of style every single week, so they need something new. We're making products out of synthetics derived from petroleum. When we're done with it, we throw it in the garbage and then it never biodegrades. Synthetics and microplastics are polluting our waters, and now are getting into our food. It's bound to affect us.

Moving forward, we need to start caring about what is going into the actual product. That's why I'm pursuing an automated manufacturing hub locally in Vancouver.

I grew up in the North Shore surrounded by mountains. There's still people sewing my products and it's still quite expensive to make sustainability more affordable and to be able to make the product locally. In Vancouver, through automation, you'll be able to create more product, and pay people more. All around it's more ethical; it's not only more just, but also more efficient for businesses.

I've created the most sustainable products out there. There's no dyes, it's all hemp and organic cotton down to the eco inks that I use. This is meant to eventually biodegrade as demand grows for a sustainable product: it'll be a turning point for the fashion industry. It'll become affordable. I'm making a bigger change than just making my own stuff. I'm getting other brands to manufacture locally as well. We can't do it on our own. It's all about coming together to make these changes in the world.

Unit 6

3 a Globalised jeans

Track 5

David Brancaccio: This is the marketplace morning report. I'm David Brancaccio. What does the world economy look like in a maybe neatly stacked pile of steel shipping containers in blue green or burgundy? A business journalist has teamed up with a graphic designer and put together a book of infographics that has the heft of an atlas. On the line from Berlin is Thomas Ramge, co-author of *The Global Economy As You've Never Seen It*. It's for the eye, but we're gonna try to evoke this for the ear. Thanks for joining us, Thomas.

Thomas Ramge: It's a pleasure and I am very grateful that I can be on the show.

David Brancaccio: The global economy is an idea that is central to our lives. But you can't see it, it's often almost a metaphor. Why did your team set out to try to visualize the world economy?

Thomas Ramge: What we're trying to do in this book is to visualize data and visualize abstract context, to lower the entry barriers into the complex world of economics.

David Brancaccio: So, you're trying to use advanced graphic design and infographics and data to explain the stuff, so people can explore. So let's just zoom into a couple parts of these pages, 88 and 89. It says "the jeans business, the blue jeans business". On page 88, a cartoon of blue jeans is depicted, supposedly off-brand jeans, available maybe at a place like Walmart – cheap jeans. On page 89 are designer blue jeans that cost a lot of money, about \$ 300. What do you get from looking at that particular part of your graphic?

Thomas Ramge: Are you wearing jeans right now?

David Brancaccio: Of course, I am. I mean, I'm an American.

Thomas Ramge: The jeans that you're wearing might have travelled – or, parts in it might have travelled more than 30,000 miles before it was put in a store in New York and Los Angeles. So, the cotton of your jeans might have been picked in Kazakhstan, or the washing might have been done in Taiwan and the buttons and rivets might come from Italy and the distribution then has been organized in Europe and the United States. And so, jeans are very practical examples, and those were the examples we were looking for that make the global economy tangible.

David Brancaccio: Alright. Now, Thomas, to page 96. What I'm looking at is a flat map of the world. It is covered in a fuzz of filaments, like someone has spread steel wool across the map of the world. Now these are not random lines, there are patterns here. What is this?

Thomas Ramge: These are the transport lines of goods and people in the world. And as you might have realized, we didn't draw the borders on it. What we see here is a map of how the world is

connected in reality. We firmly believe that the global economy is not a zero-sum game, but that if we collaborate on a global scale, if we have competition and fair terms, we all win.

David Brancaccio: The book is called *The Global Economy As You've Never Seen It*. 99 ingenious illustrations that put it all together. Mr Ramge, thank you so much.

Thomas Ramge: I thank you.

Unit 6

4 a The true cost of an iPhone

Track 6

How much would an iPhone cost if it were entirely made in the US? At the moment, the iPhone 5 costs between \$ 650 to \$ 850 retail.

iPhones are mostly manufactured and assembled in China, famously by the company Foxconn.

"It largely costs more for people to manufacture products in the United States because of higher labor costs," says Carl Howe, Vice President of data sciences at the Yankee Group. "Labor costs here are somewhere in the vicinity of two to three times what they're going to be in China."

Right now, Apple pays around \$ 5 per iPhone for assembly and labor. Moving that state-side would add around \$ 10 to the cost of an iPhone. That would move the cost of the cheapest iPhone to about \$ 660. But labor's not the most significant financial advantage to manufacturing the iPhone in China, where Apple has been able to create enormous iPhone-assembling villages.

"They have these special regions, like Shenzhen, which is an industrial region. So if you need something fixed or something changed, it's just a couple of buildings away, and the ability to keep everything so close together has incredible logistic advantages for Apple," explains Renee Ritchie, editor-in-chief of iMore, a publication about Apple products.

Ritchie says it would be almost impossible to re-create that system in the US, which would mean longer assembly times, a less efficient assembly and lots of micro-shipments.

"It's an incredibly complicated process to build one of these devices, and you'd have to move that entire culture of production to the United States in order for it to work," says Ritchie.

And then there are the parts themselves ...

Andrew Rassweilier is Senior Director of Materials and Cost Benchmarking at IHS technology: "For almost every component that goes into the device, there may be as many as two or three sources. Then if you were to dig down another layer into some of the components, such as the display, the touch screen, the batteries. Those are also assemblies that are comprised of multiple components coming from, potentially, multiple countries."

IHS broke down the cost of iPhone's components and found they add up to around \$ 190 per phone.

The most expensive part of the iPhone is the display, which costs about \$ 40. Making the display in the US would roughly triple its cost, according to Rassweilier. That alone would add around \$ 80 to the price of the iPhone.

That brings our iPhone to \$ 740.

Rassweilier says making all of the iPhone's parts in the US would push the price of the iPhone's components from \$ 190 to around \$ 600.

"If the materials alone are costing \$ 600," says Rassweilier, "it stands to reason, that same iPhone could cost, perhaps, \$ 2,000 at retail."

That's right. \$ 2,000 for an iPhone.

"It is a lot of money for an iPhone. And I would say trying to move Apple's entire supply chain is not just prohibitively expensive but it's also impractical and not realistic."

And it wouldn't even earn political goodwill from most of its customers. "Two out of three Apple customers aren't in the USA anymore," says the Yankee Group's Carl Howe. "That's quite a change from many years ago when most of Apple's customers were in the US."

It's just as well, says Howe. Even with all of the overseas cost efficiencies, the iPhone is still one of the most expensive phones around.

Siri, you cost a lot! – It's still roughly a third of what an All-American iPhone would cost ...

Unit 7

2 b Biomimicry

Track 7

Biomimicry: Technology that learns from nature

Human beings tend to imitate nature. Birds taught us to fly. Although it did take us a while to learn ... However, until the mid-twentieth century, no one had coined a term for this technological approach which Otto Schmitt christened biomimetics or biomimicry. One of the first examples would be the invention of Velcro – a material that was born after a walk in the countryside by an engineer and his dog. Upon returning home, he found that his socks were filled with little burrs from a plant called burdock. Wondering why they had stuck to his clothes, he decided to inspect them closely. Finally, he found out the answer: The burdock burrs were covered by a substantial amount of tiny hooks. Why not use those adhesive qualities for some kind of fabric? And that's how Velcro was patented. The truth is he just piggybacked on the work carried out by nature for millions of years.

Today, biomimicry and its simple and efficient solutions have a wide range of applications in technology, covering fields such as medicine, energy, aeronautics or advanced materials.

There are three types of biomimicry: First, the imitation of shapes ... During the early 1990s, the Japanese high speed bullet train created a sonic boom when exiting a tunnel because of the air pressure. Eiji Nakatsu, an engineer and bird-lover, was inspired by the kingfisher's beak, able to dive into the water at great speed with almost no friction, to create a new design. That's how the modern bullet train, much more efficient and quieter, was born.

Secondly, there's the imitation of Nature's strategies and mechanisms ... For instance, dolphins have mastered the art of emitting ultrasound without it interfering between them. A team of researchers has analysed the way they modulate these frequencies to design a tsunami alert system in the Indian Ocean.

Finally, there's also the imitation of the efficiency within an ecosystem ... In India they are developing the city of Lavasa to emulate the surrounding forests. For example, pavements are porous to drain the monsoon's waters, and the foundations of buildings grip the hillsides like the roots of trees.

Ultimately, biomimicry will allow us to manage resources more efficiently while reducing power consumption and waste.

Unit 7

3 e AI and job interviews

Track 8

Reporter: In the war for talent, companies are using predictive algorithms and machine learning as tools to identify the best candidates. They're using AI to assess human qualities – analyzing everything from word choice to tone of voice to eye contact.

Reporter as candidate: So it says here in this section there are four questions for me to answer. Some of the questions will require you to record a response with video ...

Reporter: HireVue is one such company and I got to test the interview of the future. Here I am applying for a job as a customer service representative for a paper company. But I'm not talking to an HR rep or hiring manager – it's just me, pre-recorded interview questions and the camera.

Pre-recorded interview question: Tell us of some of the things that you're passionate about and why you'd be a great fit for this role.

Reporter as candidate: So it's such a great question what am I passionate about? I love that question ...

Reporter: According to HireVue, responses to video interviews are full of data. The content of the verbal response, intonation and nonverbal communication are just a few of the 25,000 data points the company analyzes.

Employee HireVue: What the computer is really doing is decoding visually what candidates are saying. We can understand things like creative thought ... You ask somebody a question, they tend to look up like that and think for a few minutes. From a psychological point of view, that's a really strong sign of creative thought.

Reporter: In analyzing these data points, HireVue says it does a better job eliminating hiring bias than face-to-face interviews.

Employee HireVue: There's something like a hundred and fifty documented cognitive biases that we all carry around with us every single day. What the technology can do is really look objectively at candidates – irrespective of their gender, age, ethnicity ... And so we're really looking at the true person as opposed to the superficial things that an interviewer might be looking at.

Reporter: It also widens the net for finding new talent.

Employee HireVue: We can open the funnel, we can open the aperture for talent very, very widely and interview in places that we never would have thought to go. Because good talent, great talent could be almost anywhere in the world.

Reporter: Companies like Goldman Sachs, Vodafone, Nike and Carnival Cruise Line all use HireVue. But what's the experience like for the interviewee? In my case, I really enjoyed it. The worst part is hearing yourself replayed after you answer a question.

Reporter as candidate: I can't listen to myself ...

Reporter: But how do others like the experience? A quick look at the hashtag #hirevue on Twitter shows varying reactions, with some seeming to love it and others reacting less positively. Despite mixed reviews, it doesn't look like AI is leaving the recruitment landscape anytime soon.

Unit 8

4 e Managing stress

Track 9

Imagine this: one little piece of paper – like an invitation to a job interview or a report card – can have a remarkable effect. Why? Because stress is stressful.

But if you understand a bit about this, you'll be able to deal with it better. First though, take a few deep breaths. In fact, do that anytime you feel stressed. It really helps.

So where does stress come from? And why does it exist?

Stress is a survival mechanism. When danger appears, it can get you out of trouble quickly. Your body cranks up the gears and throws all its resources into getting you moving. Your heart pumps furiously to increase blood pressure, glucose is sent straight to the muscles as a fuel injection, and you become totally focused on what psychologists call fight-or-flight. The thing is, this emergency state is only meant to just last long enough to get you out of danger.

But here in the 21st century, we stress about different things and for much, much longer. Imagine what you stress about on a normal day? Imagine waking up and not being able to find your wallet, and then going to breakfast and realising you didn't do all of your homework and then having a stressful exam later on in the day ... and you should also think about Mum's birthday and getting her a present.

So, your brain and your body stay on red alert, and you'll be less able to think clearly, learn or remember things.

Take a few more deep breaths. Because as you now know stress is a physical reaction and deep breathing helps counteract its effects. So what else can you do?

Okay, here are some top tips to reduce stress. First, get plenty of exercise. Get out all that locked-up energy. Now back to the problem. Get in control. Scope out the situation and how you're going to tackle it, come up with a plan. Also, don't stress alone. Talk to someone, socialise, have a laugh because you can't laugh and quake with fear at the same time. Get down with nature on a big or a small scale, and if your mind won't stop worrying, get something else to do instead. One of my favourites is popping bubble wrap – because there is something so soothing about pressing your nail into those tiny bubbles of air and hearing them pop, don't you agree?

Unit 9

1 c US immigration overview

Track 10

This is a state-by-state look at how immigration to America has changed over time.

In 1850 the vast majority of newcomers were from Ireland and Germany. In the 1860s, the labor shortages during the Civil War created strong demand for immigrant labor. The 1870s saw Mexico become the top country of origin in much of the southwest, while British immigrants preferred the rocky mountain territories.

The 1880 census shows that the Chinese were coming in large numbers. Many took dangerous jobs in the mines or on railroad building crews. For the next century, immigrants from Canada crossing the southern border would be the largest group settling in many of the northernmost American states. In 1882, the Chinese Exclusion Act blocked the arrival of large numbers of Asian immigrants for much of the next century. Unfortunately, the overall microdata for the 1890 census was destroyed in the 1921 fire at the Department of Commerce.

So, fast-forward to 1900, the turn of the century, when the territorial boundaries of the continental United States were settled. For the first time, Norwegians, Swedes and Italians were the largest groups coming to the states of South Dakota, Minnesota and Louisiana respectively. 1910 shows us how quickly things can change, with large numbers of Russians and Italians arriving. The only state where Ireland was the top country of origin was tiny Delaware.

With the American population exceeding 100 million in the 1920 census, there were equal numbers of German, Italian and Russian born immigrants. Many had fled Europe to escape the horrors of World War I.

By 1930, the Industrial Revolution was in full swing and the country was growing rapidly from within. So the percentage of foreign-born citizens fell. And, for the first time since 1850, Mexico

was the dominant country of origin for new arrivals to California. By 1940, the quotas and other congressional measures passed in the previous decade to restrict immigration sharply cut the foreign-born population to below 9%.

1950 saw the effects of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, as Chinese immigrants were finally welcomed back. Interestingly, Greeks were the largest arriving in South Carolina. When Alaska and Hawaii became States in 1959, the year before the 1960 census, Canadians simply crossed the border to emigrate to the last frontier. But Filipinos crossed an entire ocean to become the Aloha state's largest group.

By 1970 the percentage of foreign-born citizens reached an all-time low. Italy was the only nation that had sent more than a million people. In 1980, after Congress began granting more visas to people from the Western Hemisphere, the number of states where Mexico was the top country of origin doubled in a decade, becoming the dominant foreign-born population in the entire country. And in 1990, America began to look like the diverse country we live in today. Mexico was tops in eighteen states. Dominicans were the largest group coming to New York, and South Korea and Southeast Asian Nations were the leading countries of origin in seven states. In the year 2000 census the number of Mexican-born immigrants surpassed nine million. It's also notable that India was the top country of origin in three states. And the 2010 census reveals exactly why America is quickly becoming so diverse. Only five states, all of them bordering Canada, received the most immigrants from a majority white country.

Unit 9

3 d Early Native American history

Track 11

Native Americans, also known as American Indians, Indigenous Americans and other terms, are the indigenous people of the United States except Hawaii. The name 'Indian' was given by Christopher Columbus, who mistakenly believed he had landed in the Indies.

The history of Native Americans in the US began in ancient times. Tens of thousands of years ago, late in the Ice Age, humans journeyed across the Bering Land Bridge that joined Siberia to Alaska. They had gradually migrated across the land and southward into Mexico and beyond. Their descendants explored along the west coast of North America as early as 1000 BC. They had covered nearly the entire continent. Over thousands of years, as they migrated across the continents, American Indians have developed a variety of languages and civilizations. They came from different tribes such as from Europe, Asia or Africa.

When the Ice Age ended, the Native Americans developed their tribes by making wise use of natural resources available. They had first experience with growing different crops, such as corn and squash, raising animals like turkeys, llamas and guinea pigs for food, hunting deer, bison, sea mammals, and catching fish by using a variety of efficient methods. Another development during the period before the European invasions was mound building. From the present-day region of the Midwestern United States to southern Peru in South America, centers of government were marked by enormous mounds of earth. Most of these mounds were flat on top, with palaces and temples built on them; some were burial sites of honored leaders. American Indian cities were as big as the cities in Europe and Asia at the time. Their fine architecture is still greatly admired.

After 1492, European exploration and colonization of the Americas revolutionized how the old and new worlds perceived themselves. Many of the first major contacts were in Florida and the Gulf Coast by Spanish explorers. From the 16th through the 19th centuries, the population of American Indians sharply declined. Most mainstream scholars believe that, among the various contributing factors, epidemic disease was the overwhelming cost of the population decline of the Native Americans, because of their lack of immunity to new diseases brought from Europe – such as measles, chicken pox, cholera, yellow fever and many more devastating diseases. However, these diseases were rarely fatal among Europeans.

With the meeting of two worlds, animals, insects and plants were carried from one to the other, both deliberately and by chance. And what is called the Columbian Exchange – especially horses which escaped and began to breed and increase their numbers in the wild. Native Americans used horses to carry goods, to hunt game and to conduct wars in horse rates.

The Europeans started colonizing the Americas in order to cultivate new farmlands and create new jobs for the growing populations of Europe. To do so, they often fought Native American tribal nations for the land. During the American Revolution the newly proclaimed United States competed with the British for the allegiance of Native American nations east of the Mississippi River. Most Native Americans who joined the struggle sided with the British, based both on their trading relationships and hopes that the colonial defeat would result in the halt to further colonial expansion onto Native American land.

The United States was eager to expand and develop farming and settlements in new areas, and satisfy land hunger of settlers from New England and new immigrants. The national government initially sought to purchase Native American land by treaties. The states and settlers were frequently at odds with this policy.

United States policy toward Native Americans continued to evolve after the American Revolution. George Washington and Henry Knox believed that Native Americans were equals, but their society was inferior. Washington formulated a policy to encourage the civilizing process. This led to the Civilization Fund Act of 1819, as American expansion continued, Native Americans resisted the settlers' encroachment in several regions.

Unit 10

4 b Bannings, burnings, and other censorship activities

Track 12

Since at least 213 BCE, book burnings have been a reaction to the power of the written word. When roasting paper in a giant circle went out of style (at least in the intellectual sphere, we hope), government would take it upon themselves to ban books.

However, when we talk about book bannings today, at least in the Western World, we are usually discussing a specific choice made by individual schools, school districts, and libraries made in response to the moralistic outrage of some group. This, while still hotly contested, problematic and controversial, is still nothing in comparison to the ways books have been removed, censored, and outright destroyed in the past – along with their authors. So on that happy note, let's ... explore how the seemingly innocuous book has survived centuries of the ban hammer.

Historically speaking, there are usually three big reasons books are banned: religion, morality, and politics. Back in the BC era, entire ideas, religions, and political movements were wiped out. Not with a mass tweet, but with book burnings – and sometimes, if things were really intense, people burnings as well.

One of the earliest documented examples in North America is the burning of Aztec and Mayan manuscripts in the 1560s by Catholic priests and the Conquistadors. In Tudor England, during the schism between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church, depending on which monarch was arbitrarily in power and which religion they followed, your choice of religious book could get you murdered.

Historians point to Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as the first book in the United States to experience a ban on a national scale. Many Southern states outright prohibited the sale of the book, stating that it stoked the flames of abolition. And *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is often considered the book that helped start the Civil War. Which, you know, considering all the slave narratives, ... is a hot take, but whatever.

One place you could call the Billboard Hot 100 of banned books is the Index Librorum Prohibitorum, or List of Prohibited Books. This was a list of books and other publications deemed heretical by the Vatican. Victor Hugo – over it! Copernicus and Galileo – cancelled! Rousseau – you

gotta go! If you were Catholic, you could not read this content without permission from a priest or a higher power. This included romantic texts, astronomy, science, and anything else the Church saw as antithetical to their faith. Funny enough, Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* was not listed among the banned texts in question. Things that make you go "hmmm, maybe they liked it"?! It was banned from the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the United States kept out of many schools. In Tennessee, the book as well as the teaching of evolution were banned until as late as 1967.

Two legal cases that really helped move the conversation in a different direction were *The United States vs. a book called Ulysses* in 1933, and *R vs. Penguin Books* in 1960.

In *R vs. Penguin Books Ltd*, the book in question was D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, which is about a noblewoman who has an affair with her gardener. During the trial, Mervyn Griffith-Jones, the prosecutor, asked the jury to decide if the book was obscene and if it had enough "literary merit":

Quotation: "Would you approve of your young sons, young daughters – because girls can read as well as boys – reading this book? Is it a book you would have lying around your own house? Is it a book that you would even wish your wife or your servants to read?"

Aldous Huxley, in a handwritten deposition to the defense team:

Quotation: "*Lady Chatterley's Lover* is an essentially wholesome book ... That a beautiful and serious work of art should run the risk of being banned because its creator ... chose to make use of certain words – that it is conventional to regard it as shocking – this is surely the height of absurdity."

It seemed like the jury agreed with Huxley and they ultimately voted that the book was not obscene.

Book banning is not about morality, it is about control. Controlling the scope of the imagination and smothering it before it can truly grow. It is fine to expose children to complicated books, but doing so asks us to talk to children, not just lecture them. Should we be conscious of the kind of work we expose children to? Of course, but banning books because they include LGBTQ families or because they talk candidly about the realities of marginalized existence, ignores that there are children in those families and in those realities who need these books.

Textnachweis Listening tracks (MP3s)

Track 1: based on: The Independent – youtu.be/gJjAXcPcNaQ (adapted), Track 2: based on: The Atlantic – youtu.be/_qWHJ29-s4U (adapted), Track 3: based on: Teen Kids News – youtu.be/eOvHyX3omp8 (adapted), Track 4: based on: UNEP (UN environment programme) – www.unep.org/news-and-stories/video/meet-kaya-dorey-un-environment-young-champion-earth-north-america (adapted), Track 5: based on: Marketplace (David Brancaccio, Jonaki Mehta) – www.marketplace.org/2018/11/15/what-pair-jeans-can-teach-us-about-global-economy/ (adapted), Track 6: based on: Marketplace (Stacey Vanek Smith) – www.marketplace.org/2014/05/20/how-much-would-all-american-iphone-cost/ (adapted), Track 7: based on: ACCIONA – youtu.be/HppE6ezLDqI (adapted), Track 8: based on: CNBC – youtu.be/JmF-SUiMWV4 (shortened and adapted), Track 9: based on: BBC – youtu.be/hnpQrMqDoqE (adapted), Track 10: based on: TDC (Bryce Plank, Robin West) – youtu.be/behsmahH2bg (shortened and adapted), Track 11: based on: Past To Future – youtu.be/E2YidQrQuec (shortened and adapted), Track 12: based on: Storied, PBS Digital Studios (Princess Weeks) – youtu.be/xpKqRC-9Avc (adapted)

Alle übrigen Texte stammen vom Autor:innenteam.