

Příloha č. 1
ke zprávě o průběhu přijímacího řízení na vysokých školách pro akademický rok 2019 – 2020
na ČVUT v Praze Fakultě dopravní

Informace o písemných přijímacích zkouškách

(úplné zadání zkušebních otázek či příkladů, které jsou součástí přijímací zkoušky nebo její části,
a u otázek s výběrem odpovědi správné řešení)

Bakalářský studijní program

„B 3710 – Technika a technologie v dopravě a spojích“

Anglický jazyk

(pouze uchazeči o obor 3708R030 – PIL – Profesionální pilot)

The Guardian view on 16-year-old soldiers: armies are for adults

Editorial

That the British army has, over the past year, continued its energetic recruitment of 16- and 17-year-olds should surprise no one who is familiar with the ongoing argument about the UK's [child soldiers](#), of whom there are around 2,300. Calls by campaigners, MPs and others to raise the age of enlistment to 18, in line with the vast majority of other countries (the UK is the only country in Europe or Nato to accept 16-year-olds), have been ignored before. But news that the number of under-18s joining the armed forces stands at its highest level for almost a decade, accounting for [almost 30% of all new recruits in the year to March 2019](#), still has the power to shock – and rightly so.

This is not kneejerk anti-militarism or liberal squeamishness. When the age at which young people are allowed to leave school or training was raised to 18 in 2015, boosting the number of teenage army recruits was not what MPs or voters had in mind. One [recent survey](#) showed that almost three-quarters of people think army recruits should be at least 18, with 10% opting for 21. This view is supported by [evidence](#), as well as children's rights advocates, with figures showing that younger recruits are more vulnerable to mental health difficulties, and are more likely than older recruits to be killed or injured.

For some older teenagers, a career (or at least a first job) in the armed forces may be suitable, desirable, or simply the best opportunity available to them. It is not in anyone's best interests to make this decision before they are an adult – let alone when they are 15 years and seven months old, the current minimum age for applicants.

With its recent pledge to expand the cadet programme of army, navy and air force training in schools, the government seems less inclined than ever to listen to those who counsel against the promotion of military lifestyles. The nationalistic turn of politics, combined with shortages of service personnel, may well enhance such policies' appeal. But with military veterans already widely recognised internationally as a vulnerable demographic, for the UK armed forces to continue to recruit in the current pattern is shortsighted at best. At worst it is a cruel trick played on impressionable children by those who should, and probably do, know better.

Find these words:

- 1) the fact of being easily upset or shocked by things that you find unpleasant or that you do not approve of **squeamishness**
- 2) (of a response) automatic and unthinking **kneejerk**
- 3) (of a person) in need of special care, support, or protection because of age, disability, or risk of abuse or neglect **vulnerable**
- 4) help or encourage (something) to increase or improve **boosting**
- 5) the action of enrolling or being enrolled in the armed services **enlistment**
- 6) a person newly enlisted in the armed forces and not yet fully trained **recruit**
- 7) give advice to (someone) **counsel**
- 8) a regular and intelligible form or sequence discernible in the way in which something happens or is done **pattern**
- 9) a particular sector of a population **demographic**
- 10) lacking imagination or foresight **shortsighted**

True or false?

- 1) There are 2,300 child soldiers in the UK army. T
- 2) No politicians or people call for the Army to be open only to adults. F
- 3) The majority of the UK public think the Army should be only for adults. T
- 4) Last year, more than a quarter of new recruits were under 18. T

- 5) Statistics show that teenage recruits make better fighters. F
- 6) Recruits have to be at least 16 years old to join the army. F
- 7) The government supports cadet programmes in schools. T
- 8) The UK politics is becoming less nationalistic. F
- 9) Not enough people are applying to serve in the army. T
- 10) Children should not be recruited into the army. T

Příloha č. 1
ke zprávě o průběhu přijímacího řízení na vysokých školách pro akademický rok 2019 – 2020
na ČVUT v Praze Fakultě dopravní

Informace o písemných přijímacích zkouškách

(úplné zadání zkušebních otázek či příkladů, které jsou součástí přijímací zkoušky nebo její části,
a u otázek s výběrem odpovědi správné řešení)

Bakalářský studijní program

„B 3710 – Technika a technologie v dopravě a spojích“

Anglický jazyk

(pouze uchazeči o obor 3708R030 – PIL – Profesionální pilot)

The Guardian view on Huawei: if May wants to trust, we must keep verifying *Editorial*

In these gloomy times, the threat that technology will lead not to freedom but to surveillance, control or disruption from authoritarian adversaries has some resonance – and supporting evidence. The Trump administration has been pressing its allies to ban the Chinese telecoms equipment giant Huawei from participating in their 5G networks, arguing that it could be used by the Chinese state for spying or even attacks upon democratic nations. Huawei insists it has been traduced, is independent of the Chinese state and would never compromise a client.

The difficulty in such situations is trying to understand and address the precise challenges beneath the dispute. This should be what Theresa May has sought to do in [giving the nod to](#) Huawei's involvement in Britain's 5G network, while limiting its equipment to “non-core” parts. (Some suspect a tactical attempt to navigate a path between the wrath of Washington and Beijing.)

For both the US and China, intellectual and economic interests and abilities are increasingly linked to political and military ones as technology develops. It is increasingly hard to draw the kind of clear lines that help to define and answer policy challenges. The US has repeatedly complained about Chinese industrial espionage, including through hacking, and recently indicted Huawei for stealing trade secrets as well as sanctions-related fraud; the company denies the charges. The fury with which Beijing responded gives all the evidence needed of the importance it accords Huawei.

But it is not only the US and its western allies who are concerned about Beijing's reach. The entrenchment of party control over business and society at home, and its growing forcefulness overseas, as well as its record of commercial and other hacking, have made many countries nervous. After Australia banned Huawei from its new network, despite its [heavy reliance on trade with China](#), its spy chief [warned](#) that the distinction between core and non-core collapses with 5G: “A potential threat anywhere in the network will be a threat to the whole network.” Yet now the US has [rowed back](#) from its direst threats of non-cooperation with countries using Huawei gear, stating only that none of the Five Eyes intelligence sharing nations will use it in the “sensitive” parts of their networks.

A second problem is that this is by necessity a hypothetical argument, and when it is not, it will be too late either way. As Huawei points out, no one has produced any evidence that it has ever compromised a client. But as its critics note, it is easier to hide than to find back doors; and if the Chinese party state demanded it do so in future, the lack of a free media, civil liberties groups, political opposition or independent judiciary mean that we would never know.

That the UK is making its own decisions on security is right and proper. But Britain has been much too casual about its use of Huawei equipment in the past. Compromised equipment is not the only risk: whoever provides the gear, the danger of exploitation of vulnerabilities in the system, or human frailties, remains high. Huawei's inclusion rams home the case for the highest level of vigilance at every stage. Mrs May has decided to trust. Britain must keep verifying.

True or false?

- 1) The US government wants to use Huawei equipment to attack other democratic countries. F
- 2) Theresa May has allowed Huawei to participate in Britain's 5G network. T
- 3) The US claim Huawei stole trading secrets. T
- 4) The Chinese government protects Huawei. T
- 5) Australia uses Huawei because it has strong economic ties to China. F
- 6) In a 5G network there is no distinction between its core and non-core parts. T
- 7) Huawei claims no-one has ever proved it spied on a client. T
- 8) The Chinese Communist party can abuse Huawei because there is no political opposition, free press or independent judges in the country. T
- 9) The UK has been too strict with Huawei, now it is time to include the company. F
- 10) Britain should reject Huawei's role in its communication network. F

Find these words:

- 1) extreme anger WRATH/FURY
- 2) to hit or push something with force RAM
- 3) more careful attention, especially in order to notice possible danger VIGILANCE
- 4) to strongly criticize someone, especially in a way that harms their reputation TRADUCE
- 5) a movement up and down with the head NOD

- 6) the process by which ideas become fixed and cannot be changed ENTRENCHMENT
- 7) an enemy ADVERSARY
- 8) to accuse someone officially of a crime INDICT
- 9) not taking or not seeming to take much interest CASUAL
- 10) to lead a company, activity, etc. in a particular direction, or to deal effectively with a difficult situation NAVIGATE