

**Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès  
Concours d'Entrée, Juin 2016  
CeTIM : Centre de Traduction, Interprétation et Médiation Linguistique**

**Sujet d'anglais  
Niveau M2  
Durée totale des épreuves : 4h**

**Les documents accessibles en ligne sont autorisés**

Répondre aux questions dans un document Word (interligne 1,5), que vous intitulerez  
NOM\_Prenom\_epreuveANG\_M2\_juin2016

A la fin de l'épreuve, envoyez votre document à : [secretariatcetim@univ-tlse2.fr](mailto:secretariatcetim@univ-tlse2.fr) et [josselin@univ-tlse2.fr](mailto:josselin@univ-tlse2.fr)

**Consignes :**

1. Faites une analyse du titre anglais de l'article, traduisez-le (15 mots à traduire) et commentez votre traduction.
2. Traduisez le texte en français de la ligne 1 à la ligne 56 (texte entre crochets, 683 mots à traduire).
3. Commentez le style et le ton du texte anglais (dont vous citerez des extraits) et expliquez comment vous avez tenu compte de ce paramètre dans votre traduction.
4. Choisissez trois unités terminologiques précises dans le texte qui vous ont posé problème pour la traduction ; expliquez en quoi consiste le problème, comment vous l'avez résolu et grâce à quelle ressources en ligne.

## How the Great Barrier Reef got polluted – from farms and fossil fuels to filthy propaganda

Graham Readfearn, *The Guardian*

Wednesday 8 June 2016 23.40 BST

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/commentisfree/2016/jun/09/how-the-great-barrier-reef-got-polluted-from-farms-and-fossil-fuels-to-filthy-propaganda>

1 [In late November 2015, as corals across the northern section of the Great Barrier Reef  
2 started to bleach white, the game was finally up.

3 For years, Australians had been told the country's jewel in the ocean's crown was on the  
4 mend. Only months earlier the Coalition government had won a two-year fight to keep the reef off  
5 a United Nations list of world heritage sites in danger.

6 The stakes were high. International reputations and tourist dollars were at stake. The  
7 foreign minister, Julie Bishop, and the trade minister, Andrew Robb, had even attacked Barack  
8 Obama, who feared for the reef's future.

9 The reef was not in danger, Bishop insisted. The president was misinformed, claimed Robb.

10 Conservative commentators hanging around News Corp media have said the dangers to the  
11 reef were overblown.

12 The mining industry cast the views of environmentalists as green propaganda, ignoring how  
13 for the most part, conservationists were echoing the findings of the government's own scientists.

14 Now, about half the corals bleached in the once pristine northern section are dead or dying.

15 Then, just two weeks ago, Guardian Australia revealed the government's scandalous but  
16 successful censoring of a Unesco climate report, where all references to the reef and the country  
17 were deleted. If the intention was to keep negative commentary from harming tourism, then it  
18 backfired badly, as media outlets including the BBC and the New York Times followed the story.

19 Now these once glorious and vivid animals are suffering the ignominy of a slime green  
20 coating after their death.

21 So that's the poetic opening over with.

22 Unfortunately, only by getting into some detail is it possible to understand the Machiavellian  
23 tendencies of those who have worked to underplay the reef's plight.

24 For a decade or so, government and university scientists have outlined two key tasks to  
25 secure the reef's future – cut fossil fuel emissions and reduce pollution running into catchments.

26 Fossil fuel emissions have pushed ocean temperatures higher, causing three severe coral  
27 bleaching events since 1998. Increasing amounts of CO2 in the atmosphere also make the oceans  
28 become more acidic, making it harder for coral to grow.

29 Several government agencies have repeatedly outlined how climate change is the main  
30 threat to the reef's future.

31 But almost all of the hundreds of millions of dollars invested by state and federal  
32 governments of both colours have gone towards improving water quality – cutting the pollutants  
33 running into the reef's catchments chiefly from sugar cane growing and cattle grazing.

34 Pollutants damage habitats, kill corals or slow their growth and could be linked to outbreaks  
35 of attacks from coral-eating crown of thorns starfish. They also make it harder for corals to recover  
36 from storm damage and global warming-driven bleaching.

37 But has all this investment on water quality worked?

38 Greg Hunt, the Australian environment minister, will tell you that it has, just like he told the  
39 UN world heritage committee that it had, despite knowing of a Queensland auditor general report  
40 saying in June 2015 that there was "significant uncertainty" about the water data.

41 But in April 2016, government scientists at the Australian Institute of Marine  
42 Science published a detailed assessment of the state and federal government policies to date to  
43 improve water quality.

44 [...].

45 Key habitats showed “severe declines in abundance and condition”, populations of species  
46 such as sharks, rays and dugongs were falling and water quality was declining. Hardly a glowing  
47 endorsement of what Hunt says is the “best-managed marine ecosystem in the world”.

48 A key problem was that programs targeting farmers were voluntary and only half the land  
49 used for cane growing and 10% of grazing land was accredited under the voluntary programs.

50 Globally, the scientists wrote, the only time that significant reductions in coastal pollution  
51 had been achieved anywhere was when governments forced action through legislation.

52 One key victory for campaigners has been to force governments to legislate against the  
53 dumping of dredge materials in reef waters.

54 Dredging, a process that on its own is damaging regardless of where you drop the spoil is  
55 still planned to make way for more coal and gas exports.

56 And here lies the big rub. ]

57

58 Governments – both state and federal, and Labor and Liberal – continue to support the  
59 expansion of Australia’s coal export industry, the same industry that is the chief protagonist of  
60 global warming that drove the devastating bleaching this year.

61 Terry Hughes, a professor at James Cook University and convenor of the National Coral  
62 Bleaching Taskforce, says: “Water quality is important, but only for the bottom two-thirds of the  
63 reef. The part that’s bleached to blazes was the most pristine part with no coastal development –  
64 that’s the part Australia used to argue to the UN that the whole reef should be kept off the danger  
65 list. Now it’s wrecked – from Port Douglas to New Guinea.”

66 Hughes says there’s a mismatch between Australia’s support for coalmining, the country’s  
67 endorsement of a UN target to keep warming “well below 2C” and apparent concern for the reef.

68 “Clearly if only 1C of warming is enough for three bleaching events then we are kidding  
69 ourselves if we think 2C is safe,” says Hughes

70 But there’s also been another form of pollution damaging the reef in the form of partisan  
71 propaganda that has left some people confused about the true state of the natural icon.

72 This is where an army of invective language has been filled with an infantry of strawmen  
73 arguments.

74 Queensland’s main newspaper, the Courier-Mail (I worked at the newspaper for four years,  
75 leaving in 2010) has published several pieces underplaying the significance of the bleaching,  
76 often failing to mention the role of human-caused global warming in the disaster. The newspaper  
77 has been accused of underplaying the recent bleaching – an accusation the newspaper rejects.

78 Some scientists were so frustrated by the muted coverage from the Courier-Mail they took  
79 out an advertisement in its pages to get their message across.

80 The Courier-Mail, together with other News Corp columnists, were also caught  
81 misrepresenting the views of Sir David Attenborough, who, despite the claims, had not said that  
82 report’s of the reef’s demise had been “exaggerated”.

83 Over at the Australian, the newspaper last year published a column from Canadian climate  
84 science denier Patrick Moore claiming the science linking ocean acidification and coral damage to  
85 fossil fuel use was all bunk. Coral experts said the column was “highly misleading” and “very, very  
86 wrong”.

87 Even in the Times in Britain, a scientist accused the newspaper of “cherry-picking” an  
88 interview that had led to the page one headline: “Scientists are ‘exaggerating carbon threat to reefs  
89 and marine life.” The story also made its way into the Australian.

90 The coalmining industry has also polluted the public space with disingenuous arguments and  
91 misrepresentations.

92 At one stage, the Queensland Resources Council ran television advertisements claiming a  
93 government-funded study proved the industry and port development were not harming the  
94 reef. The study itself said the opposite.

95 The apparent objective with many of these actions – the berating of Obama, the lobbying,  
96 the censorship and the creative interpretation of scientific findings – is to try and control the  
97 narrative around the reef by denying what’s clearly evident to everyone else.

98 The Great Barrier Reef – a unique wonder of the natural world – is collapsing under the  
99 strain of pollution, propaganda and policy failures.