

Correction DS 1 BV2

Average mark : 10.58

I- CE

Ces deux articles présentent des points de vue qui s'opposent. Même si le premier article est moins virulent que le second, il est clair que le journaliste présente la suspension comme une attaque, comme un « musellement de la liberté d'expression » selon ses mots. Mais, comme il le souligne, est-ce un fait ou une opinion ?

Document 1 : les propos de Kimmel étaient une critique, qui a été transformée en « appel à la haine », ce qui justifie la suspension.

- Paul Gratian cite des experts qui démontrent que l'affaire Kimmel n'est qu'un exemple parmi d'autres : Trump souhaite faire taire la critique – dans les médias mais aussi sur les réseaux et dans les écoles.
- Pour le journaliste, Trump instaure un climat de peur (= peur de critiquer Trump) qui implique, *a minima*, de l'auto-censure.

Dans l'article 2, la prise de position est plus nette, mais il fallait identifier de manière fine l'argumentaire de celui qui écrit.

- Ce que Kimmel a dit est un mensonge. MAIS, selon Bozell, ce n'est pas parce qu'il a menti que la décision est justifiée (car même un mensonge est protégé par le 1^{er} amendement). L'écrivain évoque la notion de "accountability" : "accountability requires saying the correction where you said the offense." Il faut donc bien voir que pour lui, la suspension est justifiée au nom de cette « accountability » c'est-à-dire de **responsabilité** : « his refusal to take responsibility for his comments is unacceptable ». « we should not confuse accountability with censorship ». Plus loin, il parlera d'intégrité.
- Il ajoute, que la décision a été prise par une entreprise privée qui bénéficie de fonds publics, ABC. Il s'agit ici de parler d'intérêt public « The public interest means the whole public ». C'est donc, selon lui, normal qu'une entreprise qui reçoit des fonds publics prenne cette décision.
- Bozell se réfère ensuite à l'utilisation des médias qui, selon lui, ont trop longtemps servi à se moquer, insulter, tenir des propos haineux envers les conservateurs. Cette décision marque un tournant.

A repérer: dans cet article, l'auteur dépeint clairement un clivage entre les démocrates, *the radical left, the left*, et les conservateurs.

Points de méthodologie : Il faut aller au-delà du discours rapporté. Vous ne pouvez pas vous contenter de lister les arguments sans organisation et donc d'avoir une réponse du type « he says that...and in the other article it is said that... ». L'organisation était essentielle ainsi que relier les phrases avec des liens logiques.

Certains éléments n'étaient pas pertinents pour répondre à la question, par exemple le fait que dans le doc 2 l'auteur fait l'éloge de Kirk. De même le lien avec la misogynie de Kirk dans le doc 1 n'a pas été compris : ici le journaliste évoque la misogynie pour affirmer qu'une critique peut être factuelle (la teneur de la critique n'était utilisée ici qu'à titre d'exemple).

Langue : Correct the mistake(s) in the following sentences:

- ✗ Jimmy Kimmel – a famous TV presentator – was cancelled.
- ✗ For the journalist, this is a form of censor.
- ✗ This is an attempt at the free speech.
- ✗ In the French article, the journalist mention that democracy is endangered.
- ✗ Donald Trump is imposing a form of dictatorship which results in autocensure.

“Some of the left are trying to spin these dismissals as conservatives embracing “cancel culture””

- a) What do the “dismissals” refer to?
- b) What does “spin” mean in this context?
- c) What is “cancel culture” (definition + examples)?

- d) To go further: a clever fiction about the cancel culture:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EZcYRrwLuN0>



Suggested answer:

In **the aftermath of** the Charlie Kirk shooting — involving a pro-Trump influencer — ABC's late-night show host Jimmy Kimmel was suspended. The two opinion pieces under study provide very different analyses of this decision: for Paul Gratian, writing in *Ouest-France* (doc. 1), it represents an **infringement on free speech**, whereas David Bozell, writing in *Fox News* (doc. 2), **hails** it as a necessary measure.

Both articles **acknowledge** that Jimmy Kimmel was **a fierce critic** of Trump's administration. His remark about Kirk, however, is **framed** differently: for *Ouest-France* it was legitimate criticism, while for *Fox News* it was a lie and an insult.

For Gratian, then, the suspension is another example of Trump's **crusade against his opponents**. Those who have criticised Charlie Kirk have faced repression (losing their jobs, for instance), as **criticism is reframed as hateful speech**. At the very least, this dynamic will encourage self-censorship, which in turn **undermines** free speech (doc.1).

By contrast, Bozell insists that the suspension cannot be equated with **censorship**, since it was a decision taken by a private company. He stresses the importance of different standards and accountability, which he sees as distinct from the fundamental right to express an opinion. In his view, since the media has long been dominated by the left, this decision represents a move toward greater plurality (doc.2).

Kimmel's remark — and his suspension — are therefore clearly **depicted** as a **partisan** issue. 229 words

! Fox News is a TV news channel and website. If you're not sure you can say that it's a "media outlet". It's owned by the **Murdoch family** (who inspired the renowned series "Succession")

In the aftermath of		To hail	
Infringement on		To acknowledge	
A crusade		To (re)frame	
An opponent		To undermine	
Hate(ful) speech		To depict	
Partisan (adj)			

II- EE

Point méthodologie : Vous ne devez pas faire de hors sujet et vous devez répondre à la question. En revanche, reformuler la question est un point qui peut s'avérer crucial car il permet de montrer que vous avez compris les enjeux. Il est fortement recommandé de

le faire, et de toute manière cela était nécessaire pour le sujet b qui est une citation trop longue.

a) Do attempts to regulate free speech protect society or endanger it?

Même si le plan (*regulating is necessary because otherwise there's violence / but not too much or it becomes a dictatorship*) convient parfaitement, il faut développer les idées, nuancer au sein même des arguments et surtout apporter des illustrations et justifications pertinentes. Une notion intéressante à mobiliser est celle de tissu social (*social fabric*) : car l'enjeu est bien de maintenir un tissu social fort.

The right to express one's opinion is a fundamental **pillar** of democracy. It encourages debate and serves as a way to **hold leaders to account**. But is it necessary to regulate it?

Whenever there is an attempt to regulate free speech, there is always the suspicion of a **hidden agenda**. Even if hate speech is sometimes considered a legitimate limit to free expression (in Europe, for example), the very definition of what constitutes hate speech is problematic. At one extreme, even satire or offensive speech could be censored — as cancel culture has sometimes been accused of doing. From this perspective, regulating free speech risks becoming censorship and could **erode** democracy.

On the other hand, **free speech absolutists** such as Elon Musk also contribute to the deterioration of public debate and democracy. It has become clear that some regulation is necessary, particularly **given** the new ways in which information **circulates**. Social media platforms and their algorithms **amplify** radical speech, undermining **reasoned** debate. Their very business model **rewards** engagement and addiction, and research shows that anger is the emotion most likely to drive engagement with **content**. The growing hostility toward politicians can, in part, be explained by the role of social media in **stirring up hatred** toward public representatives.

While it seems reasonable to call for greater civility in public debate, in practice meaningful regulation appears nearly impossible. 226 words

A pillar		To hold someone to account	
A hidden agenda		To erode	
A free speech absolutist		To circulate	
given		To amplify	
Reasoned (adj)		To reward	
content		To stir up hatred	

b) “We live our comfortable lives in the shadow of a disaster of our own making. That disaster is being brought about by the very things that allow us to live our comfortable lives.” (From A Life on Our Planet: My Witness Statement and a Vision

for the Future by David Attenborough, published in 2020) In what ways is Attenborough's warning relevant to our current way of life?

Pour ce sujet, il fallait bien identifier que le problème soulevé est un problème lié à notre « mode de vie » (= current way of life). Se questionner sur la pertinence c'est montrer en quoi David Attenborough a raison de relier le désastre environnemental à notre style de vie (ici, relier à la surconsommation etc.) mais peut-être nuancer également (pourquoi pas montrer en quoi la notion de « confort » peut être discutée).

David Attenborough has dedicated his life to revealing the **wonders** of the natural world and, more recently, has become an **advocate** for urgent environmental action. (He has indeed been a **first-hand witness** to the deterioration of ecosystems caused by human activity.) In *A Life on Our Planet*, he argues that the pursuit of comfort is directly responsible for the **collapse** of biodiversity. This raises the question of whether our pursuit of our comfort is to blame.

(Modern life, with all its conveniences, has had an unprecedented impact on the natural world—so much so that scientists now refer to the Anthropocene to describe our geological era and the dominance of human influence on ecosystems. A striking example is plastic. In just over a century since its invention, plastic has become **ubiquitous**: it is found in oceans, in wildlife, and even in the human body. It has **disrupted** marine ecosystems and urgently requires collective action. Furthermore, plastic contributes significantly to carbon emissions, which in turn accelerate climate change.)

CO₂ emissions are the main driver of global warming, **harming** both animals and plants. Despite international efforts to **curb** emissions, they have continued to rise. Our way of life is **undoubtedly** a major factor. **Consumer society** has brought comfort through **household appliances**, cars, airplanes, telecommunications, and countless other innovations that have made daily life easier. Yet these conveniences consume enormous amounts of energy. (For instance, it is estimated that artificial intelligence and data centres now use electricity on the scale of some medium-sized countries.)

Comfort has undeniably come at the cost of environmental degradation. At the same time, population growth exacerbates the problem. In 1900, the global population was around 1.6 billion; today, it exceeds 8 billion. This exponential growth increases land use, **depletes** natural resources, and places immense pressure on ecosystems. That said, the environmental impact is far from **evenly** distributed: industrialised nations **bear** a disproportionate **share** of responsibility due to their **energy-intensive** lifestyles.

In conclusion, Attenborough is right to condemn the destructive consequences of modern comforts. Yet giving them up entirely seems unrealistic, as they are deeply **intertwined** with what we now consider a healthy, desirable, and fulfilling life. (The real challenge, therefore, is not to abandon comfort but to redefine it in a way that is compatible with the survival of our planet.)

384 words : My essay is too long, you may remove the parts in parentheses to fit the word count.

The wonders		To advocate for	
A first-hand witness		To collapse	
Ubiquitous		To disrupt	
Undoubtedly		To harm	
Consumer society		To curb	
Household appliances		To deplete	
evenly		To bear the share of	
Energy-intensive			
Intertwined			

III- Langue

Vocabulary : a TV host, a presenter, a programme (~~presenter, emission~~), to agree with (~~be agree with~~), censorship, to censor, a suspension, to suspend, resource.

With the acidification of oceans, the 7th planetary boundary has been breached.

Grammar:

- always use a capital letter when you mention a nationality, even when it is an adjective ex.: the **F**rench article.
- Quand vous parlez d'un événement passé, n'oubliez pas d'utiliser le passé => il fallait utiliser le passé pour raconter pourquoi Kimmel avait été suspendu.
- Ø *Free speech* !!!!! attention à l'orthographe, et il ne faut pas de déterminant.
- Il faut maîtriser les propositions en V-ING dont on se sert pour traduire l'infinitif.

Translate :

Critiquer un opposant devrait être permis.

Donner son avis ne devrait pas être censuré.

Cancel culture, also called **call-out culture**, is a cultural phenomenon in which people criticize an individual thought to have acted or spoken in an unacceptable manner, and call (typically over [social media](#)) for the target to be [ostracized](#), [boycotted](#), [shunned](#) or [fired](#).^{[1][2][3][4]} This shunning may extend to social or professional circles—whether on social media or in person—with most high-profile incidents involving [celebrities](#).^[5] Those subject are said to have been "canceled".^{[6][7][a]} While the careers of some public figures have been impacted by boycotts—widely described as "cancellation"—others who complained of cancellation successfully continued their careers.^{[8][9]}

The term "cancel culture" came into circulation in 2018 and has mostly negative connotations.^[7] Some critics argue that cancel culture has a [chilling effect](#) on public discourse, that it is unproductive, that it does not bring real [social change](#), that it causes [intolerance](#), or that it amounts to [cyberbullying](#).^{[10][11]} Others argue that the term is used to attack efforts to promote [accountability](#) or give disenfranchised people a voice, and to attack language that is itself [free speech](#). Still others question whether cancel culture is an actual phenomenon,^[12] arguing that boycotting has existed long before the origin of the term "cancel culture".

Conversations about "cancel culture" increased in late 2019.^{[25][26]} In the 2020s, the phrase became a shorthand [nom de guerre](#) employed by spectators to refer to what they perceived to be disproportionate reactions to [politically incorrect](#) speech.

- **Literal meaning of “spin”:** to turn or rotate quickly.
- **Figurative meaning (in politics/media):** to “spin” information means to **present it in a particular way** — often selectively or persuasively — so that it appears more positive (or less negative) than it really is.

 **So:**

- **“Spin doctors”** are **experts in shaping public perception**.
They work in politics, PR, or media and craft messages to control how events or statements are interpreted.

 **Example:**

- After a political debate, **spin doctors** might tell journalists that their candidate “came across as strong and confident,” even if public reaction was mixed.

 In short:

“Spin” = strategic interpretation of facts,
and **“spin doctors” = people who professionally create and spread that spin.**