

2025年6月真题·第三套

写作 30分钟

阅读 40分钟

翻译 30分钟

完整真题·排版优化版

一、写作

Part I · Writing

Directions: For this part, you are allowed 30 minutes to write an essay that begins with the sentence "With the increasing application of AI technology, there is a growing concern that it may negatively impact human creativity." You can make comments, cite examples or use your personal experiences to develop your essay. You should write at least 150 words but no more than 200 words.

You should copy the sentence given in quotes at the beginning of your essay.

二、听力说明

Part II · Listening Comprehension

 **提示：** 2025年6月六级只考两套听力，请参考第一套或第二套听力进行练习。

三、阅读理解

Part III · Reading Comprehension

Section A Banked Cloze

No beast on Earth is tougher than the tiny tardigrade. It can **26** being frozen at -272° Celsius, being exposed to the vacuum of outer space and even being **27** with 500 times the dose of X-rays that would kill a human. In other words, the creature can endure conditions that don't even exist on Earth. And researchers are looking to

the microscopic animals to learn how to prepare humans and crops to handle the **28** of space travel.

The tardigrade's indestructibility stems from its **29** to its environment — which may seem surprising, since it lives in **30** comfortable places, like the cool, wet patches of moss that dot a garden wall.

But it turns out that a tardigrade's damp, mossy home can dry out many times each year. Drying is pretty **31** for most living things. It does damage to cells in some of the same ways that freezing, vacuum and radiation do. Tardigrades, however, have **32** special strategies for dealing with these kinds of damage.

As a tardigrade dries out, its cells produce several strange proteins that are unlike anything found in other animals. In water, the proteins are shapeless. But as water disappears, the proteins self-assemble into long fibers that fill the cell's **33**. The fibers support the cell's membranes and proteins, preventing them from breaking or **34**.

Emulating tardigrades could one day help humans colonize outer space. Food crops could be engineered to produce tardigrade proteins, allowing these organisms to grow more efficiently on spacecraft where levels of radiation are elevated compared with on Earth.

So if humans ever succeed in reaching the stars, they may accomplish this **35**, in part, by standing on the shoulders of the tiny eight-legged endurance specialists in your backyard.

Word Bank: A) adaptations B) blasted C) catastrophic D) evolved E) feat F) interior
G) probing H) recurrence I) rigors J) seemingly K) survive L) tempt M) thrill N)
unanimously O) unfolding

Section B Long Reading Matching

Yes, Eating Meat Affects the Environment, but Cows Are Not Killing the Climate

(A-O paragraphs)

- 36.** The FAO concluded that farm animals were producing more greenhouse gases than all modes of transportation combined.
- 37.** Consumption of meat per person in developing countries is much less than that in countries like the US.
- 38.** The FAO was worthy of praise in that it admitted its mistake once it was pointed out.

- 39. Environmentalists try hard to make people consume less meat to combat climate change.
- 40. Recent research has shown that even if Americans quit eating meat altogether, the resulting reduction of greenhouse gases in the US would be slight.
- 41. More than half of the world's farmland is suitable only for animals like cows to graze on.
- 42. The allegation that farm animals produce the world's largest portion of greenhouse gases is responsible for meat's bad reputation.
- 43. Raising farm animals makes it easier to meet people's nutritional needs.
- 44. The author doesn't believe giving up meat and meat products will be a cure-all for the environmental problem.
- 45. Changes in America's farming technology and management in the past decades have increased efficiency and reduced greenhouse gas emissions in meat production.

原文段落 A – O

A) As the scale and impacts of climate change become increasingly alarming, meat is a popular target for action. Advocates for the protection of the natural environment from destruction or pollution urge the public to eat less meat. Some activists have even called for taxing meat to reduce consumption of it.

B) A key claim underlying these arguments holds that globally, meat production generates more greenhouse gases than the entire transportation sector. However, this claim is demonstrably wrong, as I will show. And its persistence has led to false assumptions about the linkage between meat and climate change.

C) My recent research focuses on ways in which animal agriculture affects air quality and climate change. In my view, there are many reasons for either choosing animal protein or opting for a vegetarian selection. However, abandoning meat and meat products is not the environmental panacea many would have us believe. And if taken to an extreme, it also could have harmful nutritional consequences.

D) A healthy portion of meat's negative reputation centers on the assertion that livestock is the largest source of greenhouse gases worldwide. For example, an analysis published in 2009 by the World Watch Institute based in Washington, D.C. asserted that 51 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions come from rearing and

processing livestock. According to the US Environmental Protection Agency, the largest sources of US greenhouse gas emissions in 2016 were electricity production (28 percent of total emissions), transportation (28 percent) and industry (22 percent). All of agriculture accounted for a total of 9 percent, but all of animal agriculture contributes less than half of this amount, representing 3.9 percent of the total greenhouse emission in the US. That is very different from claiming that livestock represents as much as or more than transportation.

E) Why is there such a misconception? In 2006 the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) published a study titled "Livestock's Long Shadow," which received widespread international attention. It stated that livestock produced a staggering 18 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. The agency drew a startling conclusion that livestock was doing more to harm the climate than all modes of transportation combined. This latter claim was wrong, and has since been corrected by Henning Stenfeld, the report's senior author.

F) The problem was that analysts from the FAO used a comprehensive life-cycle assessment to study the climate impact of livestock, but a different method when they analyzed transportation. For livestock, they considered every factor associated with producing meat. This included emissions from fertilizer production, converting land from forests to pastures, growing feed, and direct emissions from animals (manure as well as expelling of gas from the stomach) from birth to death.

G) However, when they looked at transportation's carbon footprint, they ignored impacts on the climate from manufacturing vehicle materials and parts, assembling vehicles and maintaining roads, bridges and airports. Instead, they only considered the exhaust smoke emitted by finished cars, trucks, trains and planes. As a result, the FAO's comparison of greenhouse gas emissions from livestock to those from transportation was greatly distorted.

H) I pointed out this flaw during a speech to fellow scientists in San Francisco on March 22, 2010, which led to a flood of media coverage. To its credit, the FAO immediately owned up to its error. Unfortunately, the agency's initial claim that livestock was responsible for the lion's share of world greenhouse gas emissions had already received wide coverage. To this day, we struggle to "unring" the bell. In its most recent assessment report, the FAO estimated that livestock produces 14.5 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions from human activities. There is no comparable full life-cycle assessment for transportation. However, as Stenfeld has

pointed out, direct emissions from transportation versus livestock can be compared and amount to 14 versus 5 percent, respectively.

I) Many people continue to think that avoiding meat as infrequently as once a week will make a significant difference to the climate. But according to one recent study, even if Americans eliminated all animal protein from their diets, they would reduce US greenhouse gas emissions by only 2.6 percent. According to our research at the University of California, Davis, if the practice of Meatless Monday were to be adopted by all Americans, we'd see a reduction of only 0.5 percent.

J) Moreover, technological, genetic and management changes that have taken place in US agriculture over the past 70 years have made livestock production more efficient and less greenhouse gas-intensive. According to the FAO's statistical database, total direct greenhouse gas emissions from US livestock have declined by 11.3 percent since 1961, while production of livestock meat has more than doubled.

K) Demand for meat is rising in developing and emerging economies, especially in the Middle East, North Africa and Southeast Asia. For example, raising livestock such as goats in Kenya is an important source of food and income for many small-scale farmers and herders. But meat consumption per person in these regions still lags that of developed countries. In 2015, average annual meat consumption per person in developed countries was 92 kilograms, compared to 24 kilograms in the Middle East and North Africa and 18 kilograms in Southeast Asia. Still, given projected population growth in the developing world, there will certainly be an opportunity for countries such as the United States to bring their sustainable livestock rearing practices to the table.

L) Removing animals from US agriculture would lower national greenhouse gas emissions to a small degree, but it would also make it harder to meet people's nutritional requirements. Many critics of animal agriculture are quick to point out that if farmers raised only plants, they could produce more pounds of food and more calories per person. But humans also need many essential micro- and macro-nutrients for good health. It's hard to make a compelling argument that the United States has a calorie deficit, given its high national rates of adult and child obesity. Moreover, not all plant parts are edible or desirable. Raising livestock is a way to add nutritional and economic value to plant agriculture.

M) As one example, the energy in plants that livestock consume is most often contained in cellulose, which is indigestible for humans and many other mammals. But cows, sheep and other ruminant animals can break cellulose down and release the solar energy contained in this vast resource. According to the FAO, as much as 70 percent of all agricultural land globally is range land that can only be utilized as grazing land for ruminant livestock.

N) The world population is currently projected to reach 9.8 billion by 2050. Feeding this many people will raise immense challenges. Meat is more calorie-dense per serving than vegetarian options, and ruminant animals largely thrive on feed that is not suitable for humans. Raising livestock also offers much-needed income for small-scale farmers in developing nations. Worldwide, livestock provides a livelihood for 1 billion people.

O) Climate change demands urgent attention, and the livestock industry has a large overall environmental footprint that affects air, water and land. These, combined with a rapidly rising world population, give us plenty of compelling reasons to continue to work for greater efficiencies in animal agriculture. I believe the place to start is with science-based facts.

Section C Passages

Passage One

Why are we so worried about our careers? Partly it's to do with money, but there's a psychological aspect to our fears as well.

We worry because we suspect — not wrongly — that the world is full of a frightening sort of person ready to judge us ruthlessly and swiftly: a person we can call a snob.

A snob is anyone who takes a relatively small part of us and uses it to come to a rigid conclusion about how much of their attention we deserve. In the past, that might be your ancestry and royal connections. Nowadays, the snob cares about one thing only: what you do for a living.

This explains why the first question we will be asked in any new social context is "What do you do?" and according to how we answer, snobs will either welcome us with broad smiles, or leave us in the cold.

And that is why we are fired up by such a desperate urge to achieve and impress.

Sometimes our behaviour is mistaken for greed and vanity, but it is more than this. A lot of our interest in fancy cars, jobs and houses has nothing to do with materialism. It has to do with a hunger for the respect and esteem that is only available in our societies through the acquisition of material goods. It isn't the goods themselves we seek, it is the love we stand to gain through our possession of them. The next time we see someone driving a Ferrari, we shouldn't condemn them for their greed, we should pity them for the intensity of their need for love from the world.

At the root of snobbery is a lack of imagination and confidence about how to decide who in the world is valuable. The snobs are brutally misguided and slavish in their beliefs about how the superior individuals can be identified. For snobs, it is the already acclaimed and already successful who are the only ones worthy of respect. There is no room in their timid regimented minds to imagine that someone might be clever, kind or good — and yet somehow have been overlooked entirely by society, their qualities lying hidden beneath an unfamiliar veil and having as yet discovered no obvious outlet.

The true answer to snobbery is not to say that there is no such thing as a better or worse person, but to insist that better or worse exist in constantly unexpected places and carry none of the outward signs of distinction. And because we are such poor judges of the worth of others, our ultimate duty remains to be kind, good, curious and imaginative about pretty much everyone who ever crosses our path.

46. What gives rise to our worry about careers apart from money?

- A)** Fear of being judged in a snobbish manner.
- B)** The prospect of facing fault-finding managers.
- C)** The ruthless way employees are often treated.
- D)** Fright at the difficulty in hunting for a job.

47. What do we learn from the passage about today's snobs?

- A)** They try hard to dig into a person's past.
- B)** They draw a rigid conclusion about people.
- C)** They judge a person by their occupation.
- D)** They tend to place people in a social context.

48. What does the author say about people's interest in material goods?

- A)** It is the cause for condemnation of their greed.

- B)** It has a lot to do with the comforts they provide.
- C)** It arouses pity rather than respect from the wealthy.
- D)** It arises from their craving for social recognition.

49. What kind of people do snobs deem worth respect and esteem?

- A)** Those with fame and fortune.
- B)** Those with regimented minds.
- C)** Those with intelligence and imagination.
- D)** Those with qualities lying hidden in disguise.

50. What does the author imply we should do to avoid being snobbish?

- A)** Be aware there has never been such a thing as a better or worse person.
- B)** Be kind to and curious about those who we happen to meet in our lives.
- C)** Realize that better or worse keeps changing in unexpected ways.
- D)** Judge people on the basis of their distinctive character traits.

Passage Two

Women have historically been paid less. But in the US in the 1980s, they began to catch up — fast. During that decade, the gender pay gap closed by about one percentage point a year. Had that trend continued, the gender wage gap would have been closed by 2017.

But the trend didn't continue, and the gap remains yawning.

According to a new study from academics at Harvard, the stagnation can be put down, perhaps counterintuitively, to the introduction of state and federal family leave policies.

The academics argue that during the 1990s, as governments began to introduce leave policies, it was mainly women who took advantage of them. Though the leave policies might have helped those women to stay in the workplace — instead of dropping out to have families — those who returned saw their wages had increased at lower rates than the men.

After family leave was introduced in the US, in fact, the rate of gender wage convergence fell to just 0.03 percentage points per year, and has remained there ever since.

Those monitoring the process towards salary equity at work have long watched as progress slowed in many countries around the world. In fact, that progress began to

reverse during the pandemic.

The gender pay gap is one of the most outstanding examples of that lack of parity, and still exists just about everywhere. The motherhood penalty has become a shorthand for describing why: In many places, especially rich countries, women earn the same as men until they reach their childbearing years. Women who have children begin to see their salaries slip behind their male counterparts.

Part of this is because women take on more of the unpaid labor at home, which can eat into time available for work and energy for career advancement. But it's also because mothers are passed over for raises and promotion, and because time out of the workplace sets women back, even if that time is taken voluntarily, and supported by company or government policy.

What would have happened if leave policies hadn't been introduced? The study doesn't go into that question, other than to say that if the 1980s trend continued, we would have been at parity by now.

It's possible, however, that the journey towards wage parity would have stalled either way. If women's gains in the 1980s were made through the erasure of things like bias, once those less uncontrollable problems had been addressed, there would still have been an issue with women — who are the ones to bear children and take care of them in the early weeks because of biological factors like the ability to breastfeed, forcing them to take breaks, whether or not those breaks were mandated.

51. What do we learn about the gender pay gap in the US during the 1980s?

- A)** It was being slowly closed.
- B)** It was shrinking rapidly.
- C)** It started to yawn.
- D)** It remained substantial.

52. What happened with the introduction of state and federal family leave policies?

- A)** The process towards salary equity at work began to reverse.
- B)** The rate of gender wage convergence started to fall noticeably.
- C)** The trend of women returning to work after childbirth started.
- D)** The narrowing of the gender pay gap attracted more attention.

53. What partly accounts for the slip in women's salaries?

- A)** The insufficient motivation women generally have for career advancement.
- B)** The opportunities numerous women give up for pay raise and promotion.

- C) The huge amounts of time and energy women spend taking care of the family.
- D) The lack of policy support from government and business corporations.

54. What does the new study say about wage parity?

- A) It would have stalled if those controllable problems had not been addressed.
- B) It would have halted if company and government had not worked together.
- C) It would have been achieved with the complete erasure of gender biases.
- D) It would have been attained with the continuation of the 1980s trend.

55. What prevents women from achieving parity with men in the final analysis?

- A) Ignoring biases against women in the workplace.
- B) Giving birth to children and taking care of them.
- C) Failing to mandate breaks for childbirth and care.
- D) Lacking resources to address biological problems.

四、翻译

Part IV · Translation

【中文原文】

粤港澳大湾区（Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area）具有得天独厚的地理位置，拥有完善的交通基础设施和丰富的产业资源。大湾区是中国开放程度最高、经济活力最强的区域之一，在国家经济发展中具有重要的战略地位。大湾区不仅将建成充满活力的世界级城市群和具有全球影响力的国际科技创新中心，还将打造成适合工作、购物、旅游的优质生活圈。随着改革开放的不断深入，大湾区的建设将进一步推动区域经济发展。到2035年，大湾区将实现成为国际一流湾区的目标。