

**МИНИСТЕРСТВО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И НАУКИ РОССИЙСКОЙ ФЕДЕРАЦИИ**

**Федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение  
высшего профессионального образования**

**«НИЖЕГОРОДСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ  
ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
ИМ. Н.А. ДОБРОЛЮБОВА»**

**О.В. Петрова**

**ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ПЕРЕВОД**

**Учебно-методические материалы  
для студентов IV курса отделения английского языка  
переводческого факультета**

**Нижний Новгород  
2015**

Печатается по решению редакционно-издательского совета ФГБОУ ВПО «НГЛУ». Специальность: 45.05.01 – *Перевод и переводоведение*.

Дисциплина: Практический курс перевода (I иностранный язык – английский).

УДК 811.111'255 (075.8)

ББК 81.432.1-93

П 305

Петрова О.В. Общественно-политический перевод. Учебно-методические материалы для студентов IV курса переводческого факультета. – Н. Новгород: ФГБОУ ВПО «НГЛУ», 2015. – 49 с.

Учебно-методические материалы по общественно-политическому переводу предназначены для студентов переводческих факультетов и переводческих отделений факультетов иностранных языков. Материалы могут использоваться для проведения занятий и организации самостоятельной работы студентов по практическому курсу перевода первого иностранного языка (английского).

Цель данных методических материалов – научить применять на практике изученные ранее способы перевода, выработать умение осуществлять национально-культурную адаптацию текста при переводе, а также закрепить навыки переводческого анализа текста.

УДК 811.111'255 (075.8)

ББК 81.432.1-93

Составитель О.В. Петрова, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры теории и практики английского языка и перевода

Рецензенты: А.В.Иванов, доктор филологических наук, профессор,  
К.Е.Калинин, кандидат филологических наук, доцент

© ФГБОУ ВПО «НГЛУ», 2015

© Петрова О.В., 2015

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY NOTES.....	4
<b>Part I. EU: PROMISES AND RESULTS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Text 1. FIVE TOP AIMS OF THE EU.....	8
Text 2. FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS AND IS THERE SOMETHING ROTTEN IN BRUSSELS?.....	9
Text 3 "SOMETHING IS ROTTEN IN EUROPE" – EUROPEAN ELECTIONS REACTION ROUND-UP...	15
<b>Part II. US: FROM HOPES TO APPREHENSIONS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
Text 1. THE OBAMA STYLE: EFFICIENT, PRIVATE.....	20
Text 2. ELECTION ANALYSIS 2014.....	26
Text 3. AMERICA FACES MOST DANGEROUS TWO YEARS IN 150 YEARS.....	31
<b>Part III. WHO IS THE AGGRESSOR?.....</b>	<b>36</b>
Text 1. RUSSIA OR AMERICA: WHO IS THE REAL AGGRESSOR?.....	36
Text 2. COWARDLY MISFEASANCE OF DUTY.....	43

## INTRODUCTORY NOTES

Translation of a text should always start with the so-called pre-translation analysis. This analysis consists in answering a number of heterogeneous questions.

**1. What is the theme of the text?** It means finding out what the text is about. One should realize that a text in which the author concentrates on the criticism of the government for underfunding health care is not “about healthcare”, and an article on the problem of freedom of speech on the Internet is not “about the Internet”. It is necessary to be able to see the difference between the theme, the subject matter of a text and the material used to substantiate or illustrate the main idea.

**2. What is the text written for?** In other words, **what is the communicative purpose of the text?** Texts are seldom written “just to inform the readers”. As a rule the author’s purpose is different. The target audience is often well aware of facts stated in the text. So the author’s purpose can be to attract the readers’ attention to some particular aspects of the problem, to try to shape public opinion, to galvanize some political forces into action, etc. This is a very important stage of analysis because many choices made by a translator depend on the understanding of the purpose of the text. At this stage it is also reasonable to find out the author’s attitude to the problem discussed in the text, because it is closely connected with the purpose. It is necessary to identify those parts and elements of the text that are indicative of this attitude.

**3. What is the purpose of translating the text?** A text is never translated for no particular reason, just for the sake of translating. Same as there are no texts written for no purpose, there can be no translations done for no purpose. Before translating a text it is necessary to find out what this translation is needed for. It is also necessary to define the target audience of the text in the TL. A translation targeted, say, at analysts, who will use it to assess the balance of political forces and possible impacts of the events described in the article, could be different from a translation of the same article addressed to a mass audience. In this latter case there can also be various purposes: to inform readers about something happening in a different country, or to show that people in other countries have problems similar to their own, or to show how these problems are solved in other countries, etc. Anyway, a translator must know what the text is translated for, because it may significantly influence some choices in the process of translation. For example, *several thousand people* can be translated both as *несколько тысяч человек* and as *тысячи людей* – the choice will depend on whether we want merely to state the fact or we want to emphasize the mass character of the described event, which is predetermined by the purpose of translation.

**4. What is the difference between the target audience of the original text and its translation?** The purpose of translation is closely connected with the target audience. When translating a text one should keep in mind that both the background knowledge of the

TL speakers and the way they perceive a text can never coincide with those of the SL speakers. So from the very beginning it is necessary to find out what this difference can be and take it into consideration. It means that, apart from finding additional information on the subject matter of the text, it is necessary to decide what is naturally known to the readers of the original text and what can or cannot be known to the recipients of translation.

**5. What is the composition of the text?** Having discussed the questions of the theme, purpose of the text and its translation, the difference between the background knowledge of SL and TL readers of the text, it is now possible to turn to the text itself. The first thing to pay attention to is the composition of the text. In other words, at this stage it is necessary to see how the text is structured. Here we look at the succession in which facts and ideas are presented, at the dependence of the structure on the character of the text (for example, a fixed structure of some types of texts in business correspondence), at how homogeneous the text is logically, thematically and stylistically, see if it can be broken down to its constituent parts and how these parts are logically connected.

**6. What is the genre of the text and how does the style depend on it?** These questions can be discussed at an earlier stage, together with the communicative purpose of the text, because in some cases they are closely connected. For example, social satire is supposed to ridicule some socially important vices, follies, abuses, and shortcomings, while the purposes of writing a business letter are quite

different. But in most cases one and the same communicative purpose can be achieved through various types of texts. So the stage at which it is more appropriate to discuss the genre and genre style of the text depends entirely on the text.

To sum up, pre-translation analysis presupposes contextualization of the text; determination of the purposes for which the original text is written and for which it is translated; identification of potential translation recipients and their difference from the addressees of the original; analysis of the composition of the text and of those linguistic forms by means of which the goals set by the author are achieved.

After this the next stage of work, i.e. translation proper begins.

**PART I**  
**EU: PROMISES AND RESULTS**

Text 1

**FIVE TOP AIMS OF THE EU**

*BBC News*

These are the five big things the EU has set out to do.

1. Promote economic and social progress.

Help people earn enough money and get treated fairly.

2. Speak for the European Union on the international scene.

By working as a group the EU hopes that Europe will be listened to more by other countries.

3. Introduce European citizenship.

Anyone from a member state is a citizen of the EU and gets four special rights.

4. Develop Europe as an area of freedom, security and justice.

Help Europeans to live in safety, without the threat of war.

5. Maintain and build on established EU law.

Make laws that protect peoples rights in the member countries.

Text 2



**FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS  
AND IS THERE SOMETHING ROTTEN IN BRUSSELS?**

*By Tsvetan Vassilev<sup>1</sup>, NEW EUROPE*

*Published 01:57 January 13, 2014*

1 Belgium – Brussels –The European Union’s enlargement strategy, which was accepted in the beginning of the 1980s, was intended to fill the gaps of socio-economic development in the countries of the Community.

2 What is the situation thirty years later?

3 • The crisis in the European Union is the longest and deepest when compared to the rest of the world;

4 • The divergence between the developed countries of Northern Europe and the less developed states of Central and Southeastern Europe has not decreased, but one could say it has grown;

5 • The lack of effective economic mechanisms, which can accomplish integration, has led to political decisions that are often unjustified and detached from the economic reality;

6 • This environment is suitable for anti-European, xenophobic and other similar theories. Even worse, it is suitable for movements and political parties, as it allows them to become important factors in the political systems of the European countries.

7 Where did we go wrong?

8 Above all, the general approach was wrong! The inclusion

---

<sup>1</sup> Tsvetan Vassilev is Chairman of the Supervisory Board of Corporate Commercial Bank.

of the EU countries into the Eurozone, especially after 2000, was done based on hasty, mainly political decisions and ungrounded euphoria. None of the factors and champions of this political expansion took into consideration the fact that the great divergence in labour productivity and labour compensation cannot be overcome using solely the intended European programmes.

9 Furthermore, the absorption effectiveness and sector distribution turned out to be on much lower levels than the desired ones.

10 The major problems in this direction are:

11 – The insufficient volume of funds aimed at increasing the technological level and competitiveness of the less developed states' economies;

12 – The prioritised funding for infrastructure projects with no direct impact on the economic growth of the countries, especially in the last budget period, which coincided with the global financial and economic crisis;

13 – The ineffectiveness of the projects due to corruption in almost every country, combined with the practice of imposing companies from leading countries as contractors in most of the projects;

14 – The excessively short-term view on the new EU countries mainly as new markets. The chronic deficit in the trade balance of these countries, especially in the period between 2000 and 2008, led to the incontrollable growth of

- their debt – a problem which is still to be resolved;
- 15 -The concentration of Public-Private Investment (PPI) in a few countries (80% of the total PPI in the European Union in 2001 went to eight countries).
  - 16 At the same time, the majority of the investments in other EU countries (mostly the new ones) were used by banks which refinanced their local branches. These branches were mainly financing the import in these newly-joined countries in the period between 2005 and 2009. The withdrawal of these “direct investments” in the beginning of the crisis led to the situations that occurred in the Baltic countries, as well as in some other countries, including Bulgaria;
  - 17 – The hasty implementation of the single European currency and especially the acceptance of unprepared countries, such as Greece, Portugal and Spain, into the Eurozone. Moreover, the unfounded and prolonged “proud” support of the high exchange rate of the Euro to other currencies decreased the European Union countries’ export potential.
  - 18 Where to now?
  - 19 It is time to give a new meaning to the development model of the European integration in a Europe where even the Germans are ashamed to say “I am proud to be a European”.
  - 20 First and foremost, the emphasis should be on the change in the development of the EU from an “introvert” type of

system to an “extrovert” one. What does this really mean? Above all, it means increasing the competitive advantages of the EU countries in comparison with third countries. This could be put into practice when the Community cooperates with every member state so the latter can work towards a gradual balancing of its trade balance, achieving a surplus. If a surplus is unachievable within the EU, it has to be an aim when trading with third countries.

21 Otherwise, we would be forced to resolve the unachievable task of preventing the entropy of a system (the EU), which is comprised of imbalanced component elements – the countries.

22 In practice, this means a completely new qualitative approach in the programme and funds distribution for the new budget period. This approach should be based on more research and analyses of the expected effects of these investments as regards their impact on the export potential of the member states.

23 Secondly, there should be a change in the EU’s policy towards the overcoming of the crisis. The Nobel laureate Paul Krugman has recently stated that “Brussels has not had a single right decision since the beginning of the crisis”.

24 The policy of short-term expenditure decreases has brought depression and deflation to most European economies. Instead of decreasing the government debt, it has increased from 70% (Debt to GDP) in 2008 to 95% in 2013.

- 25 At the same time, we talk about a European Central Bank policy of negative interest rates (for example, why do banks have to be punished, more precisely for maintaining their liquidity levels).
- 26 I think this policy will deepen the discrepancies and it will increase the countries' debts and budget deficits. Last but not least, it will increase the unemployment levels.
- 27 Unquestionably, these severe problems require drastic measures in the right direction. Such measures have been missing so far. All of that reflects as it breaches the fundamental economic principles of the European Union, laid out in its establishing agreement – The Treaty of Rome, which guarantees the free movement of people, goods and capital.
- 28 Last but not least, it undermines the foundations of the system and the attractiveness of the European idea.

### **Comments and hints**

1. Before choosing a corresponding Russian word, pay attention to the context in which the following polysemantic English words and phrases are used; remember that words can be used as part of a compound term:  
environment (paragraph 6);  
absorption effectiveness and sector distribution (paragraph 9);  
“proud” support (paragraph 17);  
meaning (paragraph 19);

ashamed (paragraph 19; think how it combines with “to be proud”);

entropy (paragraph 21; it is obviously not a technical term in this context);

negative interest rates (paragraph 25);

to reflect (paragraph 27; note the absence of object).

2. Pay attention to the compound subject in the last sentence of paragraph 8: “None of the factors and champions of this political expansion”. Think of the way to translate it without making the Russian sentence sound clumsy and unnatural.

### Text 3

#### **"SOMETHING IS ROTTEN IN EUROPE" - EUROPEAN ELECTIONS REACTION ROUND-UP**

*Open Europe, Tuesday, May 27, 2014*

1     *As the dust settles following the European elections, we are now beginning to see some interesting analysis and commentary from across the EU. Here is our round-up.*

2     Despite the relative success of the established parties in Germany, many commentators have picked up on the EU-wide picture with FAZ's economics editor Holger Steltzner writing that the rise of anti-EU and protest parties across Europe should serve as a “dramatic warning” and that:

3     “The EU can not any longer be a one-way street, but should give back [powers] to the member states or local authorities.”

4     Die Welt's front page leader, written by Alan Poesner argues that:

5     "Something is rotten in Europe. And the reaction of politicians from the large European party-blocs makes it clear where the problem lies. 'Given the strength of the populists we have to work even closer together' is what you hear from both sides. This means: the establishment is locking ranks and closing its ears."

6 In Bild, Jan Schäfer argues that:

7 "In the future, extremists from both sides will grip  
Europe like a set of pliers! The result: more nationalism,  
more little-statism and less free trade. That is bad for  
exports, for jobs. It is the opposite of what Europe needs  
right now."

8 Spain's leading daily El País leader argues that:

9 "In reality, it will be difficult to get out of the dynamics  
of a grand coalition, irrespective of whether the latter is  
the most convenient [option] from the political point of  
view, which demands a display of alternatives. But there is  
little doubt [a grand coalition is the most convenient  
option] from the perspective of the necessary stability of  
the continent."

10 In Italian daily Corriere della Sera, Aldo Cazzullo  
argues that:

11 "The 2014 [European Parliament] elections will be  
remembered as the historic defeat of a political system.  
The eclipse of traditional parties. The rejection of the  
European establishment... The European vote confirms a  
trend that extends itself well beyond the continent: the  
sign of our times is the revolt against the elites, the  
institutions, the traditional forms of representation. And  
Europe is perceived as the bedrock and the guarantor of  
those elites people are rebelling against."

12 In France, Nicolas Barré argues in Les Echos that:



13 “With regard to Europe, the message from voters and those who abstained is rather a great distress towards political projects that seem empty to them – as [these projects] offer a choice between going backwards, which is always something difficult to enthuse about, and moving forward, but without knowing very well to where. Since the status quo is not an option either, for being so unsatisfactory, one can understand that a large number of voters have stayed away from ballot boxes or have voted 'against'.”

14 Dutch daily De Volkskrant features a comment piece by Alexis Brezet, the opinion pages editor of French daily Le Figaro in which he argues that:

15 "the European idea, as developed since the Treaty of Maastricht, is the main victim of the elections. If you add the non-voters to the voters who have supported a europhobic or eurosceptic party, it's only one third of EU citizens which supports the European project. Apparently Europe, which is being shaped without the people and sometimes against the people, doesn't appeal any longer...If Europe wants to win back the hearts of Europeans, simple reparations won't suffice: a fundamental reform is needed."

16 A leader in Belgian daily De Tijd argues that:

17 "the eurosceptics will in-avoidably weigh on decision making in their own countries and in Europe... Cameron

will now refuse to make any concessions to Brussels... discussions about British EU membership and its modalities will become very difficult. France is an even bigger problem. The core eurozone country has struggled for a long time already, economically... Now that a quarter of the French have voted for Marine Le Pen... it will become even more difficult for Hollande to implement necessary reforms and savings."

18 In Poland meanwhile, most commentators are focusing on the national implications of the vote - where Civic Platform beat Law and Justice by a very narrow margin - and have not really commented on the broader European picture.

19 No doubt much more will be written about these elections in the coming days and weeks, but it's clear that many already consider them to be a potential watershed moment for the 'European project'.

### **Comments and hints**

1. Think of a proper word to render the meaning of “established” in paragraph 2, where it is opposed to the rising anti-EU and protest parties.

2. What does FAZ stand for in paragraph 2?

3. Think of the meaning of “nationalism” in paragraph 7, and also of the meaning of “little-statism”. How is the word formed and why is it hyphenated?

4. What is the meaning of “for” in the last sentence of paragraph 13 (“for being so unsatisfactory”)?

5. Think of the contextual meaning of the verb “to feature” in paragraph 14.

6. Pay attention to the article “a” in the second sentence of paragraph 15 (“a europhobic or eurosceptic party”).

7. When translating the sentence “Apparently Europe, which is being shaped without the people and sometimes against the people, doesn't appeal any longer...” (paragraph 15) think what is being ignored: the existence of people or their opinion.

8. In the same paragraph the word “reparations” is opposed to a fundamental reform. Remember it when choosing the proper lexico-semantic variant of the word.

9. Make sure you analyze the structure of the first sentence in paragraph 17 correctly.

10. Do not fail to look up the word “modalities” (paragraph 17).

11. Depending on the target audience of your translation think if pragmatic adaptation is needed in the last sentence of paragraph 17.

12. What savings are meant in the last sentence of paragraph 17, if it can be difficult for the president “to implement necessary reforms and savings.”?

**PART II**  
**US: FROM HOPES TO APPREHENSIONS**

Text 1

**THE OBAMA STYLE: EFFICIENT, PRIVATE**

*By Jennifer Loven<sup>2</sup>, The Associated Press*

*Posted: 10/18/08, 9:00 pm pdt*

- 1      WASHINGTON – For all Barack Obama’s talk about change, there are signs that in style – if not substance – a new White House under Democrat Obama would operate much like the current one under President Bush.
- 2      Think discipline, efficiency and secrecy. These are hallmarks of Obama’s campaign, just as they have been for the last eight years in the leak-proof, tightly managed Bush administration.
- 3      If Obama becomes the nation’s 44th president, however, the extraordinary history-making aspects of his ascension could for a time overshadow almost everything else.
- 4      The nation would have its first black leader, one of its youngest presidents ever and someone with a varied, even exotic, background. The book on the United States’ checkered history of race relations would add a new chapter.

---

<sup>2</sup> Jennifer Loven is an American journalist and a former White House press correspondent for the Associated Press (AP) and current Managing Director at the Glover Park Group, a Washington, D.C.-based strategic communications firm.

And even if Obama's honeymoon was short-lived, the world would see America in a new light.

5 There are other ways, small and large, that an Obama White House promises to usher in newness.

6 Obama's two daughters, at ages 10 and 7, would be the youngest residents to roam the White House since 9-year-old Amy Carter tagged along with President Carter and his wife in 1977. Obama's poise at the podium would end an era of water-cooler jokes about presidential malapropisms.

7 On issues, Obama's approach on everything from Iraq to health care would look much different from the past eight years. He has pledged to preside over an unconventional style of politics and policy development virtually blind to party, an intriguing possibility even if hard to trust after years of divisive partisanship.

8 Circumstances often spring game-changing surprises on a new president. But how candidate Obama has managed his campaign, and what he's promised along the way, offer hints of how a President Obama would govern.

9 Obama, like Bush, demands an orderly shop.

10 Aides are expected to be both tightlipped and tight-knit. They get a "no drama" speech upon hire. And even if that rule is violated, histrionic disagreements over strategy, policy or personality are expected to stay behind closed doors, and they actually do. Most events come off like clockwork.

11 Obama's style as a candidate predicts a CEO-style president, one who delegates rather than micromanages.

12 It's the same model as for Bush, the nation's first MBA president. It derives in part from something the two men have in common: natural political gifts that set them on a path to the White House that took shortcuts around much government experience. That means policy experts are needed for heavy lifting.

13 The 47-year-old Obama hasn't finished his first term in the U.S. Senate, and before that had just eight years as a state lawmaker under his government belt.

14 Obama, like Bush, relies most on a small, hard-to-penetrate inner circle. It's been a successful formula, but can irk power players in his party and in Congress, who sometimes see Team Obama as too insular. This image was only fed by the decision to place Obama's campaign headquarters far from Washington in Chicago and the way his campaign used the Internet and grass-roots supporters, more than party bosses, to capitalize on the Obama phenomenon.

15 Obama's discipline is less about the importance of secrecy and more about making the organizational trains run on time, said Princeton University political historian Julian Zelizer.

16 Bush and Obama stand for very different things, says Zelizer, but Obama "runs his campaign with the same sort of

methodical efficiency and closed nature of the Bush White House.”

17 “He’s not going to have a freewheeling White House where people are free to go out on their own and do what they want and be allowed to talk to the press,” Zelizer said.

18 Sen. Dick Durbin, a longtime Obama friend and fellow Illinois Democrat, says Obama created a tight ship in part by being willing to hear things he doesn’t like from aides, and by not ripping into them when mistakes were made. “There were setbacks, but there was no bloodletting,” he said.

19 Obama is known for his loyalty, as well as for preferring aides who keep their mind on the work and the attention on the boss.

### **Comments and hints**

1. Pay attention to the composition of the text. See how the statement expressed in one paragraph is further expounded on in the next paragraph.

2. Compare what is said in paragraphs 1 and 7. Does the author speak about politics in paragraph 1?

3. Pay attention to the meaning of the word “secrecy” in paragraph 2. If it is a hallmark of an election campaign, it obviously can be neither “секретность” nor “конфиденциальность”.

4. What extraordinary history-making aspects of Obama’s ascension are meant in paragraph 3? Find a way to say it in

Russian without seeming to imply some shady past of the candidate.

5. The word “honeymoon” in paragraph 4 does not mean presidency, but only an initial period of enthusiasm or goodwill.

6. Think of the meaning in which the verb “to promise” is used in paragraph 5. Does it mean that somebody gives a promise?

7. Would it be correct to translate “an Obama White House” as “администрация Обамы” in this context (paragraph 5)? What “newness” is meant?

Pay attention to the word order in the phrase “other ways, small and large” (paragraph 5) and to the order in which these ways are expounded on in paragraphs 6 and 7.

8. Analyze the last sentence of paragraph 7. What is the syntactic function of the phrase “virtually blind to party”? What does it modify?

9. Think of what “divisive partisanship” is meant in paragraph 7. In this context the word “partisanship” acquires an additional shade of meaning connected with adherence to a political party. In what sense is it divisive?

10. To translate the phrase “a “no drama” speech” it is necessary to learn why Barack Obama got his nickname “no drama Obama”.

11. What is a CEO-style of management? What is it opposed to in paragraph 11? Is it necessary to use the corresponding Russian term or would it be better to resort to modulation (semantic development)?



12. When translating the sentence “It derives in part from something the two men have in common: natural political gifts that set them on a path to the White House” in paragraph 12 do not forget that by the time the article was published Barak Obama had not been elected President yet.

13. Analyze what is said in paragraph 13 about Obama’s first term in the U.S. Senate. Does the author mean that Barak Obama failed to complete his first term as senator or is it an explanation of what is said in the previous paragraph about “shortcuts around much government experience”?

14. In paragraph 15 pay attention to the allusion “make the trains run on time” and think of its stylistic function.

15 Is the phrase “to go out on their own” in paragraph 17 used in its direct meaning?

## Text 2

### **ELECTION ANALYSIS 2014**

*By John Solomon<sup>3</sup>, The Washington Times*

*Wednesday, November 5, 2014*

1 Americans spoke with a vengeance on Election Day  
2014. They no longer trust big government to solve their  
deepest worries. They're tired of the war on women  
narrative, too. They still want their economy fixed and  
don't mind their governors taking on public unions, either.

2 And oh yes, Kansas, you're still a red state.

3 Those are the top line lessons of a turbulent election that  
gave Barack Obama the biggest rebuke of his presidency,  
reversed the gains Democrats made just a few short years  
ago in states like Iowa and Colorado and awarded  
Republicans the full control of Congress that they coveted.

4 But make no mistake, the love for Republicans is a  
fleeting, inch-deep right now. It can grow with decisive,  
clear action. Or it can fritter away with a dose  
of GOP infighting, excuse-making and gridlock.

5 In fact, more than a third of those who voted for  
Republican House candidates were dissatisfied or even  
angry with GOP leaders in Congress, an early warning  
sign.

---

<sup>3</sup> John Solomon is Editor and Vice President for Content and Business Development for The Washington Times.

6 Voters made clear they expect more action in  
Washington on the issues that matter to them, and a better  
economy by the next time they cast their ballots in 2016.

7 That's why House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy  
went on TV as the ballots were still being counted to urge a  
joint retreat of House and Senate Republicans to ensure  
they forge a single message, game plan and agenda.

8 "It's the first thing we should do," Mr. McCarthy said.

9 Republicans will have plenty of early agenda items to  
choose from: send Mr. Obama a full budget for the first  
time in years, roll back a hugely unpopular medical device  
tax in the Obamacare law and press to improve border  
security as a first step toward immigration reform to name a  
few.

10 To guide their early decisions, Sen. Mitch McConnell,  
the expected Senate majority leader, and House Speaker  
John Boehner have some takeaways from the exit polls that  
were the barometer of this election.

11 First up, Americans who voted for Mr. Obama's big  
government agenda as a solution to the ailing economy in  
2008 no longer believe his approach worked or that a  
bloated federal government can deliver.

12 By a wide margin, voters declared the economy still  
broken and their confidence in big government eroded.  
Only one in five said they trusted government to make the  
right decision.

13 “It’s the incompetence of big government that voters are responding to,” declared Rep. Paul Ryan, the Wisconsin congressman and Republican nominee for vice president in 2012.

14 Mr. Ryan said he and Mitt Romney ran against the Obama agenda two years ago, but at the time they had the challenge of arguing against “big government in theory.”

15 “Now we have big government in practice, and it doesn’t look anything like the rhetoric used to sell it,” Mr. Ryan said.

16 The Democratic narrative of a GOP “war on women” – a key to the 2012 election results — also got resoundingly rejected this time around.

17 The Democrat who most embraced that narrative this time around, Sen. Mark Udall in Colorado, was ousted easily by Republican Corey Gardner.

18 And Republicans elected high-profile women like Joni Ernst in the Iowa Senate race, former congressional investigator Barbara Comstock in a closely watched northern Virginia race and 30-year-old Elise Stefanik, a former aide in President George W. Bush’s administration, to be the youngest House member from suburban New York City.

19 “We are here tonight because you believe that Washington is ready for fresh ideas and a new generation of leadership,” the youthful Ms. Stefanik declared in her

victory speech.

20 Gov. Scott Walker's resounding victory in Wisconsin made clear that unions don't have the clout they once had. Mr. Walker, who took on collective bargaining reform and busted the grip of public worker unions on his state's budget, was Big Labor's No. 1 target this election. And he won easily, despite millions of dollars in outside money spent against him.

21 Other union foes, like Govs. Rick Snyder in Michigan and Rick Scott in Florida, also won, further eroding image of Big Labor as an mighty election force.

22 In the end, the unrest of the 2014 electorate demolished the coalition of voters that sent Democrats to control of both chambers of Congress in 2006, and Barack Obama to the White House in 2008 and 2012.

23 How far was that coalition disrupted?

24 Well, Republicans captured the governorship of three of the bluest states in America: Mr Obama's home state of Illinois, Maryland and the land of Kennedys in Massachusetts. And they were in position to capture the governorship in another bright blue state, Connecticut.

25 It was just a few days ago when Democrats were dreaming of stealing the red state of Kansas, unseating longtime incumbent Pat Roberts. That, too, didn't come to fruition. And Democrats, it is fair to say, aren't in Kansas anymore.

## Comments and hints

1. To understand the text and make it understandable to the TL reader it is necessary to find out what is meant by the following:

big government; war on women; public unions; red/blue states; GOP; collective bargaining; Big Labor.

2. Make sure that you understand in what meaning the following words are used in the text:

to take on (paragraph 1);

a retreat (paragraph 7);

takeaways (paragraph 10);

to deliver (paragraph 11);

to embrace (paragraph 17);

narrative (paragraph 17).

3. Analyze the logical structure of paragraph 20 and decide in which of its many meanings the conjunction “and” is used in the last sentence.

### Text 3

## **AMERICA FACES MOST DANGEROUS TWO YEARS IN 150 YEARS**

*By Charles Hurt<sup>4</sup>, The Washington Times  
Wednesday, November 5, 2014*

1 If President Obama suffered a “shellacking” in the  
2010 elections, then what he endured Tuesday night was  
nothing short of a vicious gangland beatdown the likes of  
which have rarely been seen before in the history of  
electoral politics.

2 This, of course, is a wonderful and well-deserved  
outcome. But beware: America now enters the two most  
dangerous years of her existence — or certainly the most  
dangerous since the Great Depression and possibly going  
all the way back to the Civil War.

3 Not to dismiss the promising results of Tuesday’s  
election.

4 Voters clearly and forcefully rejected the party,  
politics and policies of President Obama. They slapped  
his socialist agenda back into the days of Soviet gulags,  
where it belongs.

5 His grand visions of mighty government ruling  
unchecked over desperate ghettos have been snuffed out.

6 Gone, too, were the so-called “low-information  
voters” who have been coaxed to the polls since 2008 on

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles Hurt is an American conservative columnist and writer for The New York Post and The Washington Times.

lies and false promises that the federal government would solve all their problems.

7 They are used up and wrung out.

8 Even the onslaught of threats and desperate accusations in endless emails to their Obamaphones couldn't motivate those people to the polls one more time.

9 Voters rejected the craven, crass and mafioso tactics of Senate Leader Harry Reid.

10 Voters stripped him of his baldly partisan use of the United States Senate as a graveyard for all House legislation in order to protect his Democrats from tough votes and insulate the President from reality.

11 The little man with giant fists got staggered by a nasty uppercut from voters even though Reid saw it coming for weeks. Now, the ex-boxer stumbles on the canvas all tangled in the ropes, waiting for the bell.

12 And voters also rejected the loony-toon delusions of House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi. Honestly, the woman should be running a hat and wig shop in Haight-Ashbury, selling weed and prescription pills on the side. How it is that Democrats in Congress have taken her so seriously for so long will baffle historians for decades.

13 The silver lining for Democrats today is now they now have the perfect excuse to bounce both of them out of leadership forever.



- 14 And this is where things get very, very dangerous for America. President
- 15 Obama still has two more years left in his final term.
- 16 Already, he has demonstrated again and again that he has no regard for the constitution or the legitimacy of laws when they do not suit his agenda. He flaunts his disregard for the constitutional process, dismisses laws he doesn't like and rewrites others.
- 17 He mocks the powers of Congress. The Supreme Court has slapped him down more than any president in recent times. All of this as he tells us he is an expert on constitutional law.
- 18 Now come his very explicit threats to pass more illegal and unconstitutional presidential edicts to grant amnesty to illegal aliens already in the United States. This, in turn, will issue invitations for millions more illegals to come streaming across the border.
- 19 It will not end at immigration. Unchecked power is addictive.
- 20 Disowned by Democrats and made to feel irrelevant in this election, President Obama's enormous and unjustified ego is deeply wounded. He is frustrated and feels caged, cornered. This is when people like him are most dangerous.
- 21 Buoyant Republicans will make an effort to engage him.

22 But President Obama is not a listener. He is not a negotiator. He is not a learner. He will just take what he wants. It is easier that way.

23 Franklin D. Roosevelt's court-packing scheme during the Great Depression was nothing like the strains this president has put on Constitution. Indeed, not since the Civil War has America faced such a dire threat to her existence as a lawful, constitutional republic.

24 The difference in leadership between then and now could not be more striking.

25 To bind the union, Abraham Lincoln took an economic and political war and elevated it into something higher. He made it about emancipating slaves and won. And saved the Republic.

26 This president does the opposite. He got elected promising to elevate politics but instead finds unity and sows discord, often inciting racial divisions.

27 America's only hope today is that President Obama finally turns to the bust of Lincoln he keeps in the Oval Office and listens.

### **Comments and hints**

1. When translating paragraph 7, make sure it is consistent with the previous sentence, for the reader not to be confused about the antecedent of "they".

2. Depending on the target audience of your translation,

decide if it is necessary to explain what Obamaphones (paragraph 8) are and what is the best way to do it.

3. Americans are sure to know Harry Reid's party affiliation (paragraph 9), which is important here. Do all the potential Russian readers know it?

4. The definite article in "The little man with giant fists" (paragraph 11) refers the reader to the previous two paragraphs. How can it be done in Russian?

5. Look up "loony tune" ("the loony-toon delusions" in paragraph 12). Do not rely on your background knowledge.

6. Pay attention to the specific use of "all of this" in paragraph 17, where it corresponds to the Russian "и при этом", "при всем при этом".

7. Think of the meaning of the verb "to engage" (paragraph 21) in this context.

8. Does your potential reader know what Franklin D. Roosevelt's court-packing scheme is?

## PART III

### WHO IS THE AGGRESSOR?

Text 1

#### RUSSIA OR AMERICA: WHO IS THE REAL AGGRESSOR?

*By Alexander Clackson<sup>5</sup>, Global Research  
March 11, 2014*

- 1 *As the crisis in Ukraine continues to perpetuate, one aspect that has been particularly striking is the language used by the Western media and politicians to describe Russia and its President, Vladimir Putin.*
  
- 2 *The country and its leader have been branded as aggressors, invaders, empire builders and have even been compared to Nazi Germany. In the field of psychology, there is a term to describe a defence mechanism – projection, which is characterised by projecting unwanted feelings onto other people. Perhaps, the US and its Western allies are experiencing a surge of projection, as the way they have been describing Russia is not only incorrect, but is also an appropriate way to describe the Western powers.*

#### **Russia's non-aggression**

---

<sup>5</sup> Alexander Clackson is a British journalist, the founder of Global Political Insight, a political media and research organisation. He has a Master's degree in International Relations. Alexander works as a political consultant and frequently contributes to think-tank and media outlets.

3 Let us start with Russia. Since President Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000, apart from the most recent crisis in Ukraine (which I will address shortly), Russia has been involved in just two major conflicts: The Chechen War between 1999 and 2009 and the so-called Five Day War with Georgia in 2008. In both of these events, it can be argued with some certainty that Russia did not instigate the conflict, and was in fact acting defensively. The Chechnya conflict began after the Invasion of Dagestan, when the Chechnya-based Islamic International Brigade (IIB), an Islamist militia [covertly supported by the CIA], led by warlords Shamil Basayev and Ibn al-Khattab, invaded the neighbouring Russian republic of Dagestan on August 2, 1999, in support of the Shura of Dagestan separatist rebels. Russia was left with little choice but to enter Chechnya on 1 October. The campaign ended the de facto independence of Chechen Republic of Ichkeria and restored Russian federal control over the territory. It is even debatable to even consider this as a “foreign” conflict, as it is quite plausible to argue that this crisis was an internal one.

4 The conflict with Georgia follows a similar line of events as with Chechnya. During the night of 7 to 8 August 2008, Georgia launched a large-scale military offensive against South Ossetia, in an attempt to reclaim the territory. This move was completely unprovoked. The

Georgian attack caused casualties among Russian peacekeepers, who resisted the assault along with Ossetian militia. Russia rightfully reacted by deploying units of the Russian 58th Army and Russian Airborne Troops into South Ossetia one day later, and launched airstrikes against Georgian forces in South Ossetia and military and logistical targets in Georgia proper. It is now well established that the majority of experts, monitors and ambassadors agreed that the war was started by Georgia.

### **Ukrainian Crisis**

5 Since Putin became President, Russia has never attacked or invaded another country, unless there was a clear provocation from the opposite side. This fact seems to have gone unnoticed by the Western leaders and the media who continue to portray Russia as a scary and unpredictable country. Following the coverage of events in Ukraine, especially in Crimea, one would come to sense that the media is very keen to portray Russia as a nation that has repeatedly violated international law and sovereignty of other nations, when in fact, the opposite is true. Can the crisis in Crimea be called an “invasion”? Firstly, no blood has been spilled and there has been no fighting or even shots fired, except for warning shots into the air.

6 There is an argument to be made that Russia has violated the territorial sovereignty of Ukraine,

however, it must be noted that both Crimea and Russia do not recognise the current interim Ukrainian government and thus to them, the territory of Ukraine is under completely anarchy and chaos. Due to the well documented incidents of neo-Nazi violence in Kiev and other parts of Ukraine, it has been the responsibility of Russia to ensure that ethnic Russians in Crimea are protected. Let us remember that Russia has not claimed that Crimea now belongs to the Russian Federation. It has simply placed its troops to preserve peace in the region. Depending on the outcome of the upcoming referendum on the status of Crimea on 16<sup>th</sup> March, Russia will no doubt take appropriate action, i.e. either leave if Crimea chooses to remain part of Ukraine, or stay if Crimean votes to become a part of Russia.

### **US interventions and NATO expansion**

- 7 While Russia has been adhering to international law and showing complete lack of aggression over the last 14 years, the US and NATO have been doing the opposite. US alone has intervened in the following countries: Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Philippines, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, Georgia, Haiti, Djibouti, Kenya, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Pakistan, Lebanon, Somalia, Libya, Uganda, Jordan, Chad, Mali, Turkey. NATO, meanwhile, has been involved in the Bosnia and Herzegovina intervention,

Kosovo intervention, the Afghanistan War and most recently the Libyan intervention; with the latter two being complete disasters that have left the countries in shambles and anarchy.

8 In addition, NATO has broken its promise to Russia. Mikhail Gorbachev reportedly agreed to allow German reunification within NATO after being promised that NATO would not expand “one inch to the east.” Instead, in 1999, Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic joined the organization, despite NATO claiming that it had no plans to expand after the end of the Cold War. Another expansion came with the accession of seven Central and Eastern European countries: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania. These nations were first invited to start talks of membership during the 2002 Prague summit, and joined NATO on 29 March 2004, shortly before the 2004 Istanbul summit. Most recently, Albania and Croatia joined on 1 April 2009, shortly before the 2009 Strasbourg–Kehl summit. Future expansion is currently a topic of debate in many countries. Cyprus and Macedonia are stalled from accession by, respectively, Turkey and Greece, pending the resolution of disputes between them. Other countries which have a stated goal of eventually joining include Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Georgia.

### **Russia’s worries justified**



- 9 Putin rightly feels worried that NATO is on a mission to encircle Russia and the recent EU and US involvement in Ukraine only exacerbates those worries. Given the hostility that Russia faces on a daily basis from Western politicians and the media, is it really a surprise that Russia vehemently opposes any Western-backed government in Ukraine, especially following a dubious revolution, financed by the US?
- 10 Russia is used to receiving negative press ever since President Putin came to power in 2000 and made it his priority to protect the Russian national interest and not allow the West to go on an interventionist spree. But the latest attacks on Russia are not only incorrect and hypocritical, but also illustrate the desire of the Western powers to discredit and vilify Russia for its own geopolitical objectives. However, the events of the last decade clearly illustrate that it is the West that has been aggressive and interventionist, and it is NATO that has a plan to create an empire, not Russia.

### **Comments and hints**

1. Look up the meaning of the word “projection” (paragraph 2) as a psychological term and the definition of the corresponding notion.

2. The acronym IIB in paragraph 3 stands for Islamic International Brigade (an international unit of Islamist

mujahideen founded in 1998) and is translated as «Исламская интернациональная бригада». “An Islamist militia” corresponds to “исламское незаконное вооруженное формирование”. Shura is an Islamic council, Шурá.

3. Paragraph 4: Ossetian militia – юго-осетинские вооружённые формирования; logistical targets – объекты тылового обеспечения.

## Text 2

### **COWARDLY MISFEASANCE OF DUTY**

(from “Failing Tonkin Gulf test on Ukraine”)

*By Robert Parry<sup>6</sup>, Consortiumnews.com*

*February 21, 2015*

1     Though the last Congress already whipped through belligerent resolutions denouncing “Russian aggression” and urging a military response – with only five Democrats and five Republicans dissenting – members of the new Congress could at least ascertain the facts that have driven the Ukraine conflict. Before the world lurches into a nuclear showdown, it might make a little sense to know what got us here.

#### The Nuland Phone Call

2     For instance, Congress could investigate the role of Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland and U.S. Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt in orchestrating the political crisis that led to a violent coup overthrowing Ukraine’s constitutionally elected President Viktor Yanukovich a year ago.

3     What was the significance of the Nuland-Pyatt phone call in early February 2014 in which Nuland exclaimed “Fuck the EU!” and seemed to be handpicking the leaders of a new

---

<sup>6</sup> Robert Parry is an American investigative journalist best known for his role in covering the Iran-Contra affair for the Associated Press (AP) and Newsweek. He was awarded the George Polk Award for National Reporting in 1984. He has been the editor of Consortium News since 1995.

government? “Yats is the guy,” she said referring to her favorite, Arseniy Yatsenyuk, with Pyatt musing about how to “midwife this thing”?

4 Among other questions that Congress could pose would be: What does U.S. intelligence know about the role of neo-Nazi extremists whose “sotin” militias infiltrated the Maidan protests and escalated the violence against police last February?

5 And, what does U.S. intelligence know about the mysterious snipers who brought the crisis to a boil on Feb. 20, 2014, by opening fire on police apparently from positions controlled by the extremist Right Sektor, touching off a violent clash that left scores dead, including police and protesters.

6 Congress might also seek to determine what was the U.S. government’s role over the next two days as three European countries – Poland, France and Germany – negotiated a deal with Yanukovich on Feb. 21 in which the embattled president agreed to Maidan demands for reducing his powers and accepting early elections to vote him out of office.

7 Instead of accepting this agreement, which might have averted a civil war, neo-Nazi and other Maidan militants attacked undefended government positions on Feb. 22 and forced officials to flee for their lives. Then, instead of standing by the European deal, the U.S. State Department quickly embraced the coup regime as “legitimate.” And,

surprise, surprise, Yatsenyuk emerged as the new Prime Minister.

8 What followed the coup was a Western propaganda barrage to make it appear that the Ukrainian people were fully behind this “regime change” even though many ethnic Russian Ukrainians in the east and south clearly felt disenfranchised by the unconstitutional ouster of their president.

9 A U.S. congressional inquiry also might ask: Was there any internal U.S. government assessment of the risks involved in allowing Nuland and Pyatt to pursue a “regime change” strategy on Russia’s border? If so, did the assessment take into account the likely Russian reaction to having an ally next door overthrown by anti-Russian extremists with the intent to put Ukraine into NATO and potentially bring NATO armaments to Russia’s frontyard?

10 Since the entire crisis has been presented to the American people within an anti-Yanukovyh/anti-Moscow propaganda paradigm – both by the U.S. mainstream news media and by the U.S. political/academic elites – there has been virtually no serious examination of the U.S. complicity. No one in Official Washington dares say anything but “Russian aggression.”

#### Post-Coup Realities

11 Beyond the events surrounding the coup a year ago, there

were other pivotal moments as this crisis careened out of control. For instance, what does U.S. intelligence know about the public opinion in Crimea prior to the peninsula's vote for secession from Ukraine and reunification with Russia on March 16?

12 The State Department portrayed the referendum as a “sham” but more objective observers acknowledge that the vote – although hasty – reflected a broad consensus inside Crimea to bail out of the failed Ukrainian state and rejoin a somewhat more functional Russia, where pensions are about three times higher and have a better chance of being paid.

13 Then, there was the massacre of ethnic Russians burned alive in Odessa's trade union building on May 2, with neo-Nazi militias again on the front lines. Like other topics that put the U.S.-backed coup regime in a bad light, the Odessa massacre quickly moved off the front pages and there has been little follow-up from international agencies that supposedly care about human rights.

14 The next major catastrophe associated with the Ukraine crisis was the shooting down of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 over eastern Ukraine on July 17. Again, the State Department rushed to a judgment blaming the ethnic Russian rebels and Russia for the tragedy that killed all 298 people onboard. However, I've been told that some U.S. intelligence analysts had a very different take on who was responsible, finding evidence implicating a rogue element of

the Ukrainian government.

15     However, following the pattern of going silent whenever the Kiev coup regime might look bad, there was a sudden drop-off of interest in the MH-17 case, apparently not wanting to disrupt the usefulness of the earlier anti-Russian propaganda. When a Dutch-led inquiry into the crash issued an interim report last October, there was no indication that the Obama administration had shared its intelligence information.

16     There also is little interest from Congress about what the MH-17 evidence shows. Even some progressive members are afraid to ask for a briefing from U.S. intelligence analysts, possibly because the answers might force a decision about whether to blow the whistle on a deception that involved Secretary of State John Kerry and other senior Obama administration officials.

17     This sort of cowardly misfeasance of duty marks the latest step in a long retreat from the days after the Vietnam War when Congress actually conducted some valuable investigations.

### **Comments and hints**

1. To understand the author's position it is necessary to find information about the incident of Tonkin Gulf.

2. Pay attention to the phrasal verb "whip through" (paragraph 1). It probably requires descriptive translation.

3. In paragraph 4 “sotin militias” means paramilitary force of 100 fighters. Find the corresponding Russian name.

4. Pay attention to the meaning of the noun “take” (paragraph 14). Look it up in a dictionary.



Ольга Владимировна Петрова

## **ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ПЕРЕВОД**

**Учебно-методические материалы  
для студентов IV курса отделения английского языка  
переводческого факультета**

Редакторы: А.О. Кузнецова  
Д.В. Носикова  
А.С. Паршаков

Лицензия ПД № 18-0062 от 20.12.2000

---

Подписано к печати			Формат 60 x 90 1/16
Печ. л.	Тираж	экз.	Заказ
Цена договорная			

---

Типография ФГБОУ ВПО «НГЛУ»  
603155, Н.Новгород, ул. Минина, 31а