

**QUESTION 1 /20 → Ramenée sur 7**

**QUESTION 2 /20 → Ramenée sur 13**

1. **According to the article, why should the cigarette industry be destroyed?** Answer the question in your own words. (80 words  $\pm$  10 %)

Vaping – although not a healthy habit – is less dangerous than smoking. **Therefore**, the prohibition<sup>1</sup> of vaping would be counterproductive. It would lead to a higher consumption of illegal products and dissuade<sup>2</sup> many smokers from turning to vaping. **Instead**, vaping should be well regulated. The government should carefully control the products used in vaping liquids, regulate advertising and marketing to protect children from the temptation of taking to <sup>3</sup> vaping, and set up a more efficient warning system.

76 words

**Extrait du rapport de jury Mines-Ponts 2020 :**

En un nombre de mots si limité, il **n'est pas souhaitable de proposer d'introduction ni de conclusion**.

De plus, pour cette question, il s'agit de **faire valoir le point de vue du journaliste** (« *according to the journalist* ») **et non pas celui du candidat** : c'est en effet la capacité de ce dernier à bien entendre et à restituer un propos argumenté qui est sollicitée ici. Les ajouts d'information et autres commentaires personnels sont donc à proscrire, tout autant que les formulations lourdes et peu efficaces telles que « *according to the journalist from The Economist* », « *in the journalist's opinion* » et autres « *the journalist gives his point of view* ». Ce type de métalangage est stérile et dessert le candidat, délayant inutilement un propos qui au contraire doit viser à un équilibre entre concision et densité. De même, les phrases de conclusion commençant par « *in a nutshell* » (à proscrire), « *all in all* », voire « *to cut a long story short* », outre leur inélégance, sont absolument hors de propos dans le cadre de cette question.

**Il n'est cependant pas interdit de structurer sa réponse, ce qui dans le cas de la question de cette année était tout à fait possible et permettait d'éviter un désagréable effet de liste.** Pour rendre compte des stratégies gouvernementales à mettre en place du point de vue du journaliste, les meilleurs candidats ont commencé par expliquer que la prohibition s'avérerait délétère dans la lutte contre les cigarettes électroniques pour en arriver logiquement (en suivant la démonstration de l'article) à l'idée selon laquelle c'est la mise en place de réglementations qui devrait plutôt prévaloir.

Enfin, la question doit être lue attentivement afin d'éviter le hors-sujet : **il ne s'agit pas de résumer tout le texte** mais bien de répondre à une question précise par un repérage des éléments de réponse pertinents.

---

<sup>1</sup> **To oppose sth** = s'opposer à qch

<sup>2</sup> **To dissuade sb from doing sth** = to deter sb from doing sth

<sup>3</sup> **To take to smoking/vaping** = to take up smoking/vaping = se mettre à fumer / vapoter

The cigarette industry should be destroyed for the benefit of public health, Prof. Sir Chris Whitty, the Government's chief medical adviser, has said.

Sir Chris, who is also chief medical officer for England, warned that smokers faced an appalling death, and said ministers are currently considering whether to bring in new policies to limit smoking.

An independent review, which was published in June, recommended that the Government enact measures to ensure England is smoke-free by 2030, which could include stronger taxation, and limiting further where people can light up.

However, the Government has not yet said which recommendations it will follow.

Speaking at a symposium on medical ethics held by the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Medicine, Sir Chris said: "Smoking is the biggest driver that we could easily deal with in the sense of the inequalities we see across the UK. It is an appalling way to die – it kills people in multiple ways. Everybody in this room would agree that getting smoking down to zero and destroying the cigarette industry should be an aim in public health."

He added that it was important for the state to intervene in industries that were based on addiction.

In 2019, the Government set an objective for England to be smoke-free by 2030, meaning only 5 per cent of the population would smoke by then. However, according to the review published in June, without further action, England will miss the smoke-free 2030 target by at least seven years, and the poorest areas will not meet it until 2044.

The review's recommendations include raising the legal age of smoking each year until nobody can buy tobacco, and banning smoking in many public areas, such as outside of hospitals and in the majority of new social housing.

At a backbench business debate of the Government's smoke-free policy, a Tory MP said that making smoking obsolete was "vital" to the health of the entire population. He added: "It also helps deliver economic growth because smoking increases sickness, absenteeism, and disability and the total public finance cost of smoking is twice that of the excise taxes that tobacco brings into the Exchequer<sup>[1]</sup>. Many tens of thousands of people die prematurely each year from smoking, and 30 times as many as those who die are suffering from serious illnesses, which cost the NHS billions of pounds every year".

Adapted from *The Daily Telegraph*, November 2022

<sup>[1]</sup> The Exchequer = le ministère britannique des finances

The cigarette industry should be destroyed for the benefit of public health, Prof. Sir Chris Whitty, the Government's chief medical adviser, has said.

Sir Chris, who is also chief medical officer for England, warned that smokers faced an appalling death, and said ministers are currently considering whether to bring in new policies to limit smoking.

An independent review, which was published in June, recommended that the Government enact measures to ensure England is smoke-free by 2030, which could include stronger taxation, and limiting further where people can light up.

However, the Government has not yet said which recommendations it will follow.

Speaking at a symposium on medical ethics held by the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Medicine, Sir Chris said: "Smoking is the biggest driver that we could easily deal with in the sense of the inequalities we see across the UK. It is an appalling way to die – it kills people in multiple ways. Everybody in this room would agree that getting smoking down to zero and destroying the cigarette industry should be an aim in public health."

He added that it was important for the state to intervene in industries that were based on addiction.

In 2019, the Government set an objective for England to be smoke-free by 2030, meaning only 5 per cent of the population would smoke by then. However, according to the review published in June, without further action, England will miss the smoke-free 2030 target by at least seven years, and the poorest areas will not meet it until 2044.

The review's recommendations include raising the legal age of smoking each year until nobody can buy tobacco, and banning smoking in many public areas, such as outside of hospitals and in the majority of new social housing.

At a backbench business debate of the Government's smoke-free policy, a Tory MP said that making smoking obsolete was "vital" to the health of the entire population. He added: "It also helps deliver economic growth because smoking increases sickness, absenteeism, and disability and the total public finance cost of smoking is twice that of the excise taxes that tobacco brings into the Exchequer. Many tens of thousands of people die prematurely each year from smoking, and 30 times as many as those who die are suffering from serious illnesses, which cost the NHS billions of pounds every year".

Adapted from *The Daily Telegraph*, November 2022

The cigarette industry should be destroyed for the benefit of public health, Prof. Sir Chris Whitty, the Government's chief medical adviser, has said.

Sir Chris, who is also chief medical officer for England, warned that smokers faced an appalling death, and said ministers are currently considering whether to bring in new policies to limit smoking.

An independent review, which was published in June, recommended that the Government enact measures to ensure England is smoke-free by 2030, which could include stronger taxation, and limiting further where people can light up.

However, the Government has not yet said which recommendations it will follow.

Speaking at a symposium on medical ethics held by the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Medicine, Sir Chris said: "Smoking is the biggest driver that we could easily deal with in the sense of the inequalities we see across the UK. It is an appalling way to die – it kills people in multiple ways. Everybody in this room would agree that getting smoking down to zero and destroying the cigarette industry should be an aim in public health."

He added that it was important for the state to intervene in industries that were based on addiction.

In 2019, the Government set an objective for England to be smoke-free by 2030, meaning only 5 per cent of the population would smoke by then. However, according to the review published in June, without further action, England will miss the smoke-free 2030 target by at least seven years, and the poorest areas will not meet it until 2044.

The review's recommendations include raising the legal age of smoking each year until nobody can buy tobacco, and banning smoking in many public areas, such as outside of hospitals and in the majority of new social housing.

At a backbench business debate of the Government's smoke-free policy, a Tory MP said that making smoking obsolete was "vital" to the health of the entire population. He added: "It also helps deliver economic growth because smoking increases sickness, absenteeism, and disability and the total public finance cost of smoking is twice that of the excise taxes that tobacco brings into the Exchequer. Many tens of thousands of people die prematurely each year from smoking, and 30 times as many as those who die are suffering from serious illnesses, which cost the NHS billions of pounds every year".

Adapted from *The Daily Telegraph*, November 2022

## PLAN

Death and illnesses

\*~~Then~~ it costs money

\*~~Moreover~~ it slows down the growth of the country

Death and illnesses

It's **even more** crucial because it has an economic impact

Not only does it slow down growth

But it is also very costly



The industry should be destroyed because it causes diseases and deaths. (+**addiction**)

\*(~~Moreover~~, banning smoking would be an advantage for the country's finances)

—> It would be **even more** beneficial to the whole country since it would have economic advantages. As smokers are more prone to sickness and tend to be absent from work more often, it is up to the state to cover these expenses **while** (✓) taxes on tobacco do not make up for the amount spent. Therefore, eradicating the industry would save people and boost the economy.

The tobacco industry should be eliminated in order to improve public health, as smoking kills a large number of people each year and causes a lot of diseases. **Thus**, smokers will eventually be sick, which will impact the country's economic growth because, since they are sick, they are unable to work properly. (~~\*Moreover~~) **Worse still**, state finances are negatively impacted because smoking is too expensive for the government compared to what the taxes on tobacco are bringing in.

CORRIGE	Eléments attendus
<p>Smoking should be eradicated, first, because it kills thousands of Britons each year. Therefore, killing the industry would save smokers' lives and limit other cigarette-related deaths. And as smoking is an addiction, state intervention is necessary. All the more so since smoking a costly habit for the state: the National Health Service bears the economic brunt of cigarette addiction which also drives inequalities and chokes off economic growth when smokers fall ill. True, there are taxes on tobacco, but they do not cancel out the health-related costs.</p> <p>87 words</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Public health reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Smoking kills directly and indirectly</li> <li>- Smoking is an addiction which requires state intervention</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) Economic reasons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It comes at a hefty cost for the NHS</li> <li>- Smoking drives inequalities</li> <li>- It chokes off economic growth and productivity</li> <li>- The costs outweigh tax revenues on tobacco</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## **Fix the Mistakes**

\*wich (O4)

\*on an economical point of view

\*government should destroy the industry

\*people health

\*the country economy

\*smoke kills (P30)

\*destroy the industry would lead to economic growth

\*to make economies

\*it's benefic

**Make this sentence shorter:**

This is something that the government cannot ignore →

2. In your opinion, how far should the state intervene to change health-related behaviours?

Illustrate your answer with relevant examples. (180 words  $\pm$  10 %)

## METHODOLOGIE DE L'ESSAI

Votre essai doit impérativement être structuré de la façon suivante :

### 1- Introduction

- a. Accroche
- b. Thèse défendue ou question qui lance le développement  
**Il est interdit de recopier la question, il faut au minimum la reformuler.**

### 2- Développement

- a. 2 parties identifiables [faire des **paragraphes**]
- b. Dans **chaque** paragraphe
  - i. Idée clé explicitée et développée
  - ii. **Exemples** précis
  - iii. Clôture

### 3- Conclusion

- a. Réponse claire à la question posée et/ou prise de position personnelle
- b. Ouverture vers de nouvelles perspectives **si cela est pertinent.**

When it comes to<sup>4</sup> health issues, although individuals should be free to make their own decisions, I can't help thinking<sup>5</sup> that the state has a part to play too, whether we like it or not<sup>6</sup>.

True<sup>7</sup>, most adults are sensible<sup>8</sup> enough to understand what is good for them and to make choices accordingly<sup>9</sup>. Who does not know about the dangers of smoking, for instance? Citizens are free to live their lives as they see fit<sup>10</sup>, and it should not be the role of the state to protect them against their own excesses. (1)

Yet, things are not as easy as they appear. The recent Covid crisis has shown that the line is blurred between individual liberties and the public good. Many people saw mask mandates<sup>11</sup> and lockdowns as a form of tyranny. But the example of the US, where Covid response was slowed down by the federal government's inaction, not to mention the many legal challenges<sup>12</sup> from individuals, suggests that only government intervention could get us out of that crisis.

All in all, I would say that health is a matter for both individuals and the State, since the public good always trumps<sup>13</sup> personal liberty. (195 words)

---

<sup>4</sup> **When it comes to sth / to doing sth** = lorsqu'il est question de qch/de faire qch

<sup>5</sup> **I can't help thinking that** : je ne peux m'empêcher de penser que

<sup>6</sup> **Whether we like it or not** = que ça nous plaise ou non.

<sup>7</sup> **True, ...** = Certes, ...

<sup>8</sup> **Sensible** = raisonnable / sensé

<sup>9</sup> **Accordingly** = en conséquence.

<sup>10</sup> **As they see fit** = comme bon leur semble

<sup>11</sup> **Mandate** = ordre / décret

<sup>12</sup> **Legal challenges** = actions / recours en justice

<sup>13</sup> **To trump sth** = l'emporter sur / être plus fort que

QUESTION REPETEE

PAS DE PARAGRAPHES

PAS DE CONCLUSION

PAS D'EXEMPLES



! TICKET TO DISASTER !



In some countries, people are free to do anything they want

The state cannot take any measure to stop people taking drugs

With the recent development of the industry

We have to do sth

The government is right but on the other hand they are wrong



## PLAN

- ~~The state should take measures~~
- ~~However the state shouldn't take measures~~



## CONCLUSION

- ~~The state must intervene but people also have a role to play~~
- ~~It depends on people and situations~~
- Question : How far ...?
- Answer : ~~Not too far.~~



## EXAMPLES:

~~\*North Korea & Nazi Germany~~ → give me a break!

- State intervention in people's behaviours when those behaviours have an impact on their health or a direct link to their health
- Possible examples of health-related behaviours and the problems they raise:
  - HIV
  - obesity (overconsumption of sugar or junk food → social and political issues)
  - addiction to drugs, alcohol, cigarettes
  - attitude towards viruses : wearing masks, using hand sanitizing gels, social distancing
  - attitude towards vaccines (anti-vaxxer movement / conspiracy theories and trust in science)
- State intervention is necessary to protect other citizens' lives : non-smokers (the smokers' children, etc), the victims of alcohol abuse
- The case of obesity is different though because a person who is obese endangers only their own life → it is thus a question of personal choice → is state intervention justified then?
- Notwithstanding these concerns for individual rights, helping people lose weight or preventing obesity is a state responsibility: considering the extent of the epidemic in the US (where over 14 million children are obese) or even in the UK (where around 1 in every 4 adults and around 1 in every 5 children aged 10 to 11 are living with obesity, according to the NHS website), reducing obesity could help prevent healthcare systems from collapsing
- Sugar tax / Soda tax in Scotland

**Abortion** ≠ health-related behaviour

**Roe v. Wade (1973)**: the Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution of the United States conferred the right to have an abortion.

**Roe v. Wade** was overturned by the Supreme Court (SCOTUS) in June 2022

**In your opinion, how far should the state intervene to change health-related behaviours?**

- HOW FAR
- CHANGE
- SHOULD
- HEALTH-RELATED BEHAVIOURS

## PLANS

- 1- No intervention if it only hurts you
- 2- Intervention if it also hurts the others

Conclusion : it's ok if hurts the others but not if it only hurts you 😞

ADD SOMETHING → don't people's bad habits ALWAYS have consequences on society as a whole?

## OR

- 1- **At first sight** state intervention could be acceptable only when sb is harming the others, not themselves
- 2- **But on second thought**, do our behaviours not always have consequences on society?

**Conclusion** : In theory the state should not infringe on individual liberties when it comes to health, but unfortunately, in practice it has to.

## **The right calls it the ‘nanny state’ – I call it standing up to rich corporations and protecting people’s health**

Devi Shridar, *The Guardian*, Mon 23 Sep 2024

The UK government’s plans to restrict junk food ads, ban energy drink sales to children and phase out smoking have been met with a predictable refrain: that this is all a “nanny state” plot.” [...]

The phrase was first widely used in 1965 when a former Conservative minister was unhappy about the introduction of the 70mph speed limit on England’s motorways. He was expressing the view that the government shouldn’t treat its people like naughty children who need a nanny to tell them what they are and aren’t allowed to do.

Since then, it’s become a shorthand – often directed at Labour by the Conservatives – for expressing dissatisfaction with a range of public health measures, including the indoor smoking ban, minimum alcohol pricing, caloric listings on menus and speed limits on UK roads. The sense is always the same: that mass public health measures are draconian, excessive and interfere with individual civil liberties. [...]

As someone working in this field, this framing is frustrating, because public health is at its core about providing freedom, including the freedom to live a long and healthy life. Government policy is usually a delicate balancing act between intervention and individual freedom. [...]

But even the word “freedom” is loaded: its use to argue against certain policies assumes one person’s pursuit of freedom doesn’t infringe on another’s. For example, should someone be free to drink and drive recklessly, even if it endangers someone else’s freedom to get home safely? Should someone be free to smoke in a car, even if it endangers children or other passengers who want to be free to breathe clean air and have healthy lungs?

With diet and tobacco, the argument isn’t about taking away someone’s freedom, but regulation to restrict corporations’ behaviour that affects all of us. [...] Should corporations be free to market unhealthy food to children, even if the consequences of childhood obesity are not only faced by these individuals, but also a healthcare system crumbling under the weight of chronic disease? This is where the freedom and anti-nanny state arguments break down.

**Here’s some realism. The NHS cannot treat its way through an unhealthy and ageing population: the burden is too high on an overstretched health service. Prevention is the way to ensure that people stay healthy and out of clinics and hospitals – and this prevention has to start in communities.**

We have the benefit of living in a democracy where the government is concerned about our health and wants to give us the most freedom to live our life disease-free and pain-free – and wants to continue to provide all of us with free medical services through the NHS. Two ways it can do this is through creating the incentives not to smoke and supporting us to keep our weight within a healthy limit. **We can’t leave it up to individuals to figure it all out. They’re fighting against a corporate push to sell cigarettes or unhealthy foods, which is about maximising profits and not the welfare of the public.** [...]

**[A]nd if that means we are living within a “nanny state”, then maybe that’s not so bad.**

## PROBLEMATIQUES

To what extent is the state legitimate to intervene in people's daily lives?

To what extent should the health of individuals be a matter for the government?

Is there a limit to the state's impact on individual attitudes to health? (Or "Where is the limit"?)

Where is the line that the state should not cross when it comes to health issues?

Aren't individuals alone responsible for their own health?

If individuals alone are not responsible for their own health, then what role should the state play?



## **Fix the mistakes**

~~\*Like it says in the article~~

~~\*Like it is said in the article~~

~~\*Dangerous people's behaviour~~

~~\*Since the Covid crisis, people are worried that ....~~

~~\*It's for that that the state has to intervene~~