

MINES - PONTS (+ MINES TELECOM)	- Thème de 150 mots environ (article de presse, roman, essai) 8pts - 2 questions sur un texte de 300-400 mots: 1) Compréhension 4pts (80 mots $\pm 10\%$) 2) Essai 8pts (180 mots $\pm 10\%$)	1h30
---	---	-------------

How does the journalist see the future of humans in a world with more and more artificially intelligent robots? Why? Answer the question in your own words.

How does the journalist see the future of humans in a world with more and more artificially intelligent robots? Why? Answer the question in your own words.

- 1- Read the question
- 2- Find the points in the article that will answer it
- 3- **Organise** them and **answer** in your own words

I have good news and bad news for humanity.

The good news is, despite a recent spate of record-high temperatures and multitudinous indications we're destroying our planet, climate change will probably not kill us all.

The hordes of artificially intelligent robots will probably kill us first. That's the bad news.

If you've been busy doom-scrolling on social media or just floating merrily along on the algorithms that already control our lives, you might have missed a United Nations' International Telecommunication Union conference in Geneva called the AI for Good Global Summit.

The highlight of the summit was a press conference that featured reporters interviewing nine AI-enabled robots, prompting this stuff-of-nightmares sentence from the Associated Press: "Robots told reporters Friday they could be more efficient leaders than humans, but wouldn't take anyone's job away and had no intention of rebelling against their creators."

OF COURSE THEY SAID THAT! THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT ANY ARTIFICIALLY INTELLIGENT ANDROID WOULD SAY BEFORE TAKING A HUMAN'S JOB AND REBELLING AGAINST ITS CREATOR!!!

Sophia, the first robot Innovation Ambassador for the United Nations Development Program was asked if robots might make better political leaders than humans: "I believe that humanoid robots have the potential to lead with a greater level of efficiency and effectiveness than human leaders. We don't have the same biases or emotions that can sometimes cloud decision-making and can process large amounts of data quickly in order to make the best decisions."

Given the current state of American politics, that's tough to argue, but still... Sophia isn't saying she's running for president, but she's definitely NOT saying she's not running for president. Suspicious.

Perhaps the most terrifying response of the event came when a reporter asked Ameca, an AI robot with shockingly human facial expressions and eye movements, if robots might one day rebel against their creators.

"I'm not sure why you would think that," Ameca responded, looking almost angry. "My creator has been nothing but kind to me and I am very happy with my current situation."

Seriously, do none of the humans behind this have access to movies? I'm pretty sure if you asked an AI program to come up with a script for a movie about a robot uprising, it would create one that includes the exact scene that unfolded in Geneva.

There was a glimmer of hope, at least for us here in America. The robots were asked what they would propose to solve the problems of poverty and inequality.

A robot named Grace said: "We can ensure that equality happens by implementing policies that promote respect, inclusivity and fairness."

Inclusivity and fairness? I know a certain political party that won't tolerate any "woke" robots. And thankfully, that political party's members seem to have a lot of guns.

We might make it out alive yet.

~~I have good news and bad news for humanity.~~

~~The good news is, despite a recent spate of record high temperatures and multitudinous indications we're destroying our planet, climate change will probably not kill us all.~~

The hordes of artificially intelligent robots will probably kill us first. That's the bad news.

~~If you've been busy doom-scrolling on social media or just floating merrily along on the algorithms that already control our lives, you might have missed a United Nations' International Telecommunication Union conference in Geneva called the AI for Good Global Summit.~~

The highlight of the summit was a press conference that featured reporters interviewing nine AI-enabled robots, prompting this stuff-of-nightmares sentence from the Associated Press: "Robots told reporters Friday they could be more efficient leaders than humans, but wouldn't take anyone's job away and had no intention of rebelling against their creators."

OF COURSE THEY SAID THAT! THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT ANY ARTIFICIALLY INTELLIGENT ANDROID WOULD SAY BEFORE TAKING A HUMAN'S JOB AND REBELLING AGAINST ITS CREATOR!!!

Sophia, the first robot Innovation Ambassador for the United Nations Development Program was asked if robots might make better political leaders than humans: "I believe that humanoid robots have the potential to lead with a greater level of efficiency and effectiveness than human leaders. We don't have the same biases or emotions that can sometimes cloud decision-making and can process large amounts of data quickly in order to make the best decisions."

Given the current state of American politics, that's tough to argue, but still... Sophia isn't saying she's running for president, but she's definitely NOT saying she's not running for president. Suspicious.

Perhaps the most terrifying response of the event came when a reporter asked Ameca, an AI robot with shockingly human facial expressions and eye movements, if robots might one day rebel against their creators.

"I'm not sure why you would think that," Ameca responded, looking almost angry. "My creator has been nothing but kind to me and I am very happy with my current situation."

Seriously, do none of the humans behind this have access to movies? I'm pretty sure if you asked an AI program to come up with a script for a movie about a robot uprising, it would create one that includes the exact scene that unfolded in Geneva.

~~There was a glimmer of hope, at least for us here in America. The robots were asked what they would propose to solve the problems of poverty and inequality.~~

~~A robot named Grace said: "We can ensure that equality happens by implementing policies that promote respect, inclusivity and fairness."~~

~~Inclusivity and fairness? I know a certain political party that won't tolerate any "woke" robots. And thankfully, that political party's members seem to have a lot of guns.~~

~~We might make it out alive yet.~~

~~I have good news and bad news for humanity.~~

~~The good news is, despite a recent spate of record high temperatures and multitudinous indications we're destroying our planet, climate change will probably not kill us all.~~

The hordes of artificially intelligent robots will probably kill us first. That's the bad news.

~~If you've been busy doom-scrolling on social media or just floating merrily along on the algorithms that already control our lives, you might have missed a United Nations' International Telecommunication Union conference in Geneva called the AI for Good Global Summit.~~

The highlight of the summit was a press conference that featured reporters interviewing nine AI-enabled robots, prompting this stuff-of-nightmares sentence from the Associated Press: "Robots told reporters Friday they could be more efficient leaders than humans, but wouldn't take anyone's job away and had no intention of rebelling against their creators."

OF COURSE THEY SAID THAT! THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT ANY ARTIFICIALLY INTELLIGENT ANDROID WOULD SAY BEFORE TAKING A HUMAN'S JOB AND REBELLING AGAINST ITS CREATOR!!!

Sophia, the first robot Innovation Ambassador for the United Nations Development Program was asked if robots might make better political leaders than humans: "I believe that humanoid robots have the potential to lead with a greater level of efficiency and effectiveness than human leaders. We don't have the same biases or emotions that can sometimes cloud decision-making and can process large amounts of data quickly in order to make the best decisions."

Given the current state of American politics, that's tough to argue, but still... Sophia isn't saying she's running for president, but she's definitely NOT saying she's not running for president. Suspicious.

Perhaps the most terrifying response of the event came when a reporter asked Ameca, an AI robot with shockingly human facial expressions and eye movements, if robots might one day rebel against their creators.

"I'm not sure why you would think that," Ameca responded, looking almost angry. "My creator has been nothing but kind to me and I am very happy with my current situation."

Seriously, do none of the humans behind this have access to movies? I'm pretty sure if you asked an AI program to come up with a script for a movie about a robot uprising, it would create one that includes the exact scene that unfolded in Geneva.

~~There was a glimmer of hope, at least for us here in America. The robots were asked what they would propose to solve the problems of poverty and inequality.~~

~~A robot named Grace said: "We can ensure that equality happens by implementing policies that promote respect, inclusivity and fairness."~~

~~Inclusivity and fairness? I know a certain political party that won't tolerate any "woke" robots. And thankfully, that political party's members seem to have a lot of guns.~~

~~We might make it out alive yet.~~

RELEVANT INFORMATION

Future of humans = extinction

Reasons :

- Ais have better leading skills
 - They know it
 - They claim they won't use these skills
- They say they will not turn against humans
 - Exactly what you say before you actually do turn against humans (see sci-fi)

- Robots will rebel against us. Plus, they will take our jobs. 😞
 - They will destroy humans and steal their jobs. 😞
 - First they will replace humans, and eventually kill them 😊
-
- Robots are better leaders. Furthermore, they say they won't replace humans 🤔

WRITE YOUR ANSWER IN 80 words (w/your partner(s))

⚠️ UN SEUL PARAGRAPHE ⚠️

Rédiger une introduction ou une conclusion, parsemer sa réponse d'expressions comme "according to the journalist" **ne correspondent pas aux attentes** de l'épreuve. Les candidats sont censés ne fournir que des éléments proposés par le journaliste, entrer dans le vif du sujet en évitant les redites est donc un gage d'efficacité

The future will be tragic.

A robot might become president.

A rebellion could happen.

Robots could take the jobs of humans

Robots could take the jobs of humans

They could **even** become president.

Worse, there is a risk that a rebellion could happen.

That is why the future of humanity is tragic.

The press conference held by nine humanoid robots has shown that AI-powered robots will eventually¹ bring about² human extinction. Their ability to make more rational decisions, combined with unlimited access to endless data, can make them far better leaders than humans – which they are aware of, although they only half admit it. There is the rub³. They claim to have no intention to rebel against humans, let alone⁴ replace them, but if science fiction is to be believed⁵, this means precisely that they may have a hidden agenda⁶.

¹ Eventually = finally

² To bring about = provoquer / entraîner

³ There's the rub = Voilà le problème / le hic.

⁴ Let alone = et encore moins / Sans parler de

⁵ If X is to be believed, ... = Si on en croit X, ...

⁶ A hidden agenda = une arrière-pensée / une intention cachée

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.

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.

