

Correction DS 3 BV2 TB2

I- Compréhension Ecrite

La méthodologie est de mieux en mieux maîtrisée, mais ici vous n'avez pas assez pris en compte la question posée. Il ne s'agissait pas de parler du pour et du contre de la modification génétique, mais plutôt des avancées permises ou non et des réactions, enthousiastes ou hostiles.

Il y a eu très peu de contresens, tant mieux. Néanmoins j'attire votre attention sur l'importance à être précis, que ce soit dans les mots et dans les idées que vous exposez. Ainsi Crispr n'est pas un « projet » ou une « recherche », c'est une technologie. Il ne peut être utilisé sur l'embryon humain que dans des cas extrêmement restreints aux US (la drépanocytose, *sickle cell disease*). La technologie utilisée par Altman ou Musk pour leurs enfants n'est pas la même, il s'agit d'un score de risque polygénique (*polygenic screening*) qui n'est pas autorisé dans certains pays. Il ne s'agit pas de modification mais seulement de sélection. Il est très important de ne pas tout mélanger et de montrer que vous aviez perçu les nuances. De même, Dr. He a mené ses expériences il y a plusieurs années, on parle de lui aujourd'hui car il vient de sortir de prison et il fait appel à des donneurs pour poursuivre ses recherches. Ne présentez pas les événements sur la même temporalité.

Suggested answer:

CRISPR-Cas9 is **acknowledged as** a major scientific **breakthrough**, as **evidenced by** the Nobel Prize awarded to Jennifer Doudna. Reactions to this technology **range from caution to unbridled enthusiasm**. An article published in *The London Evening Standard* **places** greater **emphasis** on the controversial aspects of the technology than a *Le Monde* article published in 2025.

First, there are concerns regarding ethical and technical consequences. The UK, the US, and other countries have made gene editing illegal (doc. 1), and China condemned and sentenced He Jiankui to prison after he **sparked** worldwide **outrage** by genetically modifying babies (doc. 2). Both documents **stress** the potentially dramatic consequences for present and future generations.

Notwithstanding these concerns, investors are showing strong interest. Document 1 emphasizes that CRISPR has attracted the attention of Silicon Valley **tycoons**, with Sam Altman investing in a startup focused on curing genetic diseases. Moreover, Document 2 highlights that despite public condemnation, He Jiankui has **raised funds** through **crowdfunding**, with supporters even creating a **cryptocurrency** to finance his work.

Ultimately, some actors appear overly enthusiastic about the technology. The Food and Drug Administration has approved a treatment for sickle-cell disease. Altman and Elon Musk have **allegedly sought to** influence the genetic **traits** of their future children through polygenic screening, which aims to eliminate diseases and predict traits such as height and intelligence in embryos. He Jiankui himself is so convinced of **his pioneering role** that he compares himself to Pasteur.

Thus, the world is adapting to CRISPR technology at different paces. 242 words

To be acknowledged as		notwithstanding	
A breakthrough		A tycoon	
To be evidenced by		To raise funds	
To range from...to		Crowdfunding	
To place emphasis		cryptocurrency	
To spark outrage		Allegedly	
To stress		Sought to > seek to	
traits		A pioneering role	

Langue

Collocations with “research” => **carry out, conduct, do, undertake**

Collocations with “experiment” => **carry out, conduct, do, perform**

RESEARCH, CARE, PROGRESS are **uncountable**

Experience vs experiment:

Ethics vs ethical:

Genetics vs genetic:

Technique vs technical:

II- Expression Ecrite

a) Should innovation be pursued at all costs

La difficulté était de bien comprendre les termes du sujet et identifier les enjeux :

- *Should* => ce qu'on devrait faire. Il en va donc de l'éthique, de la morale, du bien et du mal.
- *Innovation* => recherche constante d'amélioration de l'existant, elle peut être immédiatement mise en œuvre et commercialisée.
- *At all costs* => il ne fallait pas se limiter au prix matériel de la recherche et de l'innovation mais élargir au prix moral.

En résumé, il s'agissait uniquement de savoir si l'innovation devait être limitée.

Certains ont pris le parti de structurer leur argumentation autour de l'opposition théorie/pratique, ce qui peut marcher. Une autre opposition structurante possible était progress/precaution. D'ailleurs, la notion de progrès a été mobilisée par beaucoup d'entre vous, avec plus ou moins de succès. Il ne faut pas confondre progrès et innovation, et justement la nuance permettait d'argumenter.

Progrès = on fait évoluer le monde, la société etc. vers quelque chose de meilleur.

La distinction intéressante était de montrer en quoi la perpétuelle recherche d'améliorations ne conduit pas à quelque chose de nécessairement bénéfique pour la société. Et ainsi montrer que l'innovation n'est pas toujours un progrès, et c'est en cela qu'il faut la limiter.

Les bonnes copies ont su mobiliser des notions telles que l'impact environnemental, l'impact néfaste des nouvelles technologies sur la société, la société de consommation et ses dérives et le principe de précaution. **Principe de précaution** (*precautionary principle*) = en l'absence de certitudes il convient de prendre des mesures pour limiter les dommages potentiels sur la santé, l'environnement ou la société.

Les copies moins bonnes ont limité le « coût » à un aspect uniquement financier et donc auront établi une argumentation sur la nécessité du financement de la recherche (ce qui est limite hors sujet). D'autres copies moins développées ont uniquement abordé le pour et le contre de certaines innovations sans essayer de vraiment tenter d'identifier des limites. Certes, il est impossible de trouver une réponse tout à fait satisfaisante face à cette question si complexe (surtout en 220 mots), mais il faut essayer d'apporter des pistes de réponse et de réflexion.

En ce qui concernait la recherche, les limites pouvaient se trouver au niveau de la recherche mettant en péril la dignité humaine et animale.

Les articles sur les récentes innovations concernant la modification et la sélection génétiques devaient vous inspirer, mais cet exercice doit mettre en valeur vos **connaissances personnelles**, justifiez à l'aide d'autres innovations ! En matière de sciences du vivant, le jury peut potentiellement s'attendre à ce que vous ayez des connaissances solides et pourrait être plus sévère si vous ne témoignez pas d'une culture scientifique solide.

Suggested answer:

Throughout history, innovation has often been met with scepticism. **The printing press** was condemned for weakening memory, and **automation** was feared for eliminating jobs. While some concerns were justified, innovation has ultimately improved **living conditions**. However, not all innovations are beneficial - should there be limits?

Excessive regulation could **stifle** economic growth and **hinder** progress. Fear of innovation risks keeping societies trapped in **outdated** practices, as Big Tech argues when opposing government regulation, such as in the EU. Indeed, if Europe **lags behind** in AI, it may face economic decline and security risks. Moreover, the long-term impact of certain innovations is unpredictable, and opinions about specific technologies - such as social media - are often divided. For instance, while social media has democratised communication, it has also been linked to mental health issues and the spread of misinformation. Ultimately, what constitutes progress is subjective and depends on societal values and priorities.

Yet, economic interests should not be the sole **driver** of research. When innovation threatens human dignity or rights, **boundaries must be set**. For example, while **geoengineering** is explored to combat climate change, simpler solutions like **sobriety** are often ignored due to lack of economic incentive. The precautionary principle should **prevail** in such cases.

If innovation is pursued solely for profit or without ethical consideration, it should be stopped. Only intergovernmental governance can effectively halt unethical innovation, but current international collaboration makes this unlikely. Balancing progress with responsibility remains **a critical challenge**. 242 words

The printing press		Outdated	
Automation		To lag behind	
Living conditions		A driver of	
To Stifle		To set boundaries	
To Hinder		Sobriety	
To prevail		A critical challenge	

An essay written by a student (best mark given):

Innovation is often seen as the main driver of progress in modern societies, as it drives economic growth, scientific discovery and technological change. However, claiming that innovation should be pursued at all costs raises the issue of whether progress remains beneficial when ethical, social or environmental limits are ignored. So, can innovation remain a positive force when it ignores ethical limits and long-term consequences?

On the one hand, innovation has clearly improved living standards. Medical advances such as vaccines or cancer treatments have saved millions of lives, while digital technologies have transformed communication and access to information. For example, renewable energy technologies like wind or solar power show how innovation can address global challenges like climate change while creating new jobs. In a competitive world, countries that fail to innovate risk economic decline and reduced influence.

On the other hand, innovation without regulation can cause serious harm. The development of social media platforms, for instance, has contributed to the spread of misinformation and mental health issues, especially among young people. Similarly, artificial intelligence technologies raise concerns about job losses and mass surveillance when they are introduced too quickly. These examples show that innovation only guided by efficiency or profit can threaten social stability and individual rights.

Innovation is therefore essential, but it should not be pursued blindly. Long-term responsibility, regulation and ethical reflection are necessary to ensure that progress truly serves society as a whole. 235 words

b) How alive in the American Dream in the USA?

La difficulté majeure a été de bien définir la notion de Rêve américain. Il ne s'agit pas de dire si la vie est bonne aux Etats-Unis, s'il fait bon vivre. La notion de Rêve américain, ce n'est pas la vie de rêve, mais la possibilité pour tous de réussir dans la vie. Cette croyance repose sur le principe d'égalité et surtout d'égalité des chances.

Pour ceux qui auraient confondu vivre le rêve américain et vivre une vie de rêve, les points de contenu ne pouvaient pas dépasser 2.5/5.

Il est évident que l'abondance des Etats-Unis et sa croissance économique exceptionnelle au XXème siècle rend les conditions du rêve américain possibles, mais l'enjeu était de montrer avant tout si oui ou non l'égalité des chances étaient respectées et si la promesse d'ascension sociale était toujours tenue.

The phrase "the American Dream" was popularised during the Great Depression (approx. 1929–1939). To believe in the American Dream is to believe that the US is a land of opportunity—a place where everyone has the freedom and opportunity to succeed and attain a better life. Achieving material wealth is the ultimate goal, but the American Dream relies on the idea that the US is a country where it is possible to go from rags to riches, as exemplified by the self-made man. It is extremely important to understand that this notion is therefore an illustration of what social mobility is supposed to be.

Suggested answer:

The United States has long been imagined as **a land of opportunity**, attracting generations of immigrants seeking to **climb the social ladder** and **achieve success**. Yet, in today's context of growing inequality and economic instability, is **social mobility** truly accessible to all?

Thanks to its status as the world's richest country and its liberal economic policies, the U.S. offers unique opportunities for entrepreneurs and ambitious workers. The Silicon Valley boom, for example, has produced many billionaires who built their fortunes through hard work and innovation. Jen-Hsun Huang, CEO of Nvidia and one of the world's wealthiest individuals, **is a testament to** this possibility, having risen from **humble beginnings** through education and perseverance.

However, such success stories remain exceptions. The American Dream is increasingly undermined by systemic **barriers**. The U.S. educational system is effectively **two-tiered**: the wealthy can **afford** elite private schools, while **disadvantaged students** attend **underfunded** public institutions. Meritocracy is therefore an illusion. What's more, persistent discrimination and harsh immigration policies, exemplified by repression by ICE agents, further marginalize many, creating a class of **second-tier citizens**.

While material success through hard work is still possible, it is now largely confined to a privileged minority - leaving most immigrants with little hope of **upward mobility**. 204 words

The land of opportunity		Humble beginnings	
To climb the social ladder		A barrier	
To achieve success		To be two-tiered / a two-tier society	
Social mobility		To afford	
To be testament to		Disadvantaged	
underfunded		Second-tier citizens	

LANGUE: The US is or has (et non ~~are~~ or ~~have~~) / The 19th century (et non ~~the~~ ~~XIXth~~ century)

PRACTICE: MAKE or DO?

Instructions: Fill in the blanks with the correct form of **MAKE** or **DO**.

1. Scientists _____ **research** every day to find new cures for diseases.
2. Our team wants to _____ **progress** in developing a more efficient solar panel.
3. If you want to succeed, you need to _____ **your best** in every experiment.
4. The company plans to _____ **a breakthrough** in artificial intelligence next year.
5. Before publishing, researchers must _____ **sure** their data is accurate.
6. The lab technicians _____ **experiments** to test the new drug's effectiveness.
7. To solve the problem, engineers decided to _____ **a prototype** of the machine.
8. The government wants to _____ **an investment** in green technology.
9. The scientist hopes to _____ **a difference** with her new invention.
10. Before starting, always _____ **a plan** for your research project.
11. The team needs to _____ **a decision** about which materials to use.
12. To get funding, you have to _____ **a good impression** on the investors.
13. The university encourages students to _____ their own **experiments**.
14. The company is trying to _____ **a profit** from its new software.
15. The scientist had to _____ a lot of **calculations** before publishing her results.
16. The inventor wants to _____ **a name for himself** in the tech industry.
17. To stay competitive, companies must _____ **innovations** regularly.
18. The lecturer _____ a speech about the dangers of new technologies.

What is the right collocation in these sentences?

19. The professor asked us to _____ **a presentation** about renewable energy.
20. Students should _____ **notes** during lectures to remember important information.

Answer Key

1. **do**
2. **make**
3. **do**
4. **make**
5. **make**
6. **do**
7. **make**
8. **make**
9. **make**
10. **make**
11. **make**
12. **make**
13. **do**
14. **make**
15. **do**
16. **make**
17. **make**

Notes on Standard Collocations

- **"give a presentation"** is standard, not "do a presentation."
- **"take notes"** is standard, not "do notes."
- **"keep a record"** is standard, not "do a record."