**Expressions to use in an opinion text:**

**A. General context / issue:**

**A. Opening sentence (see examples sheet)**

**B. Responding to the editorial:**

**B1. What the editorial argues:**

- This recent editorial from the New York Times argues that GM crops will save humanity from starvation.

- The government is failing us, according to this leader.

- It is up to governments to regulate the internet — not private companies, argues this recent editorial from The Economist.

**B2. + develop:**

- Indeed, the editorial/it explains that while governments act shocked when there are revelations about the harms social media companies can cause, they do nothing about them.

- This editorial/it examines the fact that *... ,* adding / highlighting / underlining that.....

**B3. Agreeing and disagreeing with the editorial: give your position by using "I". Keep your writing lively with questions, short tags, adverbs and dashes.**

- So is the editorial right? Yes it is and this is why I think so. / No, I don't think so / Not necessarily, in my opinion.

- I wholeheartedly agree with the editorial. I largely agree with the editorial.

- I firmly believe that the leader is right / wrong to argue that GM crops are the future.

- However, I strongly disagree with this argument, which doesn't take into account the issue of.........

- As for the argument that GM crops will save humanity from starvation, I think that in reality, these crops won't save us — though they might destroy the soil itself.

- After all, shouldn't sport be a pleasure rather than an obligation? I for one think that it should.

**C. Giving your own examples and references (see examples phrases):**

**C1. Opening sentence for your example**

**C2. Your example, which you develop**

**C3. Short concluding sentence for your example**

**D1. Move onto your next example**

**D. Add suggestions:**

- What this government really needs to do is to move away from diesel fuel straight away.

- One step in the right direction would be to move away from diesel fuel straight away.

**E. And show off.....**

**Using complex structures:**

**-** What is at stake here is the question of public health.

- This could be \*such an effective move that / It could be \*so effective that....

- \*However/ No matter how much/hard the government tries, this type of action doesn't work.

- \*However many/ No matter how many public health campaigns there are, nothing will change until...

- The consequences are \*all the more worrying as younger children are being affected.

- \*The less people are used to doing sport, the more difficult it will be to start.

**Avoiding repetition**:

- Countries should act and should do \*so as quickly as possible.

- Such words make voters nervous. And \*so they should (be).

- It is up to governments to regulate the internet — not private companies, \*as is currently the case.

- These leaders must choose the issues they will support and \*those they will not.

**EDITORIAL: Banksy breaks rules and we call it art**

idsnews.com Indiana Daily Student News, Oct 10, 2018

Banksy, a renowned street artist, made headlines when one of his more famous artworks was shredded after it was bought at an auction. The piece immediately shredded itself via a secret compartment in the frame.

The act has been met with mixed reviews, with nearly everyone lauding the fact that while it may have been a critique on capitalism it had the opposite result. The painting, sold for 1.25 million, will undoubtedly go for twice as much if it’s put on auction again in its shredded state.

This has raised the question of what artists can do with their art when it is being sold.

Art is a commodity like any other. It is bought and sold. However, the intangible difference between what is art and what isn’t is absolute. We place a higher value on that which we deem art. That tends to put it in a special class, different from anything else a person can buy.

This special class gives those who make it special privileges. For example, in 1994 artist Jake Platt vandalized another’s artwork and got away with it as it was artistic expression. Thus, there seems to be a special connection between the artist and the art they create that isn’t held to the same standard as non-artistic efforts.

This is especially true in Banksy’s stunt as no one has tried to charge anyone. If Banksy wasn’t the one who had done it is doubtful that would still hold true. Society views artists in the same regard they view their artwork. In some ways, artists are untouchable.

This is exactly how society ought to regard their artists. Art is constantly evolving, changing and reflecting from the culture that birthed it. It is only right that the artists who create a culture’s art be allowed to conduct themselves in a different manner than the rest.

One cannot fully appreciate and thus accurately depict values, themes and tones without being extreme once in a while. Of course, not every line should be crossed but there are always a few that need to be.

While Banksy’s stunt wasn’t entirely successful, it still got a message across — a message that couldn’t have been sent as effectively or interestingly if he was hindered by the rules that govern the rest of us. Even if you disagree with that message, you have to admit that you wouldn’t have heard it otherwise.

Most people do not pay attention to the art world and the artists within it. Thus, perhaps it is important that artists don’t play by the rules. That way they are able to reach across the gap into the mundane and pull your attention toward their art.

Artists want you to pay attention and you should. Art can carry important messages, emotions and responses. It can help show you a new way of looking at the world and yourself. If an artist has to push a few buttons or break a few rules in order for you to pay attention then it would have been worth it.

Example of your response:

From an artist's perspective, most people would agree with this editorial, which approves of Bansky shredding his own art. Indeed, who wouldn’t want artists to have as much freedom as they want, in order to make the best piece of art they can? I certainly wouldn’t. Art has helped to spearhead progress in society, and one would have to be of bad faith to suggest it is any different now. Nevertheless, as true as it is that freedom is a fantastic value to uphold, there is no denying that artistic expression comes with its fair share of problems that need to be addressed in some way, and that the author of this editorial notoriously forgets.

The first issue raised by such unbridled liberty is the respect of others and their belongings, or lack thereof. Surprisingly, this issue is mentioned with the reference to Jake Platt’s act of vandalism of someone else’s work, but ultimately dismissed by stating that artists have “special privileges”. How dangerous is that? Does it mean that someday, I could go to the White House, burn it to the ground, and claim to make “an allegory of the downfall of the American Empire”? I'm pretty sure I couldn't get away with it, but what about Banksy? As the journalist suggests, his name was the only reason nobody was charged for destroying the aforementioned artwork in the editorial.

This argument raises the second issue in this editorial, the notion that some people could be allowed to do some things that others could not just because they are “artists”. When I think about art, my first mental image is about something inclusive, that has been shared for all of recorded history, and that everyone can create and enjoy. Therefore, suggesting that a “licence to art” would be exclusive and restricted to people like Banksy is to act in such a way is to take away one of the core values of art, being open to anyone who wants to take part in it.

The reason the journalist gives to justify this privilege is the message carried by artists, and that in some way this exception to society is a necessary evil in order to make mindsets change and to get the message across. But what message? How are some ideas better than others, and that much better so as to get special treatment to go straight to our brains? Is there some artistic committee, made up of those privileged people, that decides what is eligible to be art and what is not? This is the problem with art, there is so much talk about breaking the barriers that everything becomes allowed and any sort of logic and values get thrown away for the benefit of a hypothetical “artistic licence”.

All in all, I do agree with the premise of the editorial: art is as important in society as anything else, or even more. But unchecked freedom is not, to my mind, the recipe for success, and is more dangerous than anything as it could lead to chaos and anarchy. (510 words)