

Extra WORK for the holiday

! Tout travail réalisé, même partiellement, par l'IA ne sera pas corrigé. Si vous cherchez des mots dans un dictionnaire pour vous aider, surlignez-les ou surlignez-les dans votre copie.

I. Résumé analytique comparatif

Répondre dans la langue cible à la question posée en 250 mots (+/- 10%) en identifiant et en comparant les informations pertinentes dans les documents 1 et 2, sans commentaire personnel ni paraphrase.

According to Documents 1 and 2, who should be held responsible for the obesity epidemic?

II. Thème journalistique

Mexique : dix ans après la taxe sur le sucre, l'obésité continue de progresser

La ministre de la Santé Geneviève Darrieussecq défendait en début de semaine une taxation des sucres transformés, avec l'espoir de réaliser près de 5 milliards d'euros d'économies dans la santé. Cette mesure fait débat au sein du gouvernement, mais reste en discussion.

Alors qu'en France, le gouvernement examine l'idée d'instaurer une taxe sur le sucre. Au Mexique, elle existe depuis déjà 10 ans. Elle a été créée en 2014 par le gouvernement en réaction à l'épidémie d'obésité qui ronge le pays et les dégâts de la malbouffe sur la santé des Mexicains. Cette taxe fait partie d'un ensemble de mesures de la politique de santé. Elle est appliquée par l'État directement sur les produits à la vente.

Avec cette mesure, dans le cas des sodas, on a pu voir une diminution des ventes les deux premières années. Mais le Mexique reste de loin le premier consommateur de boissons sucrées : 170 litres par an. Et les Mexicains ne sont pas en meilleure santé. L'obésité continue de progresser, avec 7 adultes sur 10 qui souffrent de surpoids, tout comme 16 millions d'enfants et d'adolescents de 5 à 19 ans. La malnutrition ferait chaque année 40 000 morts et est un enjeu majeur de santé publique pour le gouvernement. En plus des taxes, il parie sur d'autres mesures ces dernières années : étiquettes d'avertissements, interdiction du marketing pour les enfants, et dès l'année prochaine, l'élimination des points de vente de malbouffe à l'intérieur et autour des écoles.

Document 1 - Scientists criticize food manufacturers for massive profits from sales of unhealthy ultraprocessed food

November 20, 2025 CNN

Certain ultraprocessed foods, or UPFs, are contributing to worldwide obesity, chronic health conditions and premature death, yet the food industry continues to aggressively market new and existing products in this category for massive profits, according to an unprecedented three-part series authored by 43 global experts in nutrition and supported by the United Nations Children's Fund, or UNICEF, and the World Health Organization.

More than 50% of the \$2.9 trillion paid to shareholders by food corporations between 1962 and 2021 "was distributed by UPF manufacturers alone," according to research published Tuesday in the leading medical journal *The Lancet*.

"We found evidence that UPF consumption is increasing everywhere around the world, fueled by powerful global corporations," said coauthor Carlos Augusto Monteiro, professor emeritus of nutrition and public health in the School of Public Health at Brazil's University of São Paulo.

"To keep this business model, which is highly profitable, the industry cannot afford to make minimally processed foods as they did in the past, so they use extensive political lobbying to stop effective public health policies that support healthy eating," said Monteiro, who coined the term "ultraprocessed food" in 2009 when he developed the NOVA classification system, which categorizes foods into four groups by their level of industrial processing.

Companies can "double or triple their profits" by turning corn, wheat, beans and other whole foods "into a colorless and flavorless sawdust which is then reconstructed with artificial flavorings and additives," said Barry Popkin, the W.R. Kenan Jr. Distinguished Professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Gillings School of Global Public Health.

"The food industry doesn't want to lose their cash cow, so they're willing to put millions into fighting government restrictions on ultraprocessed food as well as funding nutritionists who'll say there's no evidence of harm," said Popkin, who coauthored two of the articles.

The series presents research on the known health harms of ultraprocessed food and calls for a global effort to regulate the industry, with methods such as food warning labels, taxation, and laws to restrict marketing and advertising, especially to children.

However, the International Food & Beverage Alliance, founded in 2008 by leading food and nonalcoholic beverage companies, told CNN that health authorities worldwide have rejected the concept of ultraprocessed food due to its lack of scientific consensus.

"The policy and advocacy recommendations of this series go far beyond the available evidence — proposing new regulatory action based on 'processing' or additive 'markers' and calling for the exclusion of industry from policymaking," said IFBA Secretary-General Rocco Renaldi in an email.

“If adopted as proposed, these policy recommendations would risk limiting access to nutrient-dense processed foods and reducing the availability of safe, affordable, shelf-stable options globally,” Renaldi said.

Document 2 - An opinion piece

The way to tackle obesity in the UK is to make healthy food affordable. But the government won't admit it

Zoe Williams June 2025 - The Guardian

The government's policy on obesity, announced on Sunday, sounds as though it's tough on the supermarkets: they really must do better on the health front, ministers say. Put the fruit nearer the doors (where it is already), make sure loyalty cards reward good choices. Calorie for calorie, a basket of healthy food costs more than twice as much as a basket of less healthy food, according to a report by the Food Foundation.

That statistic sounds stark until you engage your brain. Processed food is cheap because that is the “process”: the relentless prioritising of the profit margin over every other consideration, such as nutritional value. What else are you going to use all that big, capitalist brain power for? Making food more colourful?

There are other suggestions: voucher rewards for people who live more healthily; doubling the number of spaces on the NHS digital weight-management programme. There are cute little facts, too: cutting 50 calories a day would reduce the obesity numbers by 2 million adults and 340,000 children; a reduction of a single sugary fizzy drink a day would halve obesity.

The missing plank in this raft of suggestions is the only one that would make any difference: addressing the price of food. There is a reason that one in three children in deprived areas are overweight, compared with one in five in the general population – people on low incomes cannot afford healthy food. Prices have to come down or incomes have to go up. It's amazing how many words a government paper can put into not saying that.

Any kind of government intervention on pricing sounds pretty radical, right? The kind of thing a Marxist might suggest; the slippery slope to a collectivist five-year plan. In fact, in August 2023, at the height of the inflation crisis triggered by Russia's invasion of Ukraine, France capped the price of 5,000 grocery products, with the finance minister criticising big food by name – Unilever, Nestlé and PepsiCo – for failing to lower prices sufficiently.

But the French have form on revolutions and whatnot. Hungary's nationalist strongman Viktor Orbán? Not so much. Yet even he imposed mandatory price cuts on some basic food items in June 2023.

Kamala Harris initially fought her election on three “opportunity economy” measures: tackling the cost of groceries, housing and medical care. She sounded much more corporate-curious by the end

of that campaign than she had at the start and the jury is still out on whether that was a good idea (not).

Majority of children will be overweight or obese in nine areas of England by 2035, study shows
If we imagine, though, that no UK politician could ever take a stand as dangerously disruptive as the communist firebrands Macron, Orbán and Harris, there is one other tiny thing we could try: raising incomes. You could call this the elephant in the room, but you know the other thing they say about elephants: how do you eat one, except one bite at a time? Ahead of a coherent plan to raise incomes, the government could start by not restricting disability benefits. Even though those people exist in different headlines, they are part of the same reality - when you don't have enough money, you can't afford healthy food.

In a report published in November, *The False Economy of Big Food*, the economist Tim Jackson identified the mechanisms by which deprivation causes chronic illness in a more granular and sophisticated way. Food processing isn't just about sugar, salt and saturated fat; it strips out nutrients and fibre in the quest for shelf life and profitability.

It's uncontroversial to say that processed food is cheap and that it makes us ill, but the logical conclusion - that we are being poisoned by an industry against which only surplus wealth can protect us - is peculiarly unsayable. Never accuse them of that: you will sound like a nitwit. Instead, we get a flurry of suggestions, pitched between rearranging the fridge displays on the Titanic and imploring individuals to just do better.