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# Typical material provided – and how the course works

**We use a Moodle platform, on which you find your work and submit the tasks for marking. We currently give Zoom classes for all learners who wish to attend. These classes are absolutely optional, but certainly very helpful if you are new to CACD. Occasionally, a student may book an online meeting to discuss an issue with his/her tutor. We do almost no formal ‘teaching’ of grammar points. The Zoom classes are used to deal with TPS strategies and doubts, to work on sections of the translations, discuss strategies for phase 2, and sometimes to react to common mistakes.**

**Each month’s work will *usually* contain:**

a) printed texts for vocabulary and stylistic study, ONE per week, with

- *comprehension [TPS] exercises* – your teacher does not mark these questions, but you receive an annotated key with explanations, and you can raise queries by email or on Moodle; if you attend Zoom class you raise your doubts there;

- some additional *language practice exercises* – these may be marked by your teacher, or you can raise questions when you have seen the key;

- *translation from English to Portuguese* of one or two paragraphs of the text.

b) TWO *composition exercises* and TWO *summary-writing exercises*.

c) Around FOUR short texts for *translation from Portuguese to English*.

d) A file of *extra reading* on the topic addressed in the TPS (e.g. populism, the refugee crisis, global warming).

Texts used for TPS are chosen on a weekly basis for topic interest, normally from the areas of international relations/ current affairs. All students have access to our Moodle platform, and from there they download the week’s work and upload their tasks for the teacher to mark. Each student receives their marked work back with comments and additional exercises as is appropriate for the individual.

**An example of a week’s work appears on pages 2-5 of this file**. This sample includes TPS questions, but when the TPS test is over, our course focuses more on written tasks for phase 2 and on some particular language issues. It is difficult to keep up with the course unless you can devote about 4-8 hours a week to English, but the timing each week (ie the day(s) on which you study, and the length of each study period) is up to you.

Examples of **marked work** (composition, translation and summary) appear on **pages 6-14** of this file.

EXAMPLES OF WORK AND MARKING FOLLOW BELOW

**As well as providing exercises, we work on skills, such as ‘Using texts to develop your English: Things you can do with any English text’ – shown in the box below**

|  |
| --- |
| * **Text type and intended audience**: Classify the text- what kind of text is it? What kind of readers are the target audience? What does the title tell you? What does the text show/ tell you about the writer? * **Content and structure**: Read the text and make notes on the content. What do you know about the topic? Is the topic of interest for CACD preparation for other subjects, e.g. history, geography, politics, etc.? * Write a list of the main points in the text. Ask a colleague to do the same and compare/discuss your lists. * Pick out controversial ideas in the text and argue against them, as if you were writing a response to the article. * **Vocabulary:** List all the new vocabulary- with an explanation in English, an example, a translation and the topic area. * **Adapt language for your own use**: Practise adapting interesting phrases to different contexts. This way of adapting sentences is probably more effective than just noting isolated words. e.g*.* ***It hardly came as a shock that*** *Argentina had to restructure its sovereign debt after the crisis of 2001-2****. More surprising was*** *the speed of the country’s recovery until the latest crisis arose.* * Then try similar adaptation with the phrases in bold type in the rest of the text. * **Language study**: Highlight all the prepositions. Do they depend on verbs, nouns, etc.? Are they in fixed phrases? * Choose a section of the text. Analyse all the verb tenses and forms used [here, e.g. Part B]. * Use and omission of articles: highlight all the nouns used *with the* and those used *without the*. * Underline all the cohesive links in the text. * **Expansion:** add more ideas to this list. |

**From here to the end of page 5 you can see a typical week’s work from mid 2020**

**Read the texts carefully and answer the TPS questions without a dictionary [you can use one when you have finished, but keep your original score.**

* **Do the language study exercise on page 4 [not shown here – this week, it was about false cognates].**
* **Write the composition and do the translations.**

**Text 1 [for questions 1-3]**

LATE ONE night this week, Chaguan brewed strong green tea and rewatched the highest-grossing film

in Chinese history, “Wolf Warrior 2”. This action flick is both preposterous and oddly compelling, offering clues about the sort of China that modern-day patriots yearn to see on screen. That China is formidable. At one point the film’s hero, Leng Feng, a retired Chinese commando, uses a home-made crossbow to take on African mercenaries armed with tanks. Then he kills their American boss, a murderous racist who—moments before Leng punches him to death—sneers: “People like you will always be inferior to people like me.” The China of the film is self-confident. A crowd-pleasing scene shows warships of the People’s Liberation Army steaming towards a war-torn, pandemic-stricken corner of Africa to evacuate Chinese citizens, past American warships fleeing in the opposite direction.

The China of the movie is respected. A climactic scene sees the hero halt a battle by sticking a Chinese flag on his arm and holding it aloft. He then leads a convoy of Chinese and African refugees to safety between two rival armies, as awestruck commanders bellow: “Hold your fire! It’s the Chinese!”

Three years after its release, this noisy fantasy is back in the news. In an era of crises, from a global pandemic to an ever sharper contest between China and America, Chinese envoys and state media have gone on the attack. Ambassadors and official mouthpieces have threatened and insulted governments and elected politicians on every continent. Some have promoted conspiracy theories that America’s army spread covid-19. In China, this trend is being dubbed “Wolf Warrior diplomacy” by fans and critics alike. Actually, that is an insult to wolf warriors.

It is not hard to find Chinese who cheer the foreign ministry’s pugnacious new style. Against that, some members of China’s foreign-policy establishment express alarm over this assertiveness, calling it a mistake born of inexperience. That is letting foreign ministry hotheads off too easily. A well-travelled bunch, China’s quarrel-picking diplomats know how they sound. They are using aggression as a signal that China has grown strong, and is tired of waiting for the world to show respect and deference. To diplomatic and national-security hawks in Beijing, if some countries have to feel pain in order to understand that China’s rise is inevitable and that resistance is futile (and that no help is coming from an America consumed with its own problems), then that pain is itself a useful education. Nor is this approach about to stop. Reporters at the annual meeting of China’s legislature, the National People’s Congress, asked the foreign minister, Wang Yi, about “Wolf Warrior diplomacy”. He did not endorse the term but embraced its spirit. China’s diplomats “never pick a fight or bully others, but we have principles and guts”, he said. “We will push back against any deliberate insult to resolutely defend our national honour and dignity.”

[**China’s “Wolf Warrior” diplomacy gamble T**he Economist, Chaguan column May 28th, 2020]

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1**  Considering the ideas and the vocabulary in the text, mark the following items as right (C ) or wrong (E )  1. ( ) “Wolf Warrior 2” is an action film that depicts China as stronger and more successful than other nations.  2. ( ) In a hand-to-hand fight with a powerful American, the film’s hero, Leng Feng, declares himself and the Chinese nation as  innately superior to the Americans.  3. ( ) Chinese heroism in the film includes using sophisticated weapons to take on poorly equipped adversaries.  4. ( ) In the film, other nations hold China in high esteem, as is shown when a battle is halted to allow a Chinese column to pass.. |
| **Question 2**  Considering the ideas and the vocabulary in the text, mark the following items as right (C ) or wrong (E )  1. ( ) The film “Wolf Warrior 2” was designed to have a conspicuous influence on China’s foreign policy.  2. ( ) “Wolf Warrior diplomacy” is being used to describe a newly aggressive nationalism in Chinese foreign policy.  3. ( ) Some Chinese foreign ministry officials consider the more bellicose style of rhetoric to be callow.  4 .( ) The Chinese foreign minister recently expressed clear disapproval of “Wolf Warrior diplomacy”. |
| **Question 3**  Considering the ideas and the vocabulary in the text, mark the following items as right (C ) or wrong (E )  1. ( ) In line 6 “sneers” could be replaced by “asserts contemptuously”.  2. ( ) In line 12, “bellow” could be replaced by “chortle”.  3. ( ) In lines 17-18, “an insult to wolf warriors” refers to the combative and specious assertions of some Chinese diplomats in  contrast with the honorable heroism of the warriors in the film.  4. ( ) In line 23, “hawks” is the antonym of “doves”. | |

**Text 2 [for questions 4-6]**

**Some 150 writers, academics and activists - including authors JK Rowling, Salman Rushdie and Margaret Atwood - have signed an open letter denouncing the "restriction of debate".**

**A Letter on Justice and Open Debate July 7, 2020**

*The letter below will be appearing in the Letters section of Harpers magazine’s October issue. We welcome responses at letters@harpers.org*

Our cultural institutions are facing a moment of trial. Powerful protests for racial and social justice are leading to overdue demands for police reform, along with wider calls for greater equality and inclusion across our society, not least in higher education, journalism, philanthropy, and the arts. But this needed reckoning has also intensified a new set of moral attitudes and political commitments that tend to weaken our norms of open debate and toleration of differences in favor of ideological conformity. As we applaud the first development, we also raise our voices against the second. The forces of illiberalism are gaining strength throughout the world and have a powerful ally in Donald Trump, who represents a real threat to democracy. But resistance must not be allowed to harden into its own brand of dogma or coercion—which right-wing demagogues are already exploiting. The democratic inclusion we want can be achieved only if we speak out against the intolerant climate that has set in on all sides.

The free exchange of information and ideas, the lifeblood of a liberal society, is daily becoming more constricted. While we have come to expect this on the radical right, censoriousness is also spreading more widely in our culture: an intolerance of opposing views, a vogue for public shaming and ostracism, and the tendency to dissolve complex policy issues in a blinding moral certainty. We uphold the value of robust and even caustic counter-speech from all quarters. But it is now all too common to hear calls for swift and severe retribution in response to perceived transgressions of speech and thought. More troubling still, institutional leaders, in a spirit of panicked damage control, are delivering hasty and disproportionate punishments instead of considered reforms. Editors are fired for running controversial pieces; books are withdrawn for alleged inauthenticity; journalists are barred from writing on certain topics; professors are investigated for quoting works of literature in class; a researcher is fired for circulating a peer-reviewed academic study; and the heads of organizations are ousted for what are sometimes just clumsy mistakes. Whatever the arguments around each particular incident, the result has been to steadily narrow the boundaries of what can be said without the threat of reprisal. We are already paying the price in greater risk aversion among writers, artists, and journalists who fear for their livelihoods if they depart from the consensus, or even lack sufficient zeal in agreement.

This stifling atmosphere will ultimately harm the most vital causes of our time. The restriction of debate, whether by a repressive government or an intolerant society, invariably hurts those who lack power and makes everyone less capable of democratic participation. The way to defeat bad ideas is by exposure, argument, and persuasion, not by trying to silence or wish them away. We refuse any false choice between justice and freedom, which cannot exist without each other. As writers we need a culture that leaves us room for experimentation, risk taking, and even mistakes. We need to preserve the possibility of good-faith disagreement without dire professional consequences. If we won’t defend the very thing on which our work depends, we shouldn’t expect the public or the state to defend it for us.

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4**  In accordance with the text, decide if the following are right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) The ultimate goal of this letter is to make a plea for the freedom of speech to be upheld.  2. ( ) The writers believe that attempts to foster more social inclusion inevitably require us to submit to ideological uniformity.  3. ( ) It is claimed that radically intolerant ideas should be met with a swift response in the same coin.  4. ( ) It can be inferred that climate change denial is particularly characteristic of undemocratic illiberalism. |
| **Question 5**  In accordance with the text, decide if the following are right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) The letter claims that freedom of speech needs to be kept within known limits by cultural institutions.  2. ( ) Concern for the reputation of the establishment they direct sometimes causes leaders to over-react by castigating  outspoken staff-members who raise dissident voices.  3. ( ) Institutional policy may cow liberal professionals into being more cautious than they would otherwise be in order not to  lose their jobs.  4. ( ) A free and frank exchange of information and ideas inevitably involves a dichotomy between justice and freedom. |
| **Question 6**  In accordance with the text, decide if the following are right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) The fragment “the first development” (line 36) refers to the use of protest movements to secure greater social justice.  2. ( ) The word “censoriousness” (line 43) could be replaced by “censorship”.  3. ( ) The term “public shaming” (line 44) refers to using indecent actions to make a protest more striking.  4. ( ) “robust and even caustic counter-speech” (lines 45-46) could be replaced by “strong and perhaps abrasive responses”. |

**Text 3 [for questions 7-9]**

I WANTED to join the recent [Black Lives Matter protests in London](https://blacklivesmatter.com/), but I also didn’t want to be in close proximity to thousands of other people for hours on end. My fear of catching the coronavirus won out and so I demoted myself to social justice warrior (armchair division) and watched on TV.

The protests are principally a fight for social justice. But I also view them through another lens. Black Lives Matter may not look like an environmental movement, but I think deep down it is one, too. If – when – it achieves its objectives, the world will not only be [more socially just](https://www.newscientist.com/article/2245743-scientists-around-the-world-are-striking-against-racism-in-academia/), but more sustainable, as well.

The causes of social and environmental justice first crossed paths in the US in the 1970s when activists from both camps realised that they were fighting many of the same battles. Pollution and other forms of environmental degradation disproportionately affected certain sections of society: poorer people, working class people, people of colour, Native Americans and immigrants. Their neighbourhoods also lacked green space and [access to nature](https://www.newscientist.com/article-topic/environment/).

It isn’t hard to fathom why this link exists. It is another manifestation of the unequal distribution of wealth and power in society. Rich people can afford to buy their way out of degraded neighbourhoods, and have the political clout to resist the incursion of polluting industries.

Much has been made of the link between today’s racial injustices and historical slavery. According to Elizabeth Yeampierre, co-chair of the [Climate Justice Alliance in Washington DC](https://climatejusticealliance.org/), environmental injustices also began with slavery. The rapacious exploitation of humans enabled the rapacious exploitation of the environment, and just as the legacy of slavery endures in racism, so it endures in the economic model that regards the environment as a resource to be plundered, not preserved.

Since the 1970s, environmental injustices have only widened. The effects of climate change are now kicking in, and guess what: they disproportionately affect people who are unable to escape from extreme weather events. Consider how Hurricane Katrina laid waste to the poorer districts of New Orleans in 2005, and how Hurricane Maria did the same in Puerto Rico in 2017.

This disparity hasn’t gone unnoticed in the communities it affects. Concern about the environment is often dismissed as a self-indulgent pursuit for wealthier (i.e. white) people. But it isn’t: polling in the US regularly finds that people who are Hispanic, African American or from other minority ethnic groups are more concerned than people who are white about [environmental issues](https://www.newscientist.com/sign-up/fix-the-planet/).

BLM rests on the simple idea that if the people who are affected by racial injustice come together and say “no more”, the pressure to change will be irresistible. Environmental justice works in a similar way. If the people most affected by environmental degradation fight back, it becomes harder for destructive industries to make and conceal their messes in places where the wealthy and powerful elites don’t go.

[From: New Scientist 24 June 2020 Black Lives Matter could also help fight environmental injustices by [Graham Lawton](https://www.newscientist.com/author/graham-lawton/)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 7**  Considering the ideas and the vocabulary in the text, mark the following items as right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) The writer would like to have gone to the protest in person in normal circumstances.  2. ( ) He feels social justice, represented by Black Lives Matter, is at bottom a secondary element in environmental justice.  3. ( ) The writer blames the have-nots of society for being responsible for more pollution than the haves.  4. ( ) The more prosperous members of society are accused of damaging the environment and then moving to better areas |
| **Question 8**  Considering the ideas and the vocabulary in the text, mark the following items as right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) It has been asserted that slavery involved the predatory use of natural resources as well as harsh treatment of human  beings.  2. ( ) Climate change affects rich and poor alike by degrading the environment.  3. ( ) Environmentalism is sometimes seen as the preserve of well-heeled white campaigners.  4. ( ) The writer appears to believe that nimby protests are often effective and could be more widely used. |
| **Question 9**  In accordance with the language and ideas of the text, decide if the following are right (C) or wrong (E).  1. ( ) In line 67, the writer uses irony and a parody of military classifications to describe his decision to stay at home.  2. ( ) In line 76, the word “fathom” could be replaced by “plumb the depths of”.  3. ( ) In line 87, the fragment “did the same in” could be replaced by “ravaged”.  4. ( ) In line 88, “This disparity” refers to the difference between the effects of the hurricanes in New Orleans and Puerto Rico. |

**Composition from the same week as the TPS above**

In the context of the quotations below, consider whether there should be limits to freedom of expression in Brazil.

*“When widely followed public figures feel free to say anything, without any fact-checking, it becomes impossible for a democracy to think intelligently about big issues.” ―* Thomas L. Friedman

*“If the freedom of speech is taken away then dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep to the slaughter.” ―* George Washington

**Translation into Portuguese**

|  |
| --- |
| Dust-busters Central Asian governments admit they have a problem with covid-19 Or, in Turkmenistan’s case, with dust  WHEN TURKMENISTAN’S president did a spot of fishing recently, he brought a snazzy accessory with him: a camouflage face mask. The isolationist Central Asian state is one of the last countries still claiming to be coronavirus-free, along with North Korea and some remote Pacific islands. But something has changed in Turkmenistan, which is suddenly adopting a plethora of precautions. Out are the patriotic festivals, football matches and horse races that stood out as the rest of the world shut down earlier this year. Suddenly, the government wants citizens to wear face masks—to protect against dust, rather than germs, it insists. (No, it has not been an especially dusty summer.) The authorities even admitted a team from the World Health Organisation, which tactfully advised them to behave “as if covid-19 were already circulating”, neatly sidestepping the government’s dismissal of reports that a covid-like ailment was indeed circulating in Turkmenistan as “fake news”.  Elsewhere in Central Asia, the disease is well into a second wave and restrictions are being reimposed. In Kazakhstan officially diagnosed cases have rocketed by around 1,400% since the easing of a stringent lockdown in May. |

**Translation into English: Extract from´: Machado de Assis: Quincas Borba Capitulo VI**

Não há morte. O encontro de duas expansões, ou a expansão de duas formas, pode determinar a supressão de uma delas; mas, rigorosamente, não há morte, há vida, porque a supressão de uma é a condição da sobrevivência da outra, e a destruição não atinge o princípio universal e comum. Daí o caráter conservador e benéfico da guerra.

Supõe tu um campo de batatas e duas tribos famintas. As batatas apenas chegam para alimentar uma das tribos, que assim adquire forças para transpor a montanha e ir à outra vertente, onde há batatas em abundância; mas, se as duas tribos dividirem em paz as batatas do campo, não chegam a nutrir-se suficientemente e morrem de inanição. A paz nesse caso, é a destruição; a guerra é a conservação. Uma das tribos extermina a outra e recolhe os despojos.

Daí a alegria da vitória, os hinos, aclamações, recompensas públicas e todos os demais efeitos das ações bélicas. Se a guerra não fosse isso, tais demonstrações não chegariam a dar-se, pelo motivo real de que o homem só comemora e ama o que lhe é aprazível ou vantajoso, e pelo motivo racional de que nenhuma pessoa canoniza uma ação que virtualmente a destrói. Ao vencido, ódio ou compaixão; ao vencedor, as batatas.

EXAMPLES OF MARKED WORK

Below – a good composition, showing how we mark the task. At the end of an exercise the teacher will make a general comment and may suggest a specific exercise or attach some information or some rules to help you make fewer mistakes.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Composition 3 – November 2020** | | | | | |
| **Composition Discuss the future of multilateralism in light of the quotations below.**   1. *“In a world whose core political dynamic is competitive rivalry, consensus is a tool for obstruction. Thus, any pathway forward must start with a coalition of actors who share core values and core concerns.”* From: COMPETING FOR ORDER Confronting the Long Crisis of Multilateralism By Bruce Jones and Susana Malcorra 2. *“Rising nationalism raises a significant risk that the UN system’s structure and institutions, essential but in need of repair and rejuvenation, may instead be left to decline, decay, and even collapse. Such an outcome would be tragic, not just for those institutions but for all of humanity.”* Madeleine Albright and Ibrahim Gambari writing for Project Syndicate | Corrections  Turquoise highlight = a mistake, which will be penalized  Red font = suggestion of a better way of expressing yourself | | |
| Multilateralism and globalisation can be seen as two sides of the same coin; thus, if one of them does not work well, nor does the other. Globalisation managed to increase global GDP, but not everyone benefitted from the rising tide; in fact, inequalities grew within and across countries. As a result, multilateralism has also been put to test. Rising nationalism questions the very essence of multilateral frameworks, given that institutions have failed to prevent crises and seem to work only to the benefit of some States. However, this international multilateral order does not need to be tossed in the bin only to be replaced by an entirely new one, it requires tinkering so as to become more legitimate and suitable for the 21st century.  Academic Bruce Jones and former Argentine Foreign Minister Susana Malcorra argue that any future framework of multilateralism begins with a coalition of actors who share values and concerns. It can be argued that the current Multi-party interim agreement (MPIA), which tries to bypass the WTO’s appellate body current paralysis, follows this exact pattern. However, in undermining // WTO’s essential roles – such as that of solving trade disputes – States also sabotage the whole of multilateralism, as actors no longer see the point of its existence. Although conjectural and short-term adaptations are sometimes needed, multilateral institutions have been at risk for decades now and require more comprehensive repair.  Scholars Madeleine Albright and Ibrahim Gambari believe that the collapse of international institutions would be tragic for all humanity and argue in favour of due repair. In 2004, UN’s Secretary General Kofi Annan kicked off a rejuvenation process that resulted in the extinction (?) of the Human Rights Commission and its replacement by the Human Rights Council. States deemed that the Commission election process was unfair // thus undermining the body’s legitimacy and efficacy. Even if the establishment of a new body and election process has not been a panacea, it was a necessary reform in order to meet States’ demands and also to keep any such body relevant under the UN framework.  The international order is an evolving organism and requires constant reform. If multilateralism seems to fail to include everyone, then countries that have a voice should make sure that others are heard; a reform of the UN Security Council or its replacement is a necessary reform as the body has failed to address peace issues because of US and Russia or China feuds. Additionally, globalisation is not going anywhere, nor the globalised problems it has created–such as problematic financial integration and value chains, climate change, and cyber security- which can only be addressed multilaterally.  rather than accepting the collapse of the multilateral system, we must start encouraging the new mechanisms of solidarity that this crisis demands. This necessarily includes more inclusive and multi-level leadership that comprises not only the national but also the subnational level, ~~the~~ civil society, think tanks and NGOs. In sum, multilateralism is a means to an end, which is social and economic prosperity, not the end itself; it must thus be adapted along the way, as society’s demands change. | Tossed aside (more formal)  Adjustment (more formal and serious)  Body’s  The WTO’s  The UN’s – or just UN without ‘the’ and apostrophe  Closure  Better: the Commission’s  Comma before ‘thus’  US is a noun modifier, but Russia and China have real adjectives.  Or change to ‘because of feuds between the US and R or C’ | | |
| Well argued, knowledgeable and elegantly expressed. |  | | |
|  | | | **Max**  **10** |  | |
| **A1 Presents relevant ideas** | | | **3** | **3** | |
| **A2 Shows the kind of clear thinking and coherent argument needed from a diplomat** | | | **3** | **3** | |
| **A3 Appropriate style and high-quality language** | | | **3** | **2.75** | |
| **A 4 Legible handwriting** | | | **1** | **1** | |
| **Max** | | | **10** | **9.75** | |
|  | | |  |  | |
| **B1 Answers the question/ addresses the quotations** | | | **4** | **4** | |
| 1. **B2 A clear and relevant introduction and conclusion** | | | **3** | **2.75** | |
| 1. **B3Cohesion: appropriate cohesive links between points** | | | **3** | **2.75** | |
| **Max** | | | **10** | **9.5** | |
|  | | |  |  | |
| 1. **Good illustrations of main points** | | | **3** | **3** | |
| 1. **Capacity to show your own reflection and analysis, linking this to the illustrations** | | | **2** | **2** | |
|  | | | **Max 5** |  | |
| **Total marks for 1ª, 1b, 1c** | | | **Max 25** | **24.25** | |
| **7 mistakes** | | | **Max 25** | **20.31** | |
| **Correct length [45-50 lines/ 400-500 words] [-1 per line + or line -]** | | |  |  | |
| **Total score** | | |  | **44.56** | |
| **Comment:** | | | | | |

**Two translations that have been marked:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Task 8- *Idlib* | Corrections |
| Turkey understood, in the last 24 hours, that if Vladimir Putin has to choose, the decision will be in favour of Bashar al-Assad. With no hesitations, when the basics are at stake, the Russian president supports the Syrian side and lets the allegiance of convenience he has with Recep Tayyip Erdogan to fall.  As I have said in other recent occasions, Assad and Putin believe in a military solution. Because of that, they have prepared plans and, ~~in~~ last December, started an offensive against various rebel groups that took refuge in the only possible region, the province of Idlib. This campaign is being progressively executed, with no mercy.  However, Erdogan has decided to meddle in the dispute. This is a border area with Turkey. It is not that of the most expressive strategic interest, but it is the refuge of various armed groups close to Ankara’s interests. Thus, Erdogan stablished a dozen military Turkish positions in Idlib, in ~~a~~ territory which is not his. It was one of these bases and the refueling column that were the target of aerial attacks yesterday. Syrians attacked and more than three dozen Turkish soldiers died.  Erdogan will have to remove his troops from Idlib. He can’t keep on having more and more casualties. And I predict that he will end up opening the gates of his border for the displaced Syrians of Idlib. Along with the new refugees, the rebel combatants will go as well, some of them fundamentalists. The crowd will make these escapes go unnoticed. | Usually in the singular  lets… fall (but better ‘drops the alliance’  On  Expressive – not really used – usually ‘significant’, instead  Established  Supply column |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NE  No of errors | CGPL  0.67 per error | Language  Max 15 | Fidelity  Max 5 | total |
| 9 | 6 | 9 | 4.5 | 13.5 |

Translation **8** – model and notes

A Turquia entendeu, nas últimas 24 horas, que se Vladimir Putin tiver que escolher, a decisão será a favor de Bachar al-Assad. Sem hesitações, quando o fundamental está em jogo, o Presidente russo apoia o lado sírio e deixa cair a aliança de conveniência que tem com Recep Tayyip Erdogan.

In the last 24 hours, Turkey has understood that if Vladimir Putin has to choose, the decision will be in favour of Bashar Al-Assad. Without any hesitation, when the basics are/when what is fundamental is/when the main point is at stake, the Russian president supports the Syrian side and lets go of/disposes of/drops the alliance/marriage of convenience that he has with Recep Tayyip Erdogan.

Como já o disse noutras ocasiões recentes, Assad e Putin acreditam numa solução militar. Por isso, prepararam planos e iniciaram, em dezembro passado, uma ofensiva contra os vários grupos rebeldes que se refugiaram na única região possível, a província de Idlib. Essa campanha tem estado a ser executada progressivamente, sem dó nem piedade. [...]

As I have said on other recent occasions, Assad and Putin believe in a military solution. Therefore, they made plans and, last December\*, started an offensive against the various rebel groups that had taken refuge\* in the only region possible, the province of Idlib. This campaign has been carried out progressively, without showing any mercy/with no mercy/mercilessly/ruthlessly.

\*Word order – it was difficult to find the best place to put the time phrase ‘last December’; ideally, it should not split up the verb and the direct object

\* Past perfect tense works better here – it was before the action in December

Entretanto, Erdogan resolveu meter a colher na disputa. Esta é uma zona de fronteira com a Turquia. Não será a que tem maior interesse estratégico, mas é o refúgio de vários grupos armados próximos dos interesses de Ancara. Assim, Erdogan estabeleceu uma dúzia de posições militares turcas em Idlib, em território que não é dele. Foi uma dessas bases e a coluna de reabastecimento que foram alvo de ataques aéreos ontem. Atacaram os sírios e morreram mais de três dezenas de soldados turcos. [...]

However, Erdogan decided to get involved/interfere/meddle in the dispute/to stick his oar into the dispute/to poke his nose into the dispute. This is a zone bordering/in the border area with Turkey. It is not the one of greatest strategic interest, but it is the refuge/hiding place of various armed groups that are close to the interests of Ankara. Thus, Erdogan established a dozen Turkish military positions/outposts in Idlib, in territory that is not his. It was one of these bases and the supply column that were the target of aerial attacks/airstrikes yesterday. The Syrians attacked\*, and more than three dozen/thirty//nearly forty Turkish soldiers died.

\* See BBC report below – it was the Syrian government troops that attacked

Erdogan vai ter que retirar as suas tropas de Idlib. Não pode continuar a ter baixas e mais baixas. E prevejo que acabe por abrir as portas da sua fronteira aos deslocados sírios de Idlib. Com os novos refugiados irão também os combatentes rebeldes, alguns deles fundamentalistas. A multidão fará passar despercebidas essas fugas.

Erdogan will have to take his troops out of Idlib. He cannot go on having casualty after casualty. And I predict that he will end up opening his border to the displaced Syrians from Idlib. With the new refugees there will also come rebel combatants, some of them fundamentalists. The crowd will allow these escapes to pass/go unnoticed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Task 7- *Machado de Assis* | Corrections |
| There is no such thing as death. The encounter of two expansions, or the expansion of two forms, can determine the suppression of one of them; but, rigorously, there is no such thing as death, there is life, because the suppression of the former is the condition of survival of the latter, and because destruction does not reach the universal and common principle. Here is where the conservative and beneficial character of the war comes from.  Let’s suppose a field of potatoes and two hungry tribes. There are only enough potatoes to feed one of those tribes, which, from them, acquires force to cross the mountain and go to the other side, where potatoes are abundant; but, if those two tribes peacefully divide the potatoes of the field between them, they will not have enough to nourish themselves and will die of starvation. In this case, peace is destruction; war is conservation. One of those tribes exterminates the other and collects the spoils.  Here is where the joy of victory, anthems, acclamations, public rewards and all other effects of bellicose actions come from. If wars were not it, such demonstrations would not occur, due to the real reason that the man only celebrates and loves what is pleasant or advantageous for him, and due to the rational reason that no man enshrines an action that virtually destroy him. To the defeated, hate or compassion; to the winner, potatoes. | See note 1  See note  See notes  Were not this  destroys |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NE  No of errors | CGPL  0.67 per error | Language  Max 15 | Fidelity  Max 5 | total |
| 5 | 3.35 | 11.65 | 4.5 | 16.15 |

Translation **7** – model and notes

Não há morte. O encontro de duas expansões, ou a expansão de duas formas, pode determinar a supressão de uma delas; mas, rigorosamente, não há morte, há vida, porque a supressão de uma é a condição da sobrevivência da outra, e a destruição não atinge o princípio universal e comum. Daí o caráter conservador e benéfico da guerra.

There is no death/no such thing as death. The meeting [1] between two expansions, or the expansion of two forms, can determine the suppression of one of them; but strictly speaking there is no death, there is life, because the suppression of one is the condition for/ involves/ is/ means/ the survival of the other, and destruction [2] does not affect [3] the common universal principle. Hence the conservative and beneficial character of war/Hence, war’s [4] conservative and beneficial character.

[1] encounter is odd here – it means an unexpected meeting or a romantic meeting, usually between people not abstract things

[2] no article: ‘destruction’ in the abstract sense – not a specific/previously stated destruction.

[3] ‘reach’ as translation for ‘atingir’ seems odd here.

[4] if you’re using the possessive [war’s], no article for almost the same reason as in note 2. It is war in general, not a specific war.

Supõe tu um campo de batatas e duas tribos famintas. As batatas apenas chegam para alimentar uma das tribos, que assim adquire forças para transpor a montanha e ir à outra vertente, onde há batatas em abundância; mas, se as duas tribos dividirem em paz as batatas do campo, não chegam a nutrir-se suficientemente e morrem de inanição. A paz nesse caso, é a destruição; a guerra é a conservação. Uma das tribos extermina a outra e recolhe os despojos.

Imagine [5] a field of potatoes and two starving tribes. There are only enough potatoes to feed one of the tribes, which thus gains the strength to climb the mountain and get to the other side, where there are potatoes in abundance/ galore; but if the two tribes peacefully share the potatoes in the field, they will not get enough nourishment and will die of starvation/ malnourishment. Peace, in this case, is destruction and war is conservation/preservation. One tribe /One of the tribes wipes the other out/ exterminates the other/ and reaps the spoils/rewards.

[5] ‘Suppose’ requires a complement: Suppose there was/you had a field of potatoes…

Daí a alegria da vitória, os hinos, aclamações, recompensas públicas e todos os demais efeitos das ações bélicas. Se a guerra não fosse isso, tais demonstrações não chegariam a dar-se, pelo motivo real de que o homem só comemora e ama o que lhe é aprazível ou vantajoso, e pelo motivo racional de que nenhuma pessoa canoniza uma ação que virtualmente a destrói. Ao vencido, ódio ou compaixão; ao vencedor, as batatas.

Hence [comes] the joy of victory, the anthems, [6] acclamation, [7] public rewards and all the other effects of warlike/bellicose/ action[s]. If war were not like this, there would be no such ceremonies/ demonstrations for the good reason that men/people only celebrate and love what they find pleasurable/pleasing and advantageous and for the rational reason that no one sanctifies an action that virtually destroys them. To the vanquished, hatred or compassion; to the winner, the potatoes.

[6] ‘hymn’ is a religious song, so not the best fit in this context

[7] ‘acclamation’ is listed in both Cambridge and Oxford dictionaries as an uncountable/mass noun. There are instances of it being plural online, but CACD has had these possibly countable /uncountable nouns in the past.

**Summary – this shows the student’s work, then the criteria we use, then the model**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit 8 Turkey | Corrections |
| In the article “Erdoğan is both a bully and a menace. Europe ignores him at his peril”, Simon Tisdall point out that the European leaders have been applying two weights and two measures when it comes to standing against politics of authoritarian leaders. Although Alexander Lukashenko has been facing strong criticism in his attempt of granting his sixth reelection in Belarus, considered by the author as undemocratic and unfair, the actions of ~~the~~ Turkey’s president have not been under the same scrutiny.  The reasons for the European leaders to turn a blind eye to Erdogan’s actions, according to the author, is that Turkey has a more prominent role in the UE; it is a strategic ally and an important trade partner. Meanwhile, Turkey’s president passed a dangerous bill for reducing the power of independent media, which clearly constitutes censorship and a threat to democracy. Counteracting this trend, Macron, France’s president, has been acting alone against Erdogan’s wrongdoings. Triggered by an uneven naval dispute between Turkey warships and a French boat, and by illegal exploration of gas and oil in Greece by Turkey, Macron boosted the presence of French troops in the eastern Mediterranean.  In addition, Greece and Turkey are at loggerheads, because of territory invasion by Turkey and laws concerning energy. Despite both countries having affirmed they are not willing to engage in a military confrontation, there was a so-called accident between Turkish and Greek ships. Whereas the tension escalates, other countries are also affected, and diplomatic tools have been activated in other to intervene with the conundrum. There were, for instance, a UE foreign affairs meeting and interventions from other countries, such as German and the USA.  For the author, the intensification of an abiding crisis appears to the calculated. To reinforce this idea, Tisdall mentions the commentator Yavuz Baydar, who, in his turn, believes that Erdoğan, threatened by the Covid crisis, needs to present himself as a strong leader in order to ensure Turkey’s political importance and to prevent the country from losing power in the neighboring area, like in Syria and in Libya, should Trump lose the election, which could represent an obstacle for Erdogan to proceed with his expansion project. This power expression has aggravated since a coup attempt in 2006, to which Erdoğan responded with repression and prison for opponents, pursuing to restore the Ottoman expansion, with actions in Iraq, like drone attacks in Iraq and an offensive against Kurdish separatists, for example. Besides, the decision to follow the Syrian refugees to cross the border should be a sign of his intention to use migration as an instrument for gaining power and imprisoning enemies, instead of peacekeeping.  ~~The~~ Turkey’s president has also caused conflict with Israel by supporting Hamas and by turning Istanbul’s cathedral into a mosque and purchasing missiles, which turned his actions suspicious. Finally, the author affirms that Erdogan represents a threat and can no longer be avoided by leaders, who should prepare a plan to contain him. | Points  Of winning his sixth  Are (agreeing with ‘reasons’)  EU  Turkey’s/Turkish  While (whereas is only for expressing contrast)  In order to  Intervene to break the stalemate  Germany  An ongoing/long-standing/entrenched crisis  Been aggravated (it’s a transitive verb)  Trying/seeking to restore  Allow Syrian refugees to  Made his actions |
|  |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CSC [ out of 5] content | NE | PNE (0.35 each) | CGPL=Lang score [out of 10] | Total [15] |
| 4.7 | 14 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 9.8 |

Unit 8 Notes and summary [Sara]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Text contrasts European reactions to 2 dictators  1.Lukashenko of Belarus-   * EU condemnation of rigged re-election, but pro-Russian Belarus has little strategic importance  1. Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey  * Turkey a strategic NATO ally, trade partner, refugee control post, player in Near East. * President Erdogan a dictator, repressing citizens and press freedom [2016 failed coup] social media law - all disregarded by the EU and UK- except France | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | * Pres Macron protests: incident with French frigate and Turkish warship escorting vessel possibly smuggling arms to Libya- French ships to Eastern Mediterranean * Turkish oil exploration [law unfair!] upsets Greece + collision- * diplomatic activity: Germany-Turkey , Greece -USA | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | Deliberate provocation by Turkey?  Expert commentator: Erdogan wants to distract domestic attention from home problems   * to strengthen Turkish position whole Trump still in power- Biden might curtail his freedom | 1 | 0.9 |
| 4  Some of these! | Erdogan’s Islamist nationalism: intimidates neighbours- nostalgia for Ottoman glory   * Drone into Iraq against Kurdish separatists * Troops in Syria posing as peacemakers- repressive occupying forces * Proxy war in Syria against Saudi Arabia, UAE and Egypt- * Use of refugees as political weapon against EU * Hostility to Israel- support of Hamas, condemnation of UAE accord | 1 | 0.8 |
| 5 | * Hagia Sophia as mosque- upsets Christians and secularists * Purchase of Russian weapons offends NATO- mistrust * Turkish aggression could get worse * EU should make a plan to curb Erdogan’s provocations | 1 | 1 |

Model summary

Simon Tisdall opens his article on Turkey by contrasting European reactions to two elective dictators. The first is President Lukashenko of Belarus, the second President Erdogan of Turkey. Lukashenko is strongly criticised by the EU and threatened with sanctions for rigging his own re-election, although Belarus is under Russia’s thumb and of little importance to Europe. Turkey, on the other hand, is strategically important to Europe, as a NATO member, a trade partner, a barrier for refugees and a player in the Near East. Its president, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, is also a dictator, but his misdemeanours are disregarded by most EU governments and by the UK.

President Erdogan has used a failed coup against him in 2016 to suppress opposition and press freedom and is now introducing a law to control social media. Alone in the EU, President Macron of France has criticised Turkey and sent ships to the Eastern Mediterranean, after an incident between a French frigate and Turkish warships accompanying a vessel suspected of smuggling arms to Libya. Turkey, meanwhile, has reopened its feud with Greece, apparently defending its search for oil and gas, contesting an international law it considers unfair. A recent accidental collision of a Greek and a Turkish ship caused Angela Merkel to contact Turkey and Greece to contact the USA.

Analysing the causes of Turkey’s provocative action, Tisdall quotes a specialist commentator who sees two reasons for Turkey’s aggression in the Mediterranean and beyond. First, Erdogan wants to distract domestic attention away from problems at home with the pandemic and the financial crisis; secondly, he wants to shore up Turkey’s position in the region while Trump - who is said to envy Erdogan’s dictatorial power - is still in office, in case a Biden regime curtails his freedom.

Erdogan’s Islamist nationalism and nostalgia for Ottoman glory cause him to intimidate his neighbours, sending a drone into Iraq against Kurdish separatists and troops into Syria, theoretically as peacemakers, but really as repressive occupying forces. He also uses Syrian refugees as a political weapon against the EU. Besides opposing Saudi Arabia, the UAE and Egypt in the proxy war in Libya, he is constantly at odds with Israel, supporting Hamas and condemning the new agreement with the UAE. At home, he has upset both Christians and secularists by turning the erstwhile museum, Hagia Sophia, into a mosque. Beyond this, Turkey has caused mistrust in NATO by buying Russian weapons. Europeans appear to be hoping the problem of Turkey will disappear, but it may well get worse if nothing is done. A plan to constrain President Erdogan is urgently needed. [431 words]