

## **Correction DS 2 – BCPST 2**

### **I- Compréhension écrite**

Cet exercice n'a pas été très bien réussi, cela est dû en partie au fait que les textes étaient très denses et qu'il fallait bien identifier ce qui permettait de répondre à la question de manière claire et synthétique. Ces textes ont permis de valoriser ceux qui ont pu **organiser** et **hiérarchiser** convenablement les idées.

Par ailleurs, SDOH n'est pas un domaine d'étude connu du grand public. Une réponse claire aura donné une bonne définition et une bonne explication de ce que sont ces déterminants.

Une copie moyenne aura indiqué que ces facteurs sont essentiels pour réduire l'écart de santé entre les minorités et les blancs, et aura mis en avant les bénéfices (pour la santé de tous, pour l'économie) d'un investissement dans ce domaine.

Une meilleure copie aura été très claire sur ce que sont ces SDOH, aura replacé dans le contexte (coupes budgétaires) et n'aura pas ignoré le lien avec la santé mentale – qui parfois a été mis de côté alors même qu'il s'agit de la thématique de la tribune du *Monde*.

### **Definitions**

- **To scrap sthg: to cancel or get rid of something that is no longer practical or useful (OED)**
- **To smack of sthg:** to seem to contain or involve a particular unpleasant quality (OED)
- **To hobble sthg:** to make it more difficult for somebody to do something or for something to happen (OED)
- **Ire:** anger, wrath (OED)
- **Executive orders** are directives issued by the President of the United States that manage operations of the federal government. They are legally binding on the executive branch but do not require Congressional approval (Congress = House of Representatives and the Senate).
- **Identity politics** refers to political activity or alignment based on shared group characteristics like race, gender, sexual orientation, or religion, rather than traditional political parties. While aiming to address injustices, critics argue it can lead to political fragmentation.
- **Project 2025** is a comprehensive political initiative, primarily spearheaded by the Heritage Foundation, an American right-wing think tank, that outlines an agenda

for a conservative U.S. presidential administration starting in 2025. It proposes a radical restructuring of the federal executive branch to consolidate presidential power and implement far-reaching right-wing policy changes across government agencies. (The name of the official publication is “Mandate for Leadership: The Conservative Promise”.)

Suggested answer:

The **pervasive** influence of non-medical factors on well-being is a **core** focus of an **editorial letter** to *Le Monde* (doc.2), and *The New\_York\_Times* article (doc.1). Both link Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) to persistent health disparities, avoidable deaths, and delayed improvement and thus condemn the recent funding cuts in this sector.

First, health disparities **stem from entrenched** SDOHs. American federal initiatives have long explored how poverty, race, and location **shape life expectancy** and rates of cancer and heart disease (doc.1&2). Both articles also **cite** disability, violence, digital habits, food, and housing as physical and mental health factors.

Second, weak prevention and unequal treatment access increase **mortality rates**. In France, despite governmental support for early detection, the budget for psychiatric care remains vague (doc.2). In the US, COVID-19 **exposed** how **preventable** chronic illnesses and racially biased tools killed Black, Hispanic, and Native American people (doc.1). Moreover, Black women face nearly three times the pregnancy-related mortality due to limited quality care (doc.1).

Finally, accounting for SDOHs can **yield lasting** health benefits. Programmes targeted at Black American mothers have prevented readmission for all patients, **regardless of** their race, and have proven to be **cost-effective** solutions (doc.1). In France, inter-ministerial governance and clear coordination with local actors could **foster** an ecology of care for the young and the disabled (doc.2).

As experts **express caution** that **one-size-fits-all** programmes fail to dramatically improve general health care, **it is high time** individualists **recognized** that caring for others also serves their own best interests. (242 words)

Pervasive		cite	
core		Mortality rates	
An editorial letter		Exposed	
Stem from		Preventable	
Entrenched		Yield	
Shape		Lasting	
Life expectancy		Regardless of	
Cost-effective		Express caution	
Foster		One-size-fits-all	
It is high time + V-ED			

## LANGUE

**Grammaire** : Même si cela peut vous sembler secondaire, l'imprécision concernant les déterminants, les marqueurs du pluriel etc. peuvent vraiment gêner la lecture de votre correcteur. L'expression de la généralité par exemple s'exprime soit avec THE + singulier soit avec Ø + pluriel (sauf pour les indénombrables Ø + nom indénombrable)

Ainsi lorsque vous parlez du gouvernement, soit vous pensez à un gouvernement en particulier (ex. : le gouvernement américain) auquel cas il faudra dire « the government », soit vous parlez de gouvernement en général : « governments »

✎ Fill in the blank : Ø or THE?

- a) ..... Trump administration is waging a war on ..... woke.
- b) ..... Trump's administration has pledged to eradicate ..... wokeness.
- c) ..... health gap is widening. .... poor will not benefit from a health policy that is too general.

Dans plusieurs copies l'utilisation de V-ING n'est toujours pas maîtrisé (attention à ne pas confondre avec BE + V-ING). Ici je vous parle de propositions en V-ING, il ne s'agit pas d'un temps. C'est cette forme que vous utiliserez quand vous avez un infinitif qui est sujet de la phrase – car on parle d'une activité, on parle « du fait de ... »

Ex : Investing in SDOH will benefit everyone/ Attacking wokeness has become his priority / Paying people to donate an organ can lead to a slippery slope.

**Vocabulaire**: prevent (Faux-Ami!) = empêcher.

« instaurer » = institute, establish

## II- Expression Ecrite

- a) Currently, there is a shortage of organs from deceased donors in the United States. In your opinion, should we be allowed to pay people who are willing to donate an organ?

Voir TD de méthodologie pour travailler sur les points qui n'ont pas été bien réussis : l'introduction, la conclusion et l'identification d'une opposition structurante afin de ne pas tomber dans l'anecdote et liste de problèmes.

- b) In a 1987 interview, Margaret Thatcher said: "There is no such thing [as society]! There are individual men and women and there are families and no government can do anything except through people and people look to themselves first." Do you agree?

<https://newlearningonline.com/new-learning/chapter-4/neoliberalism-more-recent-times/margaret-thatcher-theres-no-such-thing-as-society>

*Margaret Thatcher was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1979 to 1990. During those years, she presided over a social revolution in which nationally owned industries were privatised and the welfare state was drastically reduced in size. Here she speaks of her understanding of the responsibility of the individual.*



I think we have gone through a period when too many children and people have been given to understand ‘I have a problem, it is the Government’s job to cope with it!’ or ‘I have a problem, I will go and get a grant to cope with it!’ ‘I am homeless, the Government must house me!’ and so they are casting their problems on society and who is society? **There is no such thing! There are individual men and women and there are families and no government can do anything except through people and people look to themselves**

**first.**

... [It] is, I think, one of the tragedies in which many of the benefits we give, which were meant to reassure people that if they were sick or ill there was a safety net and there was help, that many of the benefits which were meant to help people who were unfortunate ... [t]hat was the objective, but somehow there are some people who have been manipulating the system ... when people come and say: ‘But what is the point of working? I can get as much on the dole!’

---

Thatcher, Margaret. 1987. ‘Interview for “Woman’s Own” (“No Such Thing as Society”).’ in *Margaret Thatcher Foundation: Speeches, Interviews and Other Statements*. London.

---

In this passage, Thatcher questions the interdependence between the state and individuals. She argues that people should rely on themselves first and should not expect help from the state. This reflects an underlying criticism of what is often called the “**Nanny State**”, a theme that becomes even more evident in the rest of her speech.

Your essay should therefore explore whether the state ought to organise society and support individuals - that is, whether you believe state intervention is necessary.

Alternatively, if you agree with Thatcher, you might argue that private interests and individual initiative are the only forces that truly matter within a nation.

It is also important to examine the very notion of society - what defines it, what holds it together, and whether it can endure without collective responsibility. This question is particularly relevant today, at a time when individualism appears to dominate and polarisation continues to deteriorate the social fabric.

Suggested answer:

The Iron Lady **ushered in** an era of privatisation, weakened public services and a newly **emboldened** form of economic liberalism. In this 1987 interview, she even claimed that the very notion of society does not exist and that people should not **rely on** the state. Is she right? // While I strongly disagree with her view of the state, I acknowledge that the social fabric was already under considerable strain.

By the late 1980s, individualism was indeed becoming more prevalent. Under the combined influence of **globalisation**, modern technologies, shifting social norms and new forms of entertainment, social cohesion was weakened. **The nuclear family** was beginning to break down, and the economic crisis placed additional pressure on the financial foundations of the welfare state.

However, this does not mean that society did not exist. Society is a network of relationships, institutions and shared values. It would be a mistake to argue that the government should not play a role in reinforcing cohesion and solidarity. The very notion of the welfare state is **grounded in** the principle of mutual support. By contributing to a universal health system, the British population not only ensured collective well-being but also fostered a sense of unity. This is evident in the strong attachment many Britons still feel towards **the NHS** and their widespread concern about the direction it is currently taking.

While personal commitment is undeniably essential in any community - and has often been eroded - state also has a crucial role in strengthening **the social fabric**. Through schools, healthcare systems and social benefits, solidarity provides the foundation for a healthy and resilient society. 268 words (*too long but I wanted to give you context*)

Ushered in		The nuclear family	
Emboldened		Grounded in	
Rely on		The NHS	
Globalisation		The social fabric	