

A B C D E F G
H I J K L M N
O P Q R S T
U V W X Y Z

A E I O U

AI

AI

[eɪ' aɪ]



By the way, ChatGPT misspelled your name.



By the way, ChatGPT misspelled your name.

A CARTOON

~~*It's an extract/*It comes from~~ 

- It IS / WAS taken from
- It was published in (a newspaper) / on (a site)
- It's an article from ...



IN August 2026



ON August 4th, 2026

MEMO-ANGLAIS : N16

N16

Préposition devant une date

Il ne faut pas confondre les prépositions devant les jours, mois, années :

- Si la date et/ou le jour sont précisés → **ON**
- Autres cas → **IN**

À l'oral, on dit → "the 12th of June 1999"
À l'écrit, on simplifie → June 12, 1999
ou 12 June 1999

*We met **on** May 25, 1996.*

*Films are released **on** Wednesdays in France and mostly **on** Fridays in the USA.*

*Shakespeare died **in** April 1616.*

*Paul Auster was born **in** 1947.*

"I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I." – Key Vocabulary

A high vertical stroke ['] indicates a stressed syllable

- A column /'kɒləm/ :
- A plea : plaidoyer
- Perfunctory /pə'fʌŋ(k)t(ə)ri/= done without real interest or effort

"I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I." – Key Vocabulary

A high vertical stroke ['] indicates a stressed syllable

- A column /'kɒləm/ : **une rubrique / une chronique**

→ **a regular section of a newspaper or magazine devoted to a particular subject or written by a particular person**
- A plea : plaidoyer
- Perfunctory /pə'fʌŋ(k)t(ə)ri/= done without real interest or effort

I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I.

By Bret Stephens, *The New York Times*, Aug. 4, 2026

This column isn't so much an argument as it is a plea: Don't use artificial intelligence to help you write. Never let A.I. do your writing for you.

Don't use it for school papers, work briefs, letters to your in-laws, speeches at your company gathering or emails (however perfunctory) to your colleagues or friends. Don't let it organize your notes. (...) Don't ask it to write a first draft and pretend that editing that draft somehow makes it your own. It doesn't.

Do none of these things not because they are unethical. Writing with A.I. is unethical when it's a deception: when you pass off words, ideas and information as your own when they aren't. (...) Do none of these things, either, not because you might be able to learn to write better than an A.I. can. Pretty soon, if not already, you won't, just as you can't outrun a car or outplay a chess app.

The problem with writing with A.I. is that it's mentally enfeebling — an escalator toward a result when you really need to make a daily habit of taking the stairs (...). We're already reckoning with the well-documented decline of reading; A.I. is accelerating the decline of writing, ushering us further into what *The Atlantic's* Rose Horowitz calls our "postliterate age."

What, uniquely, does writing do? It compels thought. It compels thinking in ways that silent contemplation or spoken language rarely can. It compels us to subject our thinking to the effort of articulation, the rigor of grammar, the tests of intelligibility and coherence, the inspection of others. In doing so, it also enjoins us to be clear, logical, accurate — and accountable. People may easily forgive a word said in anger but not so easily one written in anger, precisely because the fact that it was written tells us that it was considered. (...)

But what happens when the words aren't considered because they were written by (or with the help of) a machine?

Words become hollow. Imagine the father of the bride turning to A.I. to help him write his daughter's wedding toast: What the A.I. can supply in eloquence it subtracts in effort and authenticity. Now imagine that the daughter learns that the speech was written by A.I.: Wouldn't she be right to be disappointed, if not insulted?

Many would argue there's a big difference between using A.I. for something as significant and personal as a wedding speech and using it for the boring and frequently exhausting tasks of writing, say, routine office memos. But the intellectual muscle that's exercised in everyday writing is the same one used for the writing that matters. (...) We become more creative when we learn how to put a personal stamp even on routine things, making them unmistakably our own.

These skills are now evaporating. A recent examination using A.I.-detection technology of 100 doctoral dissertations found that 56 percent of them contained "more than negligible" A.I.-generated writing and 19 percent had "more than 50 percent A.I.-generated text." (...) It's easy to treat the problem as one of mere cheating. But cheating doesn't capture the real scope of the A.I. threat, which isn't merely to academic integrity or personal betterment but also to democratic self-governance.

The link between broad-based literacy and the rise of democracy is well known: People who can read and write for themselves have, historically, also been good at choosing and advocating for themselves. (...) What happens when(...) people lack the patience to absorb arguments more than a few pages or sentences long? When they lack the ability to contradict those arguments because they've never honed, through daily practice, the most essential skill for clear thinking?

We're already getting a taste of what this world looks like in President Trump's social media posts and the sway they clearly exert over tens of millions of Americans. But that's a reflection of where the country was a decade ago, in the pre-A.I. age. How much farther down the road are we now, with our even more diminished capacity to read, write and think?

The next time you're tempted to just adopt an automated response for a text message or an email, don't. Type out a response that's your own. Think of it as an act of free will. Or a vote against Trump. What takes you a few additional seconds is an act of resistance against an ever-dumber world.



12 paragraphs

≠

12 parts in your summary

~~“In the first paragraph,... Then in the second paragraph... Then in the third paragraph ...”~~



I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I.

By Bret Stephens, *The New York Times*, Aug. 4, 2026

This column isn't so much an argument as it is a plea: Don't use artificial intelligence to help you write. Never let A.I. do your writing for you.

Don't use it for school papers, work briefs, letters to your in-laws, speeches at your company gathering or emails (however perfunctory) to your colleagues or friends. Don't let it organize your notes. (...) Don't ask it to write a first draft and pretend that editing that draft somehow makes it your own. It doesn't.

Do none of these things not because they are unethical. Writing with A.I. is unethical when it's a deception: when you pass off words, ideas and information as your own when they aren't. (...) Do none of these things, either, not because you might be able to learn to write better than an A.I. can. Pretty soon, if not already, you won't, just as you can't outrun a car or outplay a chess app.

The problem with writing with A.I. is that it's mentally enfeebling — an escalator toward a result when you really need to make a daily habit of taking the stairs (...). We're already reckoning with the well-documented decline of reading; A.I. is accelerating the decline of writing, ushering us further into what *The Atlantic's* Rose Horowitz calls our "postliterate age."

What, uniquely, does writing do? It compels thought. It compels thinking in ways that silent contemplation or spoken language rarely can. It compels us to subject our thinking to the effort of articulation, the rigor of grammar, the tests of intelligibility and coherence, the inspection of others. In doing so, it also enjoins us to be clear, logical, accurate — and accountable. People may easily forgive a word said in anger but not so easily one written in anger, precisely because the fact that it was written tells us that it was considered. (...)

But what happens when the words aren't considered because they were written by (or with the help of) a machine?

Words become hollow. Imagine the father of the bride turning to A.I. to help him write his daughter's wedding toast: What the A.I. can supply in eloquence it subtracts in effort and authenticity. Now imagine that the daughter learns that the speech was written by A.I.: Wouldn't she be right to be disappointed, if not insulted?

Many would argue there's a big difference between using A.I. for something as significant and personal as a wedding speech and using it for the boring and frequently exhausting tasks of writing, say, routine office memos. But the intellectual muscle that's exercised in everyday writing is the same one used for the writing that matters. (...) We become more creative when we learn how to put a personal stamp even on routine things, making them unmistakably our own.

These skills are now evaporating. A recent examination using A.I.-detection technology of 100 doctoral dissertations found that 56 percent of them contained "more than negligible" A.I.-generated writing and 19 percent had "more than 50 percent A.I.-generated text." (...) It's easy to treat the problem as one of mere cheating. But cheating doesn't capture the real scope of the A.I. threat, which isn't merely to academic integrity or personal betterment but also to democratic self-governance.

The link between broad-based literacy and the rise of democracy is well known: People who can read and write for themselves have, historically, also been good at choosing and advocating for themselves. (...) What happens when(...) people lack the patience to absorb arguments more than a few pages or sentences long? When they lack the ability to contradict those arguments because they've never honed, through daily practice, the most essential skill for clear thinking?

We're already getting a taste of what this world looks like in President Trump's social media posts and the sway they clearly exert over tens of millions of Americans. But that's a reflection of where the country was a decade ago, in the pre-A.I. age. How much farther down the road are we now, with our even more diminished capacity to read, write and think?

The next time you're tempted to just adopt an automated response for a text message or an email, don't. Type out a response that's your own. Think of it as an act of free will. Or a vote against Trump. What takes you a few additional seconds is an act of resistance against an ever-dumber world.

§1-2 - INTRO

This column isn't so much an argument as it is a plea: Don't use artificial intelligence to help you write. Never let A.I. do your writing for you.

Don't use it for school papers, work briefs, letters to your in-laws, speeches at your company gathering or emails (however perfunctory) to your colleagues or friends. Don't let it organize your notes. (...) Don't ask it to write a first draft and pretend that editing that draft somehow makes it your own. It doesn't.

§3 - The wrong reasons not to use AI for writing

Do none of these things **not because** they are unethical. Writing with A.I. is unethical when it's a deception: when you pass off words, ideas and information as your own when they aren't. (...) Do none of these things, either, **not because** you might be able to learn to write better than an A.I. can. Pretty soon, if not already, you won't, just as you can't outrun a car or outplay a chess app.

§4-9 – The actual reasons not to use AI for writing

The problem with writing with A.I. is that it's mentally enfeebling – an escalator toward a result when you really need to make a daily habit of taking the stairs (...). We're already reckoning with the well-documented decline of reading; A.I. is accelerating the decline of writing, ushering us further into what *The Atlantic's* Rose Horowitz calls our "postliterate age."

What, uniquely, does writing do? It compels thought. It compels thinking in ways that silent contemplation or spoken language rarely can. It compels us to subject our thinking to the effort of articulation, the rigor of grammar, the tests of intelligibility and coherence, the inspection of others. In doing so, it also enjoins us to be clear, logical, accurate – and accountable. People may easily forgive a word said in anger but not so easily one written in anger, precisely because the fact that it was written tells us that it was considered. (...)

But what happens when the words aren't considered because they were written by (or with the help of) a machine?

Words become hollow. Imagine the father of the bride turning to A.I. to help him write his daughter's wedding toast: What the A.I. can supply in eloquence it subtracts in effort and authenticity. Now imagine that the daughter learns that the speech was written by A.I.: Wouldn't she be right to be disappointed, if not insulted?

Many would argue there's a big difference between using A.I. for something as significant and personal as a wedding speech and using it for the boring and frequently exhausting tasks of writing, say, routine office memos. But the intellectual muscle that's exercised in everyday writing is the same one used for the writing that matters. (...) We become more creative when we learn how to put a personal stamp even on routine things, making them unmistakably our own.

These skills are now evaporating. A recent examination using A.I.-detection technology of 100 doctoral dissertations found that 56 percent of them contained "more than negligible" A.I.-generated writing and 19 percent had "more than 50 percent A.I.-generated text." (...) It's easy to treat the problem as one of mere cheating. But cheating doesn't capture the real scope of the A.I. threat, which isn't merely to academic integrity or personal betterment but also to democratic self-governance.

§10-12 – The link between writing and democracy

The link between broad-based literacy and the rise of democracy is well known: People who can read and write for themselves have, historically, also been good at choosing and advocating for themselves. (...) What happens when(...) people lack the patience to absorb arguments more than a few pages or sentences long? When they lack the ability to contradict those arguments because they've never honed, through daily practice, the most essential skill for clear thinking?

We're already getting a taste of what this world looks like in President Trump's social media posts and the sway they clearly exert over tens of millions of Americans. But that's a reflection of where the country was a decade ago, in the pre-A.I. age. How much farther down the road are we now, with our even more diminished capacity to read, write and think?

CONCLUSION

The next time you're tempted to just adopt an automated response for a text message or an email, don't. Type out a response that's your own. Think of it as an act of free will. Or a vote against Trump. What takes you a few additional seconds is an act of resistance against an ever-dumber world.

1) In an age where artificial intelligence is becoming increasingly present in our everyday lives, the way we write and think is also being transformed. The document we are studying is an opinion column entitled “I’m Begging You: Never Write With A.I.”, written by Bret Stephens and published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. In this article, the author strongly warns against using AI to write, arguing that it weakens our intellectual abilities and threatens not only personal development but also democratic self-government. We may therefore ask: why does Stephens consider writing without AI essential to preserving our capacity to think freely and critically?

In an age where artificial intelligence is becoming increasingly present in our everyday lives, the way we write and think is also being transformed. ~~The document we are studying~~ is an opinion column ~~entitled “I’m Begging You: Never Write With A.I.”~~, written by Bret Stephens and published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. In this article, ~~the author~~ strongly warns against using AI to write, arguing that it weakens our intellectual abilities and threatens not only personal development but also democratic self-government. ~~We may therefore ask: why does Stephens consider writing without AI essential to preserving our capacity to think freely and critically?~~

2) In an era where generative artificial intelligence increasingly automates human expression, the act of writing itself faces an unprecedented existential crisis. This issue lies at the heart of an opinion piece written by Bret Stephens, published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. The author firmly contends that relying on A.I. for writing enfeebls human intellect, destroys authentic communication, and ultimately threatens democratic self-governance. This raises a pivotal question: to what extent does offloading writing tasks to artificial intelligence impair critical thinking and weaken the foundations of a free society?

In an era where generative artificial intelligence increasingly automates human expression, the act of writing itself faces an unprecedented existential crisis. This issue lies at the heart of an opinion piece written by Bret Stephens, published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. ~~The author~~ firmly contends that relying on A.I. for writing **enfeebles human intellect**, destroys authentic communication, and ultimately threatens democratic self-governance. This raises a pivotal question: ~~to what extent does offloading writing tasks to artificial intelligence impair critical thinking and weaken the foundations of a free society?~~

3) Can a machine ever truly think for us — or does it only think in our place? This is the question raised by Bret Stephens in his opinion column "I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I.", published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. In this piece, the author argues that using artificial intelligence to write — whether for school papers, professional documents, or personal messages — is not merely a matter of convenience, but a threat to the very act of thinking itself. Stephens contends that writing is what forces us to structure our reasoning, take responsibility for our words, and exercise the "intellectual muscle" that democratic citizenship ultimately depends on. The text thus defends a clear thesis: relying on A.I. to write for us does not simply weaken our prose, it weakens our capacity to think clearly and, by extension, our ability to participate as free and responsible citizens.

Can a machine ever truly think for us — or does it only think in our place? This is the question raised by Bret Stephens in his opinion column **"I'm Begging You: Never Write With A.I."**, published in *The New York Times* on August 4, 2026. In this piece, ~~the author~~ argues that using artificial intelligence to write — whether for school papers, professional documents, or personal messages — is not merely a matter of convenience, but a threat to the very act of thinking itself. ~~Stephens contends that writing is what forces us to structure our reasoning, take responsibility for our words, and exercise the "intellectual muscle" that democratic citizenship ultimately depends on. The text thus defends a clear thesis: relying on A.I. to write for us does not simply weaken our prose, it weakens our capacity to think clearly and, by extension, our ability to participate as free and responsible citizens.~~

4) The sudden arrival of ChatGPT a few years ago revolutionized many aspects of daily life, including our relationship with writing. That is the subject of this opinion piece published in *The New York Times* in August, in which the columnist urges readers not to use AI for writing not only to preserve our ability to think for ourselves but also to preserve democracy.

The sudden arrival of ChatGPT a few years ago revolutionized many aspects of daily life, including our relationship with writing. That is the subject of this opinion piece published in *The New York Times* in August, in which the columnist urges readers not to use AI for writing [not only to preserve our ability to think for ourselves but also to preserve democracy.]



PROMPT : "Write a **short** introduction in English in the style of French CPGE PCSI/MPSI students. The introduction should begin with a hook or catchphrase to set the context, then present the document (including its source and date), and finally state the thesis defended **or** the main question asked."

SUMMARY

§1-2 – INTRO

SUMMARY

§1-2 – INTRO

The columnist is begging readers not to use AI when writing

Not for school/work/personal letters. Not even when writing emails

Don't have AI organize notes nor write sth for you to edit it afterwards

§3 - The wrong reasons not to use AI for writing

SUMMARY

§1-2 – INTRO

The columnist is begging readers not to use AI when writing

Not for school/work/personal letters. Not even when writing emails

Don't have AI organize notes nor write sth for you to edit it afterwards

§3 - The wrong reasons not to use AI for writing

YET/HOWEVER, the reasons are NOT that it's immoral or because humans can do better.

- Immoral only when you don't acknowledge sth was written by AI
- Soon, AI will be able to write better than humans

§4-9 – The ACTUAL reasons not to use AI for writing are :

SUMMARY

§1-2 – INTRO

The columnist is begging readers not to use AI when writing

Not for school/work/personal letters. Not even when writing emails

Don't have AI organize notes nor write sth for you to edit it afterwards

§3 - The wrong reasons not to use AI for writing

YET/HOWEVER, the reasons are NOT that it's immoral or because humans can do better.

- Immoral only when you don't acknowledge sth was written by AI
- Soon, AI will be able to write better than humans

§4-9 – The ACTUAL reasons not to use AI for writing are :

- Writing with AI will lead to a decline in writing abilities, just as there has been a decline in reading abilities
- Writing forces people to think and organize their thoughts
- Moreover, writing leaves a record → people need to be careful about what they write because it will be remembered.
- We need to get used to writing about important or meaningful topics. To do so, we need to practice regularly.
- The problem is, more and more people use AI to write, including PhD students
- It's not only about cheating

§10-12 – Beyond the ethical question it raises, this may **also** be a threat to democracy

- Necessary to be able to read and write about complex topics.
- The capacity of people to read, write, and think is already in decline, as shown by Pdt Trump's posts on social media
 - o Using AI to write would only make matters worse.

§10-12 – Beyond the ethical question it raises, this may **also** be a threaten democracy

- Necessary to be able to read and write about complex topics.
- The capacity of people to read, write, and think is already in decline, as shown by Pdt Trump's post on social media
 - Using AI to write would only make matters worse.

WRAP UP

To conclude

At the end of the day

All in all

The upshot is

The bottom line is

§10-12 – Beyond the ethical question it raises, this may **also** be a threaten democracy

- Necessary to be able to read and write about complex topics.
- The capacity of people to read, write, and think is already in decline, as shown by Pdt Trump's post on social media
 - o Using AI to write would only make matters worse.

WRAP UP

To conclude

At the end of the day

All in all

The upshot is

The bottom line is

ALL IN ALL / IN SHORT, not using AI to write not only preserves your ability to reason but is also an act of political resistance that can help save democracy.