LANGUAGE COMPETENCE TEST

ENGLISH FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Written examination

(writing skill and reading comprehension)

The use of a printed general language dictionary is allowed. You have 100 minutes for the reading comprehension test <u>and</u> the writing task.

TASK 1 (Total: 20 points)

Choose <u>ONE</u> of the writing tasks (A, or B) and write your opinion using the given prompts in 180-200 words.

A)

The world's population has reached 8 billion people, a milestone in human development, but the overall growth rate of the global population is slowing. In every region of the world except Africa, population levels have begun to level off due to declining birthrates, with some countries -like China - experiencing population decline and others bracing for it. At the same time the number of international migrants is growing, currently nearly 4% of the world's people live outside their country of birth, according to the United Nations.

Use the given prompts for your composition:

- challenges of global population growth
- consequences of aging population
- potential ways to tackle the problem of migration

B)

In 2002, India's government launched an international tourism campaign known as "Incredible India." A similar campaign today might as well be called "Inevitable India." Not just enthusiasts within the country, but a chorus of global analysts, have declared India as the next great economic power: Goldman Sachs has predicted it will become the world's second-largest economy by 2075. But as the world becomes more polarized, India's foreign policy decisions will test the country's superpower ambitions.

Use the given prompts for your composition:

- opportunities of India
- challenges India is faced with
- India's role in world politics

TASK 2 (Total: 20 points)

Text 1 (Max: 10points)

Read the text carefully. Answer the questions briefly (1- 10 words) on the basis of the text. Full sentences are <u>not</u> required. There is an example (0) for you.

CHILE

Long before jihadists destroyed the World Trade Centre, another September 11th had entered history as a dark day, especially for Latin America. On that date in 1973 Chile's armed forces overthrew Salvador Allende, an elected Socialist president, and his chaotic, divided government. The coup was a national trauma and a continental shock. Augusto Pinochet, its leader, went on to erect a brutal personal dictatorship that lasted 17 years. It murdered several thousand opponents. Tens of thousands were tortured. Pinochet's aim was to eradicate not just Marxism but the democracy that he believed had allowed it to thrive. That his regime's free-market policies laid the foundations for sustained economic growth in Chile cannot erase that infamous stain.

Now Chile is entering a stage in its history when the split between left and right again feels acute. Gabriel Boric, the millennial president who came to power on the back of a "social explosion" against inequality, has offered more fulsome praise of Allende than any of his predecessors, invoking him in his inauguration speech. But support for the young left-winger has fallen: since he took office last year, Mr Boric's approval ratings have dropped from 50% to less than 30%. An attempt, backed by his government, to replace the constitution, which is descended from the one introduced under Pinochet, was rejected by a whopping 62% of voters last year. And while the left may be in power, the far right, led by José Antonio Kast, appears to be ascendant. What can Chile's politicians learn from 1973? The first reaction should be: never again. Many Chileans imagined that the coup was the only way out and that Pinochet's regime would be a temporary expedient. He proved them wrong. Some on the left still claim that the coup was manufactured in Washington, coming as it did at the height of the cold war. That is too easy. Certainly Richard Nixon's administration, fearing a second Cuba in Latin America, did what it could to weaken Allende's government. But the coup was home-grown and commanded much support among Chileans. It was the consequence of a disastrous political failure, that of Allende's Popular Unity coalition. He proclaimed a "Chilean road to socialism" by peaceful parliamentary means. But many in his coalition wanted revolution and had little regard for democracy. What he meant by socialism was state control of the economy, which failed in Chile as it did elsewhere. His biggest mistake was to attempt to impose his revolution, intended to be irreversible, without a clear popular mandate or a parliamentary majority.

I.	Answer the questions briefly (1- 10 words) on the basis of the text. Full sentences are <u>not</u> required. There is an example (0) for you.							
0.	Question: How are 1973 and 2001 connected? Answer: Something terrible happened on 11th September in both years.							
1.	Who was the leader of Chile's armed forces in 1973?							
2.	Why did the leader of the military rule turn against democracy?							
3.	What turned out to be beneficial for the country during the military rule?							
4.	What was the social background that brought about Gabriel Boric's victory in the elections?							
5.	What was one of Gabriel Boric's first failures?							
6.	Why were the people who supported the military coup in 1973 disappointed?							
7.	What was the reason the USA meddled in Chile's affairs in 1973?							
8.	What did Allende and some of his followers disagree about when they had the power?							
9.	How did Allende want to change the system of the economy?							
10.	How could Allende's reforms have succeeded?							

Text 2 (Max. 10 points)

Read the text and write the letter of the most suitable expression (A-M) in the boxes on the answer sheet. There are two extra letters that you do not need. There is an example (0) for you.

NEGOTIATING WITH TERRORISTS: PROS AND CONS

For years, US and UK leaders have regularly stated, "We do not negotiate with terrorists," citing(0) They argue that such negotiations could fuel terrorism and legitimize terrorists' aims. However, some Western nations have reportedly paid large ransoms to bring home journalists and aid workers captured by ISIS. The "terrorist" label itself can be ambiguous, as some groups are not officially(1)
There is a moral argument that governments should not negotiate with terrorists. Paying ransoms, for instance, helps terrorist groups(2), pay their members, and fuel further terrorism and hostage-taking.
Opponents of negotiations claim that doing so encourages more terrorism. They argue that by presenting(3), terrorists may see hostage-taking as an ineffective strategy.
However, some experienced negotiators believe that governments absolutely(4); that by refusing to engage with terrorists, governments are only repeating old mistakes and misconceptions; and that(5) unnecessarily as a result.

The "no negotiation" doctrine traces its roots back to a tragic event in 1973 when Palestinian militants took hostages in the Saudi embassy in Khartoum. US President Richard Nixon declared

there(6), and the Western hostages were killed the next day. Still, this policy has become a cornerstone of US and UK foreign policy.
The UK and the US governments do not pay ransoms for hostages or terrorists, while some countries – including Colombia and Italy – have made the payment of ransoms illegal. The problem is that(7) ransoms doesn't work.
The impact of the UK and US stance on discouraging hostage-taking is debatable. In some cases, it may reduce the chances of safe returns. In 2013–14, ISIS captured around 20 Western hostages in Syria. All governments except the UK and US paid ransoms, resulting in the(8) British and American hostages.
ISIS gained tens of millions from European nations in ransom payments,(9) However, it could be argued that executing hostages enhanced the group's international profile, notoriety, and recruitment efforts.
From a political perspective, quietly paying ransoms might have been more effective than devaluing hostages(10) and exposing them to execution.

A	TORTURE AND EXECUTION OF								
В	SHOULD NEGOTIATE WITH TERRORISTS								
C	MOST OF THE HOSTAGES WERE KILLED								
D	DESIGNATED AS TERRORISTS DESPITE THEIR								
	ACTIONS								
Е	CONTRIBUTING SIGNIFICANTLY TO ITS INCOME								
F	MAINTAIN CONTROL OVER TERRITORY								
G	LIVES ARE LOST								
H	MORAL AND PRACTICAL REASONS								
I	COULD BE NO NEGOTIATION WITH TERRORISTS								
J	IN THE EYES OF THEIR KIDNAPPERS								
K	WHICH DO NOT NEGOTIATE WITH TERRORISTS								
L	BANNING THE PAYMENT OF								
M	A UNITED FRONT AGAINST RANSOM PAYMENTS								

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
H										

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

ANSWER KEY

Reading comprehension

Text 1 (Max. 10 points)

I.	Answer the questions briefly (1- 10 words) on the basis of the text. Full sentences are <u>not</u> required. There is an example (0) for you.							
0.	Question: How are 1973 and 2001 connected? Answer: Something terrible happened on 11th September in both years.							
1.	Augusto Pinochet.							
2.	It made it possible for a Marxist to win elections.							
3.	The regime's free market policies.							
4.	There was a social eruption against inequality.							
5.	He couldn't get the constitution changed.							
6.	They thought the Junta would be temporary.							
7.	The US didn't want Chile to become a second Cuba.							
8.	Allende wanted democratic changes, but his followers wanted a revolution.							
9.	He wanted state control.							
10.	With more popular support, or a parliamentary majority.							

Text 2 (Max 10 points)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
D	F	M	В	G	I	L	A	E	J

ORAL EXAMINATION

(speaking skill and listening skill)
12-14 minutes

You have 10 minutes to prepare for the discussion of the presentation question (Task 2). Use only the blank paper for making notes.

(Maximum points: 40)

TASK 1

You will take part in an interview with the examiner. (You will discuss your choice of profession, your future professional plans, career prospects, etc.)

Interview questions:

(The questions given are examples only.)

- 1. Why did you choose this course and how well do you think the university prepares its students for their future careers?
- 2. In which country abroad would you be best able to realise your professional plans and why?
- 3. What are the main challenges you see for yourself in your professional career?
- 4. How do you feel about the role and importance of compulsory internship programmes?
- 5. How do you see/imagine yourself in 10-15 years in your profession?

TASK 2

Discuss **ONE** of the two presentation questions with the examiner.

- **A)** Is there a way to make the whole world a peaceful place? Why?/ Why not?
- **B**) What is being done and what else should be done by the international community to tackle environmental problems?