



ENGLISH TESTS B2-C1¹

¹ http://www.sciencespo-toulouse.fr/medias/fichier/4a-anglais-test-entree-2017_1508919251869-pdf

“Do Chicagoans want to ‘defund the police’? It’s a tale of two cities”

(Adapted from *The Chicago Tribune*, June 15th, 2021)

By Kristen Mack, John Palfrey and Will Johnson

As the epicenter of America’s gun violence epidemic, Chicago [...] has an opportunity to chart a path on police and policy reform that could serve as a model for the entire nation. To get there, it’s important to understand the confluence of factors undergirding divergent beliefs about how to move forward, and to identify and leverage the aspects of reform upon which diverse constituencies agree.

The Harris Poll and the MacArthur Foundation recently surveyed almost 1,000 Chicagoans to better understand our city’s biggest challenges, particularly regarding public safety. The response from residents portrays a city with [...] contradictory feelings toward a police force that it at once supports and wants reformed. The survey reveals a tale of two cities, with respondents’ experiences shaping their attitudes about solutions. [...]

Strong majorities oppose reducing neighborhood police presence. [...] [However, P]eople of color in Chicago — due to historical negative experiences with law enforcement — do not feel safe or comfortable having a police presence in their neighborhood. Black and Latino residents were twice as likely as white residents to report negative experiences with cops and to display greater anxiety about reporting police misconduct, for fear of retaliation.

Additionally, most Chicagoans understand the disparate impact of policing: 64% (including 66% of Latino residents and 91% of Black residents) believe there is persistent racial bias in the city’s policing practices [...].

These attitudes and experiences explain why Chicago residents approve of the police overall while also favoring reform [...]. They know the city needs a police force — most Chicago residents oppose the “defund the police” movement (58%) — but they believe cops can improve, especially vis-a-vis people of color, with better training and more available alternatives to police response, such as neighborhood patrols and dispatching social workers to handle certain situations. Majorities of Chicagoans believe that de-escalation training (53%) and racial equity training (51%) would be the best ways to start. A force that looks more like the city it serves could help alleviate the trust gap.

On the “defund” movement specifically — which refers to efforts to reduce police department budgets and redistribute those funds toward essential and underfunded social services, such as housing, education, employment, mental health care and youth services — most Chicagoans [...] feel it wouldn’t help repair police-resident relations [...]

READING COMPREHENSION

____ / 12 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

1. Overall, what does the survey reveal about how the inhabitants of Chicago feel about their police?
(____ / 2 marks)
2. Why don't people of color in Chicago feel good about a police presence in their neighborhood?
(____ / 2 marks)
3. According to the authors, why is it useful to collect data on what Chicagoans think of their police?
(____ / 4 marks)
4. Explain the following phrase: "the disparate impact of policing" (line 18). (1 pt)
(____ / 2 marks)
5. Explain the following sentence: "A force that looks more like the city it serves could help alleviate the trust gap." (line 28-29)
(____ / 2 marks)

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____ / 28 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Do you think that "defunding" the police is desirable and/or realistic ?

.

OXBRIDGE NEEDS TO GUARANTEE PLACES FOR THE BEST STATE SCHOOL PUPILS

Owen Jones The Guardian, 7 Dec 2018

Oxbridge does not represent Britain's best or the brightest: let's just get that out of the way. Many of the country's most intelligent, thoughtful and perceptive people do not attend either Oxford or Cambridge. Both institutions are instead, disproportionately, attended by the best performing slice of the most economically privileged teenagers in the country. So the figures released today, which elicit a depressing sense of déjà vu, that eight top schools send as many pupils to Oxbridge as three-quarters of all schools and colleges put together, might be shocking, but they are unsurprising. So are the findings that top performing state school students are much less likely to apply than their private school equivalents, or that private school pupils were seven times more likely to win a place than comprehensive students.

Undoubtedly, one of the key reasons for the disparity is the resources available to private schools to "polish" up their students for the application process. I attended what was then the biggest sixth-form in the country, Stockport's Ridge Danvers: the attitude among teachers towards applying to Oxbridge was very much: "Well, you might as well give it a go!" One did try to prepare me with a mock interview, which involved questions like "Why are you applying to Oxford? What are your extracurricular interests?" Bless them, but it was entirely counterproductive: imagine my shock when I sat down at my actual interview, in what seemed like a slightly sinister Harry Potter theme park, and an emeritus professor kicked off the proceedings with "Lenin was a German spy, wasn't he?" It was always instantly possible to tell who was privately educated: they had a certain confidence and posture built into them by their schooling. (...)

Few of us actually knew much about that place – I confess, I thought "Oxbridge" was its own university, and the Oxbridge colleges on University Challenge were separate from the universities themselves – and arriving for the interviews was a far bigger culture shock than visiting France for the first time. (...)

I was one of a handful from my sixth form to get in, and – like most of the comprehensive pupils, let alone anyone else who attends – I am no working-class hero: my dad had a white collar job at Sheffield city council, my mum was an IT lecturer at Salford University. Yet even I, from a northern, public sector, middle-class background, initially had a profound, sometimes debilitating sense of imposter syndrome, that there would be a tap on the shoulder at any moment to explain that "I'm sorry there's been a dreadful mistake we let you in by accident" which was not helped by fellow private school alumni making barbed comments like "comprehensive school students only get in because of quotas". That's not to say this was three years of trauma – I had some of my happiest days there – but it's unsurprising that an Old Etonian feels at home dressing up in an absurd costume for exams (you got turned away if you wore the wrong shoes).

There are genuine attempts by Oxbridge authorities to widen access. I think of Alan Rusbridger, former Guardian editor turned principal of Lady Margaret Hall, who launched a fantastic scheme to attract young people from less privileged backgrounds. But there are such profound structural problems that are very difficult to overcome. If

you grow up in an overcrowded house, suffer the stresses poverty can place on family life, sometimes have gone hungry or had a poor diet, and don't have parents with huge "cultural capital" – like owning lots of books – then the odds are stacked against you from day one.

The educational segregation of children according to the bank balances of their parents – private education – needs to be abolished. But in the interim, it has always struck me that the only solution is to automatically enrol the best performing students from state school, taking class into account. If you grow up in a deprived ex-mining community and get two As and two Bs at A-level, you have outperformed someone at Harrow or Eton from a family of millionaires who gets four As. And until Oxbridge does this, it needs to stop pretending it represents Britain's academic elite: because it doesn't.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

6. Why did the journalist experience a culture shock when he first applied to Oxbridge?
(____/ 2 marks)
7. Why are so few state school students accepted to Oxbridge?
(____/ 3 marks)
8. What solution does he suggest for overcoming social inequality at Oxbridge?
(____/ 3 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|--------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| 1. to try | _____ | 5. acerb | _____ |
| 2. simulated | _____ | 6. to initiate | _____ |
| 3. to start | _____ | 7. to recruit | _____ |
| 4. weakening | _____ | 8. disadvantaged | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

To what extent does education promote social mobility in today's world?

N.B. You may refer to different countries, not limited to the English-speaking world.

THE HEARTBEAT OF RACISM IS DENIAL

The New York Times (adapted) | Ibram X. Kendi | 13 January 2018

When our reality is too ugly, we deny reality. It is too painful to look at. Reality is too hard to accept.

Mental health experts routinely say that denial is among the most common defense mechanisms. Denial is how the person defends his superior sense of self, her racially unequal society.

Denial is how America defends itself as superior to “shithole countries” in Africa and elsewhere, as President Trump once reportedly described them in a White House meeting [...] It’s also how America defends itself as superior to those “developing countries” in Africa, to quote how liberal opponents of Mr. Trump might often describe them.

Mr. Trump appears to be unifying America - unifying Americans in their denial. The more racist Mr. Trump sounds, the more Trump country denies his racism, and the more his opponents look away from their own racism to brand Trump country as racist. Through it all, America remains a unified country of denial.

The reckoning of Mr. Trump’s racism must become the reckoning of American racism. Because the American creed of denial - “I’m not a racist” - knows no political parties, no ideologies, no colors, no regions.

[A few weeks ago], Senator Richard J. Durbin, Democrat of Illinois [...] rightfully described Mr. Trump’s words as “hate-filled, vile and racist,” and added, “I cannot believe that in the history of the White House in that Oval Office, any president has ever spoken the words that I personally heard our president speak yesterday.”

But Mr. Trump is no exception. In framing Mr. Trump’s racism as exceptional, in seeking to highlight the depth of the president’s cruelty, Mr. Durbin, a reliably liberal senator, showed the depth of denial of American racism.

Begin with the eight presidents who held slaves while in the Oval Office. Then consider how Abraham Lincoln urged black people to leave the United States. “Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race,” Lincoln told five black guests at the White House in 1862. So “it is better for us both, therefore, to be separated.” [...]

Presidential history also includes the social Darwinism of Theodore Roosevelt, the federal-government-segregating, “Birth of a Nation”-praising Woodrow Wilson - and the bigotry that came from the mouths of presidents who are generally seen as essential to racial progress. President Lyndon B. Johnson said “nigger” nearly as often as Ku Klux Klansmen did.

This denial of racism is the heartbeat of racism. Where there is suffering from racist policies, there are denials that those policies are racist. The beat of denial sounds the same across time and space. [...]

Fifty years ago, Richard Nixon transformed this historic heartbeat of denial into an intoxicating political philosophy. His presidential candidacy appealed to George

Wallace-type segregationists while also attracting Americans who refused to live near “dangerous” black residents, obstructed the desegregation of schools, resisted affirmative action policies, framed black mothers on welfare as undeserving, called the black family pathological and denigrated black culture - all those racists who refused to believe they were racist [...] Mr. Trump opened his candidacy with racism, calling Mexicans criminals and rapists. Since taking office, he has looked away from the disaster zone in Puerto Rico, he has called some violent white supremacists “very fine people,” and he has described Nigerians as living in “huts.”

When someone identifies the obvious, Mr. Trump resounds the beat of denial as he did before he was president: “I’m the least racist person that you’ve ever met,” that “you’ve ever seen,” that “you’ve ever encountered.”

These are ugly denials. But it’s the denials from those who stand in strong opposition to this president that are more frustrating to me: denials that their attacks on identity politics are racist. Denials that the paltry number of people of color in elite spaces marks racism [...]

Because we naturally want to look away from our ugliness [...], we paint over racist reality to make a beautiful delusion of self, of society. We defend this beautiful self and society from our racist reality with the weapons of denial.

Denial is fueled by the stigma associated with being a racist. Feeding the stigma is how “racist” is considered almost like an identity, a brand.

But a racist is not who a person is. A racist is what a person is, what a person is saying, what a person is doing.

Racist is not a fixed category like “not racist,” which is steeped denial. Only racists say they are not racist. Only the racist lives by the heartbeat of denial.

The antiracist lives by the opposite heartbeat, one that rarely and irregularly sounds in America - the heartbeat of confession.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words. You should answer in 40 to 60 words:

1. What does the author mean when he states that Trump “is unifying Americans in their denial” ?

(____/ 3 marks)

The author argues that Trump is not an “exception” (l.22): what is implied by this and how is this claim justified?

(____/ 2 marks)

Whose denials are most upsetting to the author? Explain why.

(____/ 3 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article.

The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

1. to label or to stigmatize

2. assessment

3. to put into words or to present in a certain way

4. intolerance

5. not worthy

6. to echo

7. small or insignificant

8. to feed

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

To what extent can we say that racism remains a major challenge to be overcome?

N.B. You are not obliged to deal exclusively with the United States, but are free to widen your discussion to include the situation in Europe or other regions of the world

BLAIR IS RIGHT ON BREXIT : PARLIAMENT MUST HAVE A DEMOCRATIC DEBATE

The Guardian, Anatole Kaletsy, 24 February 2017

Former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair's recent call for voters to think again about leaving the EU, echoed in parliamentary debates ahead of the government's official launch of the process in March, is an emperor's new clothes moment. [...] Such is the tyranny of the majority in post-referendum Britain that a "remainer" proposal for rational debate and persuasion is considered an insurrection. And anyone questioning government policy on Brexit is routinely described as an "enemy of the people," whose treachery will provoke "blood in the streets."

What explains this sudden paranoia? After all, political opposition is a necessary condition for functioning democracy – and nobody would have been shocked if Eurosceptics continued to oppose Europe after losing the referendum [...].

The difference with Brexit is that last June's referendum subverted British democracy in two insidious ways. First, the leave vote was inspired mainly by resentments unconnected with Europe. Second, the government has exploited this confusion of issues to claim a mandate to do anything it wants.

Six months before the referendum, the EU did not even appear among the 10 most important issues facing Britain as mentioned by potential voters. Immigration did rank at the top, but, as Blair noted in his speech, anti-immigration sentiment was mainly against multicultural immigration, which had little or nothing to do with the EU. The leave campaign's strategy was therefore to open Pandora's box of resentments over regional imbalances, economic inequality, social values and cultural change. The remain campaign completely failed to respond to this, because it concentrated on the question that was literally on the ballot and addressed the costs and benefits of EU membership.

The fact that the referendum was such an amorphous but all-encompassing protest vote explains its second politically corrosive effect. Because the leave campaign successfully combined a multitude of different grievances, May now claims the referendum as an open-ended mandate. [...] Anyone who disagrees is dismissed as an elitist "remoaner" showing contempt for ordinary voters.

Making matters worse, the obvious risks of Brexit have created a siege mentality. "Successful Brexit" has become a matter of national survival, turning even the mildest proposals to limit the government's negotiating options – for example, parliamentary votes to guarantee rights for EU citizens already living in Britain – into acts of sabotage. As in wartime, every criticism shades into treason. That is why the Labour party has collaborated in defeating all parliamentary efforts to moderate May's hardline Brexit plans, even on such relatively uncontentious issues as visa-free travel, pharmaceutical testing or science funding.

[...] But this scenario is not inevitable. A more constructive possibility is now emerging along the lines suggested by Blair. Instead of vainly trying to influence May's hardline stance in the negotiations, the new priority should be to restart a rational debate about Britain's relationship with Europe and to convince the public that this debate is democratically legitimate. This means challenging the idea that a referendum permanently outweighs all other mechanisms of democratic politics and persuading

voters that a referendum mandate refers to a specific question in specific conditions, at a specific time. If the conditions change or the referendum question acquires a different meaning, voters should be allowed to change their minds.

The process of restoring a proper understanding of democracy could start within the next few weeks. The catalyst would be amendments to the Brexit legislation now passing through Parliament. The goal would be to prevent any new relationship between Britain and the EU from taking effect unless approved by a parliamentary vote that allowed for the possibility of continuing EU membership. [...]

Allowing Parliament to decide about the new relationship with Europe, instead of leaving it entirely up to May, would restore the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. More important, it would legitimise a new political debate in Britain about the true costs and benefits of EU membership, possibly leading to a second referendum on the government's Brexit plans.

This is precisely why May vehemently opposes giving Parliament any meaningful voice on the outcome of the Brexit negotiations. Presumably, she will block any such requirement from being attached to the Brexit legislation in March. But that may not matter: if a genuine debate about Brexit gets restarted, democracy will prevent her from closing it down.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

1. Why was Blair right according to the journalist?
(____/ 2 marks)
2. Why does the journalist suggest that the vote in favour of Brexit was not really a vote on the UK's EU membership?
(____/ 2 marks)
3. Why is the Labour Party so timid in its opposition to the government?
(____/ 2 marks)
4. How can a 'rational debate' on Brexit be started at this stage?
(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| 1. reasonable | _____ | 5. uncontroversial | _____ |
| 2. undermine | _____ | 6. persuade | _____ |
| 3. complaint | _____ | 7. result | _____ |
| 4. uncompromising | _____ | 8. authentic | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

In what ways is Brexit the result of a troubled relationship between the UK and its European partners?

DONALD TRUMP WILL NOT BE BARRED FROM BRITAIN DESPITE MUSLIMS OUTBURST

The Guardian, 9 December 2015

Petition calling for US presidential candidate to be denied entry to UK on grounds of hate speech racks up nearly 360,000 signatures in 24 hours.

5 The government has signalled it will not refuse the US presidential candidate Donald Trump entry to Britain following his controversial comments about Muslims, despite a petition calling for a ban gathering more than 360,000 signatures in just over 24 hours.

At the height of its popularity on Wednesday afternoon, the petition, which calls for Trump to be stopped from entering Britain on the grounds of hate speech, was racking up more than 30,000 signatures an hour, according to parliament's petitions website.

10 Parliament considers all petitions that receive more than 100,000 signatures for a debate. The petition to ban Trump, which became open for signatures at 4.39pm Tuesday, had been signed by 360,000 people by midnight on Wednesday.

It says: "The signatories believe Donald J Trump should be banned from UK entry. The UK has banned entry to many individuals for hate speech. The same principles should apply to everyone who wishes to enter the UK.

15 "If the United Kingdom is to continue applying the 'unacceptable behaviour' criteria to those who wish to enter its borders, it must be fairly applied to the rich as well as poor, and the weak as well as powerful."

The petition comes after Trump was widely criticised for saying on Monday that Muslims should be banned from entering the US. He said in a speech following a mass shooting
20 committed by a Muslim couple in San Bernardino, California, last weekend: "We need a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States while we figure out what the hell is going on. We are out of control."

On Tuesday, there was widespread condemnation of Trump's comments, including from fellow Republican presidential contenders. And later comments from the
25 presidential hopeful in a radio interview that there were districts of London and Paris so "radicalised" that they were off limits to police led to further angry rebuttals from UK politicians and the police.

The London Metropolitan police said Trump "could not be more wrong", while the mayor of London, Boris Johnson, said: "London has a proud history of tolerance and diversity
30 and to suggest there are areas where police officers cannot go because of radicalisation is simply ridiculous." The UK chancellor, George Osborne, said on

Wednesday it was best to combat Donald Trump through robust democratic debate and not to try to ban him from the UK on the grounds that his remarks incited racial hatred. Speaking at prime minister's questions, Osborne said Trump's views "flew in the face of
35 the founding principles of the American Founding Fathers", adding that those principles had been an inspiration all round the world.

- He continued: "The best way to defeat nonsense like this is to engage in robust and democratic debate, and to make it clear his views are not welcome." Osborne's aides said the previous occasions when foreigners had been banned from the UK reflected
- 40 moments when individuals had been repeatedly convicted of race hate crimes, and this did not apply to Trump. A Downing Street spokesman said there were no known plans for Trump to visit the UK, so suggestions of a ban from Britain were hypothetical. He added the remarks should be seen in the context of an internal Republican election campaign. Jon Trickett, the shadow communities secretary, praised Osborne's remarks
- 45 as clear and straightforward. He said it was "entirely inappropriate to suggest every follower of one of the world's great religions has to be suspected of terrorism". He added it was "wrong, divisive, dangerous and may speed up the radicalisation of individuals". Although he said it was interesting that so many people had called for a ban, Trickett said he preferred staging a debate, rather than imposing travel bans.
- 50 The home secretary can decide to exclude a person from the UK if it is believed that an "individual's presence in the UK would not be conducive to the public good", according to government guidance. In effect, that usually means people seen to be preaching hate or inciting extremism. However, individuals can also be blocked on the grounds of their criminal records. People previously banned from Britain include Mike Tyson, over his
- 55 rape conviction, Dieudonné M'bala M'bala, the controversial French comedian accused of antisemitism, and Stephen Donald Black, founder of the white-supremacist website Stormfront.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

1. Why was a petition signed to ban Donald Trump from entering the UK ?
(____/ 3 marks)
2. What did UK Chancellor Osborne mean when he 'said Trump's views "flew in the face of the founding principles of the American Founding Fathers"? (l.37- 38).
(____/ 3 marks)
3. When can a person be excluded from entering the UK according to the text?
(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|--------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| 1. explosion | _____ | 5. candidate | _____ |
| 2. refuse | _____ | 6. objection | _____ |
| 3. obtain | _____ | 7. unequivocal | _____ |
| 4. peak | _____ | 8. contributive | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Should Western democracies - where tolerance and freedom of speech are core principles - combat hate speech through democratic debate or by issuing bans?

N.B. Feel free to refer to the history of tolerance and speech rights in the UK, but also in the USA, France or other countries.

“A WHISTLEBLOWER’S HORROR STORY”

By Matt Taibbi, Rolling Stone, February 18, 2015

This is the age of the whistleblower. From Chelsea Manning to Edward Snowden to [...] ex-HSBC employee Hervé Falciani, whistleblowers are becoming to this decade what rock stars were to the Sixties—pop culture icons, global countercultural heroes.

5 But one of America’s ugliest secrets is that our own whistleblowers often don’t do so well after the headlines fade and cameras recede. The ones who don’t end up in jail like Manning, or in exile like Snowden, often still go through years of harassment and financial hardship. [...]

10 Two years ago this month, Winston was being celebrated in the news as a hero. He’d blown the whistle on Countrywide Financial, the bent mortgage lender that one could plausibly argue nearly blew up the global economy in the last decade with its reckless subprime lending practices. [...]

15 But today, Winston is tasting the sometimes-extreme downside of being a whistleblower in modern America. [...] He says he’s spent over a million dollars fighting Countrywide (and the firm that acquired it, Bank of America) in court. At first, that fight proved a good gamble, as a jury granted him a multi- million-dollar award for retaliation and wrongful termination.

But after Winston won that case, an appellate judge not only wiped out that jury verdict but allowed Bank of America to counterattack him with a vengeance.

20 Last summer, the bank vindictively put a lien on Winston’s house (one he’d bought, ironically, with a Countrywide mortgage). The bank eventually beat him for nearly \$98,000 in court costs. That single transaction means a good guy in the crisis drama, Winston, had by the end of 2014 paid a larger individual penalty than virtually every wrongdoer connected with the financial collapse of 2008. [...]

25 Yet Winston would likely bear all of this more easily were it not for bitterness over the fact that the sacrifices of whistleblowers like himself have too often resulted in dead ends or worse in recent years. In the finance sector, many of the biggest cooperators have seen their evidence disappeared into cushy settlement deals that let corporate wrongdoers off the hook with negligible fines. [...]

30 This is a serious problem, given that anyone considering coming forward is usually paying at least some attention to how the government has dealt with other cooperators. [...] “What I worry about,” says Winston today, “is that someone is going to see wrongdoing, and then see what’s happened to people like me, and decide it’s not worth it.”

35 Winston joined Countrywide, which was booming financially at the time, in 2005. Unbeknownst to him, his new firm was at the forefront of a mass movement to pump the global economy full of fraudulent, born-to-lose subprime loans, a movement destined to rapidly overinflate the global economy with debt and cause a catastrophic

recession. [...] Winston tried to sound the alarm within the company. He thought he was doing the firm a favor, that the bosses somehow just didn't realize their mistake. As it
40 turned out, Countrywide execs¹ knew exactly what they were doing, and Winston quickly went the way of most whistleblowers, losing his job when Bank of America acquired the firm in 2008. [...]

"I was offered a lot of money to make it all go away, quietly, but I thought to myself, do I want to be that person?" he said. "And I realized that I couldn't take it. I needed to see
45 someone held accountable." [...]

But four years later, we're still waiting for the first criminal conviction against any individual for crisis-era corruption. [...] What we've seen instead is a series of cash deals with the most corrupt companies. [...] Winston's old company got one of the best deals. Last summer, Bank of America—now responsible for all of Countrywide's
50 liability—was allowed to buy its way out of years of fraud and other abuses with a "historic" \$17 billion settlement. [...] "I just can't believe, after all of this, that it all gets swept under the rug," he said, shaking his head. [...]

Even the government's attempts to encourage whistleblowers were misguided. Eric Holder talked extensively about aiding cooperators by making more resources available
55 to them—essentially, offering them higher monetary rewards for coming forward.

But nobody in the financial services industry comes forward just for the money. The easy money is already there to be had, just by keeping your mouth shut. What Wall Street whistleblowers really need, above all else, is to see real cases made using their evidence, which is exactly what we haven't seen in recent years. Otherwise, the
60 sacrifices—which range from merely miserable to life-altering and catastrophic—aren't worth it. [...]

The pattern of whistleblowers coming forward and seeing their information either misused or absorbed into pain-free cash settlements may push the next generation of potential witnesses in a more cynical direction.

65 "The number one concern is that it incentivizes people to do nothing," Fleischmann [another whistleblower] says. "The likely thing people will do in the future is just quit."

Winston today insists he would do the same thing, if he had to do it all over again. [...] "People won't worry about it now," says Winston. "But one day they'll wonder why their air is polluted or their drinking water isn't safe. And this will be the reason why."

1 executives

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

5. Explain what the consequences of denouncing illegal practices can be for whistleblowers.
(____/ 2 marks)
6. What does Michael Winston refer to when he says "I just can't believe [...] that it all gets swept under the rug" (l.57)?
(____/ 3 marks)
7. Explain what the American government has done to encourage whistleblowers to come forward and what else should be done (according to the author)?
(____/ 3 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

1.	to disappear	5.	comfortable
2.	careless	6.	to go unpunished
3.	vengeance	7.	to lead
4.	unfair	8.	to encourage

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay of 300 words (+/- 10%) on the following subject: Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Some consider whistleblowers as heroes of the war on corporate and government secrecy and corruption, others as self-appointed vigilantes in a futile and dangerous struggle to impose complete transparency.

From your reading of the article and by drawing on recent examples in world news, defend and develop your personal position.

Yes, the church is bloody angry about these attacks on the poor, and rightly so

Giles Fraser, *The Guardian*, Friday 21 February 2014

There is nothing 'moral' about the government's portrayal of the vulnerable as scroungers. It is a national disgrace

5 Why are we so angry? By we, I mean the clergy. Because this is what the government has been hearing via our bishops and archbishops over the past few days. So let me explain.

Apparently, benefit cuts are popular with the electorate. The idea has been sold to the public that there is a whole class of scroungers which prefers to lounge around on the sofa all day, watching telly, smoking spliffs and drinking lager. Going out and getting a job makes little economic sense to such people. They are lazy and dissolute.
10 An insult to hard-working families everywhere. And nobody likes to have the piss taken out of them, which is what the sofa-lolling brigade have been doing to the rest of us. The "moral" case for benefit cuts is an attempt to re-establish a culture of personal responsibility. It is an attack on the feckless.

We are angry because this is such a distorted picture, an extrapolation from a tiny
15 number of cases into some sort of general rule. And this rule is now being used to disparage a whole class of vulnerable people whose greatest crime in life is to find themselves struggling to get by in the chill winds of a financial climate that was absolutely not of their making.

Since Christmas, my church has turned itself into a homeless shelter once a week.
20 Volunteers cook large batches of shepherd's pie for hungry people who have been wandering the streets most of the day. We provide a warm bed and a safe place to hang out for the evening. Camp beds are set up in the nave of the church. And bacon rolls and porridge are provided for breakfast. Unfortunately, business is thriving. There is a waiting list for beds. Homelessness has risen 60% in London over the past two
25 years. And half a million people now rely on food banks.

It's not just churches that are volunteering in this way. And many who help out with us are not themselves religious. But given the local nature of the parish system and given that churches have an outpost in every community in this country, the clergy are uniquely positioned to understand the effect that financial cuts are having on the
30 ground. And what makes many of us so bloody angry is that the reality of what is happening is not being acknowledged by politicians in government. They don't feel the need to face this reality because the war against the scroungers is so popular. So long as the rightwing press keeps stoking our sense of indignation at those who exploit the system, the government has little incentive to admit the much wider reality.that
35 austerity is turning pockets of Britain into wastelands of hopelessness. The scrounger tag has become a way to blame the poor for their poverty. How convenient. Those who created this financial crisis have got away scot free, protected by their money

and their lobbying power. So now we blame the poor, a much easier target.

40 David Cameron, in responding to the churches, has insisted that his is a moral vision too. But no moral vision worthy of the name can remain indifferent to the hunger and homelessness of others. This is morality 101. Indeed, far from operating out of a moral instinct, the government has poisoned the wells of public sympathy by amplifying a fear that vulnerable people are actually sniggering cheats.

45 Nothing about this shameless sleight of hand is moral. In fact, it's right out of the bullying handbook. Maybe – just maybe – he is feeling a little bit guilty about all of this. And we often blame those who make us feel guilty. Or we just ignore them. It's so much easier than admitting our own responsibility for the misery of others. No, Prime Minister: this is not moral – it's a national scandal.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 50 words per question)

1. What is making the clergy so angry?
(____ / 3 marks)
2. Why are “the poor a much easier target”? (lines 38-39)
(____ / 3 marks)
3. Explain the following sentence from the article: “This is morality 101.” (line 42)
(____ / 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|----------------------|-------|------------------|-------|
| 1. freeloader | _____ | 5. to feed | _____ |
| 2. good- for-nothing | _____ | 6. reservoir | _____ |
| 3. to cope | _____ | 7. disrespectful | _____ |
| 4. station | _____ | 8. deceit | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

The sentiment that "welfare" is a luxury we can no longer afford seems to be gaining ground. Drawing on examples from various countries, discuss what is at stake in the debate around the Welfare State.

ROMNEY'S STUMP SPEECH EVOLVED OVER TIME

By ASHLEY PARKER, The New York Times, January 3, 2012

BEDFORD, N.H. —Last month in New Hampshire, Mitt Romney delivered what his aides billed his “closing argument,” a final pitch to voters before the nominating contests begin.

5 The remarks — an aggressive attack on President Obama combined with Mr. Romney’s own vision for the future of the country — were the latest iteration of his stump speech, which has slowly evolved since he announced his candidacy for president.

10 The current speech differs from the earliest version, when Mr. Romney was trying to introduce himself to voters. In that, he often would begin with a meandering story about how when he was a boy, his parents put him in a Rambler and drove him across the country, from national park to national park, and instilled in him a love for the country.

His mother, he said, would read aloud from a book called “Men to Match My Mountains,” and early on the campaign trail, Mr. Romney liked to quote from the Samuel Walter Foss poem that inspired the book’s name. (It’s a poem he still recites, but with less frequency.)

15 “Bring me men to match my mountains, bring me men to match my plains,” Mr. Romney would say, quoting the poem’s first four lines. “Men with empires in their purpose, and new eras in their brains.”

20 The current speech also differs from the one given during Mr. Romney’s “humanizing phase,” when he was trying to show voters that, despite his \$200 million estimated net worth, he understood their concerns. Then, he began imbuing his remarks with more personal details, like how his father, born poor in Mexico, began as a lath and plaster carpenter before rising to lead American Motors, and how his wife, Ann, was the granddaughter of a Welsh coal miner.

25 During the fall, Mr. Romney began rolling out more policy-based addresses. He unveiled a foreign policy speech at The Citadel in South Carolina in October, in which he called Mr. Obama weak, and argued for a more muscular foreign policy and an “American century.” And in November, Mr. Romney modified his speech again to give it a heavier economic focus, detailing how he would overhaul entitlement programs like Social Security and Medicare. Mr. Romney has several failsafe lines, which occur often
30 across all of his remarks. He always gets applause when he says that his first act in office would be repealing

“Obamacare,” the president’s health care overhaul. And he always gets appreciative laughs when he argues that he is not a career politician, having spent only four years in office as the governor of Massachusetts, saying, “I like to joke that I didn’t inhale.”Mr.

35 Romney’s latest speech combines elements from all his previous addresses. But this “closing argument,” which never once mentions any of his Republican rivals, presents an aggressive argument against four more years of Mr. Obama in the grandest of terms.

40 “This is an election not to replace a president, but to save a vision of America,” Mr. Romney says. “It’s a choice between two very different destinies.”

He paints the November contest as “a battle for America’s soul.”

Mr. Romney hits Mr. Obama directly: “President Barack Obama has reversed John Kennedy’s call for sacrifice¹,” he says, in one of his harsher lines. “He would have Americans ask, ‘What can the country do for you?’ ”

45 He argues that Mr. Obama wants to create an “entitlement society,” whereas he prefers a “merit-based” society. “In a merit-based society, people achieve their dreams through hard work, education, risk-taking and even a little luck,” Mr. Romney says. “An opportunity society produces pioneers and inventors. It inspires its citizens to build and create.”

50 But his speech also offers a nuanced contrast between the two men. Mr. Romney often says that he believes in America and asserts his love for the country; the unspoken implication is that Mr. Obama, who Mr. Romney sometimes suggests is taking his cues from the “social democrats in Europe,” does neither.

55 The speech, which features some of Mr. Romney’s strongest criticisms of Mr. Obama so far, is a reflection of the current moment in the race — a time when voters are finally tuning in, making their decisions and looking for an electable Republican who can beat the president in November. Mr. Romney has always sought to cast himself in terms of the general election, contrasting himself with Mr. Obama rather than his Republican opponents. But at the time Mr. Romney first gave this speech here in Bedford, his team
60 also believed that they were having trouble breaking through “the noise,” as they dubbed the cacophony of strategy stories and political process pieces, and that one way to punch through was by intensifying their attacks on the president.

Still, all is not negative. When Mr. Romney took the stage, he did so to the thumping beat of his official campaign theme song: Kid Rock’s “Born Free.”

65

¹A reference to John F. Kennedy’s Inaugural Address, January 20, 1961: “Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country.”

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 50 words per question)

8. Mr. Romney has deliberately chosen to attack President Obama in his campaign speeches. In your own words, explain what his main criticisms are.

(____/ 2 marks)

9. Describe how Mr. Romney's speech has changed over time.

(____/ 3 marks)

10. When Mr. Romney uses expressions like "entitlement society," as opposed to "merit-based society," what is the contrast he is drawing between himself and President Obama?

(____/ 3 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. competition | _____ | 5. pulsing | _____ |
| 2. rambling | _____ | 6. to reveal or disclose | _____ |
| 3. to equal or correspond to | _____ | 7. to revoke | _____ |
| 4. path | _____ | 8. to label | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Mitt Romney has chosen to base a great deal of his nomination campaign on attacks on President Obama. Taking a look back at previous presidential campaigns, in the U.S. or elsewhere in the world, would you argue that this is an effective approach?

Justify and illustrate your answer.

HOW WE GOT HERE

By ROSS DOUTHAT

Abridged from The New York Times, October 31, 2010

From the early 1990s through the 2008 election, Americans grew steadily more liberal. Voters became more supportive of government spending and more sympathetic toward the poor. They were increasingly secular and increasingly likely to favor gay marriage. They were more worried about climate change and more inclined to support universal health care. And not surprisingly, they were more and more likely to identify as Democrats. This trend wasn't just a blip created by the Bush administration's unpopularity, as some conservatives hopefully suggested. It was a significant, long-running shift, pushed along by deeper demographic forces. Reliable conservative constituencies (white Christians, married couples) were shrinking. Liberal-leaning ones (Hispanics, single parents, the unchurched) were expanding. And the next generation seemed to be in the bag for liberalism. Younger voters weren't just more liberal than their parents; they were more liberal than the previous generation had been at the same age, suggesting a more enduring shift.

But since Barack Obama took the oath of office, the country's leftward momentum has reversed itself. In some cases, nearly 20 years of liberal gains have been erased in 20 months. Americans are more likely to self-identify as conservative than at any point since Bill Clinton's first term. They've become more skeptical of government and more anxious about deficits and taxes. They're more inclined to identify as pro-life and anti-gun control, more doubtful about global warming, more hostile to regulation. And, not surprisingly, they're more likely to consider voting Republican on Tuesday.

So what happened to the brave new liberal era? Well, a few things. The Wall Street bailout made big government seem like a corrupt racket. The unemployment rate made activist government appear helpless in a crisis. The yawning deficits made a free-spending government look like a luxury the country might not be able to afford.

These were all difficulties that Obama inherited, in one sense or another. But the Democrats swiftly created further problems for themselves. The central premise of the White House's policy-making, the assumption that an economic crisis is a terrible thing to waste, turned out to be a grave tactical mistake. It drew exactly the wrong lesson from earlier liberal eras, when the most enduring expansions of government — Social Security in the 1930s, Medicare in the 1960s — were achieved amid strong economic growth, rather than at the bottom of a recession.

The Obama Democrats, by contrast, tried to push through health care reform and climate legislation with the unemployment rate stuck at a 28-year high. On health care, they won a costly victory. On cap-and-trade, they forced vulnerable congressmen to cast a controversial vote, and came away with nothing to show for it. In both cases, they reaped a backlash, while defining themselves as ideological and intensely out-of-touch.

At the same time, their legislative maneuverings — the buy-offs and back-room deals, the inevitable coziness with lobbyists — exposed the weakness of modern liberal

governance: it tends to be stymied and corrupted by the very welfare state that it's
40 seeking to expand. Many of Barack Obama's supporters expected him to be another
Franklin Roosevelt, energetically experimenting with one program after another. But
Roosevelt didn't have to cope with the web of interest groups that's gradually woven
itself around the government his New Deal helped build. And while Obama twisted in
these webs, the public gradually decided that it liked bigger government more in theory
45 than in practice.

Nor have Obama's political instincts helped him through these difficulties. Presidents
always take more blame than they deserve for political misfortune, but Obama's style
has invited disillusionment. His messianic campaign raised impossible hopes, and he
has made a habit of baldly overpromising, whether the subject is the unemployment
50 rate or the health care bill. Obama seems as if he would have been a wonderful chief
executive in an era of prosperity and consensus, when he could have given soaring
speeches every week and made us all feel tingly about America. But he's miscast as a
partisan scrapper, and unpersuasive when he tries to feel the country's economic pain.

Thus his sagging poll numbers; thus the debacle that probably awaits his party on
55 Tuesday. It will not be as grave a defeat as many conservatives would like to think: the
health care bill may yet be remembered by liberals as a victory worth the price, the
demographic trends are still with the Democrats, and the Republicans will return to
power unprepared to wield it. But nonetheless, an opportunity has opened for the Right
that would have been unimaginable just two years ago — a chance to pre-empt a
60 seemingly inevitable liberal epoch with an unexpected conservative revival. Now they
just have to seize it.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 16 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

11. Illustrate how and why this text represents the Conservative viewpoint on the first two years of the Obama Administration?

(____/ 4 marks)

12. How does the author account for this reversal?

(____/ 2 marks)

13. What does the author mean when he refers to Barack Obama's "messianic campaign"?

(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 8 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

1. an illusion

5. expanding

2. segments of
the electorate
taken for

6. dubious
proximity

3. granted /
guaranteed

7. in the wrong
part

4. opposed to
abortion

8. declining

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

In the late 1920s and early 1930s in the US and in France, the economic crisis led to state interventionism, the implementation of social policies, and ultimately their consolidation into the Welfare State. Why should the crisis of 2008 not produce a revival or reinvention of the Welfare State but rather a conservative turn?

N.B. You may not limit yourself to the United States in your answer.

BEING GREEN PAYS OFF

Short version of an article from THE TIME

Who says what's good for the environment is bad for the economy? From electric cars to solar cells, products that protect the planet will earn hefty profits in the future.

5 BMW has recently unveiled its vision of the future of driving. It is a four seat car with a top speed of 120 km/h (75 m.p.h.) and a range of up to 250 km (155 miles). This car is a clean machine: it gives off no pollution that could foul the air in any way. It runs on an electric motor powered by high-energy sodium-sulfur batteries. Although it takes electricity to charge the batteries, the power plants can be far from smoggy cities. Just about all the world's major automakers are revving up to produce electric cars. They realize that in the 21st century, consumers do increasingly favour (and governments do
10 mandate) technology that preserves and protects the environment. The fortunes of companies and nations will rise and fall on how well they heed the call to save the planet.

Every potential innovation, whether a new kind of windmill or biodegradable plastic made from plants, is attracting attention from companies in host of industrial nations.
15 The U.S.'s Du Pont is in a race with Germany's Hoechst and Britain's ICI, among others, to develop replacement chemical for ozone-destroying chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). Germany's Siemens is vying with such firms as Amoco in the U.S. and Sanyo in Japan to produce cheap and efficient solar electric cells.

Who wins the race to perfect and sell green technologies will depend to a great extent
20 on who has the edge in engineering and marketing skills. But equally important may be the encouragement companies get from their countries' political leaders. Governments can exert enormous influence over how aggressively businesses take the environment into account, using sticks and carrots (sticks in the form of tough standards for products and manufacturing processes, carrots consisting of tax breaks and other incentives that
25 reward innovation).

The U.S. government has, for the most part, done a poor job of spurring business to come up with breakthroughs. In the past, federal agencies issued environmental compliance goals, like standards for the amount of pollutants coming out of smokestacks, and then mandated the acceptable methods for achieving the targets.
30 There was no incentive to do better than the standards or to develop innovative tools for meeting the goals.

Meanwhile, the U.S. is stepping up support for research into energy conservation and renewable power sources.

Funding in these areas has risen. But the White House and Congress have not shown
35 much interest in politically tough measures such as sharply higher gasoline taxes or more stringent auto-fuel-economy standards, both of which would force Detroit to design more efficient cars. There is action as well at the level of the European Community as a whole. The E.C. has helped finance development of clean

technologies, such as 100% recyclable cars and low- polluting power generators.

- 40 Many companies have recognized, without any nudge from governments, that respect for the environment can boost profits. In the U.S., 3M has drastically reduced pollution and waste at its manufacturing plants and despite the conventional wisdom that says environmentalism is a luxury has steadily increased its profits.

- 45 Once industrialists think about it at all seriously, they almost inevitably see the financial advantages of investments in environmental technology. Sustainable development meant guiding industry's views on environmental issues. After some time, executives from such firms as Chevron, Mitsubishi, Royal Dutch/Shell and Volkswagen have agreed on a set of business principles, including the need for sustainable management of resources, the charging of environmental costs against corporate profits and the rule
- 50 that polluters, not the public, must pay for cleanup.

Yet even with greater industrial environmental consciousness, there could clearly be no prospect for sustainable development in either the developed or the developing world without 50 government incentives.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 12 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

1. How do you understand the following quotation taken from the document. Comment on it.

"The fortunes of companies and nations will rise and fall on how well they heed the call to save the planet." (l. 11-12)

(____/ 2 marks)

2. What does the following quotation imply for countries and international companies?

"Who wins the race to perfect and sell green technologies will depend to a great extent on who has the edge in engineering and marketing skills." (l. 18-19)

(____/ 2 marks)

3. What do you think of the electric car depicted in the first paragraph? What is your vision of the future of driving?

(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 10 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax. Indication the line number.

1. accelerate

2. pay attention to

3. to be in competition with

4. using warnings and incentives

5. encouraging business

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 18 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Is going green a wise solution to saving the planet? Can the planet be 'saved' after all? Isn't it subversive to denounce the pessimistic description of our polluted planet as vastly exaggerated?

Give your opinion in a coherent, clear and logical way.

The Guardian, Friday 6 February 2009

THE ALL-SEEING EYE OF STATE SURVEILLANCE

It is not any one cigarette or one extra drink that is ruinous to the health. The damage is done over the years, almost imperceptibly. Grave threats to the health of democracy can also accrue so incrementally that they draw little attention. A committee of peers diagnose one such danger today in a report on the steady creep of surveillance. The charge of hysteria is routinely used to sweep aside such talk when it comes from crusading journalists and pressure groups. The Lords constitutional affairs committee, however, cannot be dismissed the same way. A more dignified band of dignitaries would be hard to imagine - it includes a former attorney general who is a conservative champion of that antiquated role, a Tory expert on the constitution, and a founder of that force of militant moderation that was called the SDP.

Their insistence that mundane data collection "risks undermining the fundamental relationship between the state and the citizen" may be dramatic, but it is rooted in careful argument. Privacy is not only a precondition to a life of any quality, it is part of the meaning of liberty. The rule of law in Britain is not codified in a constitution, but underpinned by shared support for the twin ideals of executive restraint and individual freedom. Under the gaze of 4 million CCTV cameras, and in the face of the burgeoning electronic tabs being kept on citizens, both ideals are strained. Bit by bit the state - and private firms - cease to believe that the courtroom is the place to hold individuals to account, and instead grow used to monitoring them in all sorts of contexts in the name of convenience. Bit by bit, meanwhile, individuals learn to live with the ubiquitous prying eye.

Technical change rather than political choice explains much of this drift. As collecting information gets cheaper and easier, it starts being collated in ways that no one would have dreamed up in the past. The committee does not dispute that this can bring gains, from cracking crimes to ensuring patients receive consistent treatment. As with complex derivatives in the City, however, the great problem has been that regulation has not kept pace with innovation. The peers suggest sensible steps to redress the balance - for instance, a new requirement on public bodies and firms to encrypt the personal data they hold to cut the risk of it falling into the wrong hands. An independent review of the proclaimed but largely unproven benefits of CCTV could help ensure it is used only where it really does make a difference. Automatic assessment of what government announcements mean for privacy - something already required for race equality and red tape - would build a prompt into the system so that Whitehall would get into the habit of considering the issue, a prompt that could help to turn the tide.

Failure to think is not always the problem - sometimes it is bad deliberate decisions. The peers rightly insist that it is just not acceptable for the state to hang on to the DNA of individuals never convicted of a crime, purely on the arbitrary basis that they once came under suspicion. Strasbourg recently said the same thing, in a ruling that must now be given effect. The wide powers to snoop that council officers have been handed need to be trimmed. Judicial oversight is part of the answer; another part is making sure

the powers are used proportionately. Following someone suspected of a violent crime is one thing; following a parent suspected of fibbing about their address to get their child into the right school is quite another.

- 45 One of the few shortcomings of the Lords report is its silence on those threats to privacy that ministers are currently pushing, notably the super-database on mobile communications. That silence may be the price for achieving all-party consensus. Even after that price has been paid, however, the committee has done invaluable work. It has nailed the age-old lie on surveillance - by asserting that those with nothing to hide can still have a great deal to fear.

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 12 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 20 words per mark)

2. Why can't the Lord's Committee report on surveillance be dismissed as easily as previous criticisms were ?
(____/ 2 marks)
3. Why does surveillance raise a particular problem in the British context?
(____/ 2 marks)
4. How and why has surveillance evolved ?
(____/ 2 marks)
5. What are the benefits and drawbacks of new surveillance technology, what suggestions do the Lords make to amend it ?
(____/ 2 marks)
6. Why will the government be legally obligated to make changes in its practices ?
(____/ 2 marks)
7. On what point has the committee been disappointing and why ?
(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

____/ 12 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| 1. dismiss : | _____ | 7. bureaucracy | _____ |
| 2. ordinary | _____ | 8. signal | _____ |
| 3. pushed to the limits | _____ | 9. decision | _____ |
| 4. inquisitive | _____ | 10. investigate | _____ |
| 5. new direction | _____ | 11. lying | _____ |
| 6. solving : | _____ | 12. weaknesses | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

____/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Should freedom be the price to pay for security?

THE GROUND CLINTON BROKE

Adapted from The Washington Post, Wednesday, May 21, 2008 By Ruth Marcus

5 Hillary Clinton isn't going to be elected the first female president – not this year, anyway. The reasons for this outcome have gratifyingly little to do with her gender. It may not seem that way right now to Clinton supporters seething over her treatment, but the 2008 campaign has propelled the country significantly closer to the moment when a woman takes the oath of office.

Yes, there have been sexist episodes and comments. Yes, it still is more acceptable to joke about gender than about race in the U.S. today.

10 But the notion that Clinton was the victim of unrelenting, vicious hatred because she is a woman – is it safe to call this reaction overwrought? Clinton managed to win more votes than any primary candidate in either party ever had before. It's hard to square that result with the notion that her candidacy exposed a deep vein of misogyny.

15 Considering the inexplicably intense emotions that Clinton evokes, the litany of ugliness is surprisingly short. Meanwhile, the 2008 campaign has rewritten the rule book on playing presidential politics when the team is coed. The female candidate gets to be refreshingly post-feminist. "If you want a winner who knows how to take them on, I'm your girl," Clinton announced last August. "I'm very comfortable in the kitchen," she said last month, chiding Barack Obama for not being able to stand the heat of hard questions.

20 For male candidates, gender remains a treacherous minefield whose danger zones the 2008 campaign only began to chart. Think of John Edwards commenting on Clinton's bright coral jacket ("I'm not sure about that coat") when asked in one of the debates to mention something he disliked about his opponent. You can bet a male candidate won't be dispensing fashion commentary in 2012 – if there's a woman running.

25 And Obama won't be calling female reporters "sweetie" again anytime soon, as he did last week in brushing off a query from a local television reporter. The reporter got the last laugh, pointing out in her segment that "this sweetie never did get an answer to that question." This sweetie rather liked that.

30 More important than helping candidates figure out how to talk about gender, Clinton's candidacy has dispensed with damaging myths about women's capacity to compete in presidential politics. Not tough enough? If anything, Clinton came off as too tough. Too emotional? Clinton teared up in New Hampshire – and this display of vulnerability helped her win. She demonstrated stamina and determination. Improbably, she ended up winning the white- guy vote – and not all of this can be explained by the notion that these voters faced an unpalatable choice between gender and race.

35 From a feminist perspective, Clinton's was not a perfect candidacy. Part of this stems from a fact outside Clinton's control: that her route to power was derivative. Hillary Clinton has been elected to the Senate, twice, in her own right, but the fact that her road to the White House involved standing by her man, no matter how badly he behaved, made her a weak vessel for the feminist cause.

40 And Clinton's least attractive campaign moments came when she took up the gender card and chose to play it as victim instead of trailblazer. The notion that the male candidates were ganging up on her because she is a woman was silly. The complaint that asking her the first question in debates was evidence of a double standard was even sillier.

45 By contrast, one of Clinton's most powerful lines came on Super Tuesday, when she thanked "my mother, who was born before women could vote and is watching her daughter on this stage tonight." It's easy to forget, in the passions of the time, the long way traveled in a relatively brief span.

Like the mountain climber forced to turn back just before reaching Everest's summit, however, women still face an aching long ascent. If you care about seeing a woman elected president, one of the biggest disappointments of this campaign is the paucity of credible women waiting in the wings, in either party.

If not 2008, then when? If not Clinton, then who? There are no obvious answers. Then again, four years ago, Obama was an unknown state senator, and almost no one imagined that an African American could win the presidency in 2008

READING COMPREHENSION

____/ 12 marks

Answer the following questions in full sentence form using your own words (about 40 words per mark)

8. Is the perspective of a female president more plausible now than in the past?

(____/ 2 marks)

9. According to the author of the text, has the primary campaign been particularly violent?

(____/ 2 marks)

10. Have there been any traces of misogyny in it?

(____/ 2 marks)

11. Can Hillary Clinton be considered a feminist symbol?

(____/ 2 marks)

12. Has Hillary Clinton benefited from referring to the gender issue?

(____/ 2 marks)

13. Is the point of view of the author of this article a feminist one?

(____/ 2 marks)

SYNONYMS

___/ 12 marks

For each of the following, find ONE equivalent word or expression in the article. The words are given in the order of the text, but not necessarily in the same verbal form or syntax.

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. infuriated by | _____ | 7. to explore | _____ |
| 2. ceaseless | _____ | 8. to dismiss a question | _____ |
| 3. excessive | _____ | 9. baffling | _____ |
| 4. to reconcile | _____ | 10. energy | _____ |
| 5. male and female | _____ | 11. unpleasant | _____ |
| 6. to blame | _____ | 12. pioneer | _____ |

WRITTEN PRODUCTION

___/ 16 marks

Write an essay that is approximately 300 words in length (+/- 10%. Largely under or over this will incur penalty marks).

Race and gender as structuring factors of elections: a typically American reality?

Further materials and information on some of the previous texts and their concerns

Ibram X. Kendi: 'The very heartbeat of racism is denial' : News Center (rochester.edu)

<https://www.rochester.edu/newscenter/ibram-x-kendi-the-very-heartbeat-of-racism-is-denial-470332/>

Speechwriters Compare The 2012 Stump Speeches : NPR

<https://www.npr.org/2012/10/16/163018622/comparing-the-2012-stump-speeches>

Lesson Plan | On the Stump: Examining the Form and Function of Campaign Speeches - The New York Times (nytimes.com)

<https://archive.nytimes.com/learning.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/01/24/on-the-stump-examining-the-form-and-function-of-campaign-speeches/>

Romney's Morbid New Stump Speech - The Atlantic

<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/10/romneys-morbid-new-stump-speech/263789/>

FACT CHECK: Romney's stump speech – Center for Public Integrity

<https://publicintegrity.org/accountability/fact-check-romneys-stump-speech/>