ÉPREUVE DE LANGUE VIVANTE — ANGLAIS

SYNTHÈSE DE DOCUMENTS/TEXTE D'OPINION

Durée : 4 heures (X/ENS ou Centrale) / 3 heures (CCINP)

Sujet modulable X-ENS/Centrale-Supélec/CCINP

MP* Vous composerez au choix l'épreuve type X/ENS OU Centrale-Supélec
MP : Vous composerez au choix l'épreuve type X/ENS OU Centrale-Supélec OU CCINP

Quel que soit le cas, merci d'indiquer le choix retenu en tête de copie.

Pour **l'épreuve type X/ENS**, la partie A consiste en une synthèse de 600 à 675 mots qui traitera de tous les documents de la partie A.
La partie B consiste en la rédaction d'un texte d'opinion de 500 à 600 mots, en réaction au texte d'opinion proposé.

Pour **l'épreuve type Centrale**, vous composerez une synthèse de 500 mots (+/- 10%) qui traitera de tous les documents de la partie A. La partie B ne vous concerne pas.

Pour **l'épreuve type CCINP**, vous composerez une synthèse de 400 mots (+/- 10%) qui traitera uniquement des documents 1, 2 et 4. Vous pourrez les numéroter de 1 à 4 et vous y référer ainsi dans votre rédaction. La partie B ne vous concerne pas.

Le dossier de synthèse (partie A) se compose des documents suivants :

1. Un article d'analyse tiré du *Financial Times* (juin 2023)
2. La présentation d'une étude menée par l'Université de York, publiée sur leur site en août 2023
3. Un extrait de *Nature*, essai écrit en 1849 par Ralph Waldo Emerson
4. Une illustration postée sur le site de Green Finance Observatory, un « think-tank » indépendant

Consignes de rédaction :

- Veuillez sauter des lignes, indiquez clairement le total des mots pour la synthèse ainsi que pour le texte d'opinion (si vous composez le sujet X/ENS), et ayez soin de faciliter la vérification à l'aide d'une barre tous les vingt mots.

- Rédigez votre devoir sur une feuille à grands carreaux et, en plus de la marge à gauche, tracez une marge à droite (4 carreaux).

- Veuillez laisser la page de garde vide pour la note/commentaire. Pas de bandereau, s'il vous plaît.

FINANCIAL TIMES

The EU needs to move faster on valuing nature

National governments tend to backpeddle on green policies when challenged by self-interested voters

Heather Grabb, June 26, 2023

The writer is Europe's Futures fellow of the Institute for Human Sciences-IWM and non-resident fellow at Bruegel

The European Commission last week launched an economic security strategy for the continent, responding to threats ranging from Russia's war in Ukraine to competition for critical raw materials.

The EU's 27 members still have different views on how to operationalise it, with debates raging over industrial policy and trade restrictions. But Europe's recognition of the costs of non-diversification and the downsides of interdependence is a decisive turn away from 30 years of "Wandel durch Handel" (transformation through trade), and 70 years of pursuing economic integration as its central security strategy.

Yet the biggest threats to economic security are not being addressed by political leaders. For many decades, as prosperity rose, we not only ignored the risks of our suppliers weaponising dependence, but also the costs of this economic model in destroying nature, both internally and in the countries where goods destined for European markets are produced.

The enormous cost of losing ecosystem services such as pollination, soil genesis and water and air detoxification was set out by Cambridge economist Partha Dasgupta in his landmark 2021 report on how to bring ecological externalities into economics. However, attempts to develop methods of valuing nature and quantifying climate risk have moved very slowly since.

The EU has developed a carbon market through its emissions trading scheme, and the huge business opportunities in producing low-carbon energy are driving investment. But it is hard to turn a profit from improving biodiversity in a system that overvalues productive capital, undervalues human capital and fails to value natural capital at all.

There are still no market mechanisms to protect the oceans and forests, which are profitable to destroy but not to keep as carbon sinks and biodiversity reserves. The "tragedy of the commons" is that they are not accounted for in measures of economic performance.

Work on addressing these longer-term, systemic risks is slowly reaching the EU policy agenda. On June 28, the European External Action Service and the commission are due to produce their first joint paper on climate security, a holistic overview of all the new threats from environmental degradation and climate change to European security.

Meanwhile, the European Central Bank is studying how to account for nature-related risks building up in the financial system due to the impact of environmental degradation on production processes, and hence on the creditworthiness of 4.2mn European companies accounting for more than €4.2tn in corporate loans. In the euro area, nearly three-quarters of companies are highly dependent on at least one ecosystem service, leading the ECB to argue that nature loss needs to be built into financial risk models.

Some economists ask whether the ECB should be worrying about future risks when issues such as inflation need immediate attention. But the real problem is not that European institutions are extending their mandates to recognise environmental impacts, but that national governments' mandates are too limited — both geographically and temporally. It is hard for governments to propose paying for climate issues. The immediate cost of the green transition falls on their electorate now, whereas the benefits of avoiding more expensive problems will be enjoyed by future citizens.

Climate degradation is exactly the kind of long-term, transnational problem that EU institutions were established to manage. It is a complex, long-term policy issue that affects the welfare of all Europeans — and no one government can address it on its own. That is why European-level institutions need to bring environmental risk fully into their mandates.

Currently, implementation of policies to mitigate climate risk comes down to the national level, causing a blame game. Political leaders express support for the European Green Deal and agree to EU-level common targets. But as soon as their farmers and coalminers complain, they blame Brussels.

In explaining why we have to address these huge security threats, it would help if political leaders spelt out the costs of inaction. Voters need to see why investments in natural security — such as decarbonisation, dematerialisation and nature preservation — are less costly than cleaning up after floods and wildfires, and trying to restore biodiversity after it collapses. That requires a timescale that extends beyond the next election, which is difficult in democracies. But every European institution has to take responsibility for environmental impacts, and the sooner the better.

Important study calls for major change in how decision-makers value nature

How people value nature around the world is not properly reflected in key political and economic decisions, a new study has concluded.

A new study published in the science journal Nature, based on a large-scale assessment by a panel of leading global scientists, shows how undervaluation of nature is often linked to environmental crises.

According to its authors, the different ways in which nature contributes to people's social, cultural, and spiritual well-being needs to be better reflected in key political and economic decisions. It proves we need new tools and approaches that capture a diverse range of views on the value of nature. By bringing these together, we can plan for a better future where there is space for wildlife and development.

Beyond economic growth

The study, co-authored by Professor Jasper Kenter and the late Dr Tobias Nyumba from the Department for Environment and Geography at the University of York, concludes that the value of the natural world extends far beyond the current emphasis on short-term profits and economic growth.

The study reveals that market-based values of nature - such as those associated with intensively-produced food and other commodities - are often prioritised at the expense of the non-market values associated with nature's many other contributions to society such as adapting to climate change or nurturing cultural identities.

At the same time, biodiversity conservation policies - such as the expansion of protected area networks - have also often prioritised narrow sets of nature conservation values, frequently marginalising values of Indigenous peoples and local communities, who in many cases have been shown to protect biodiversity on their territories.

Undervaluation of nature

The paper argues that the undervaluation of nature is a fundamental cause of today's global environmental crisis and that the continued dominance of a narrow set of market-based values is unfit for the purpose of dealing with the biodiversity and climate emergencies.[…]

Three postgraduate students from the University of York (Jordan Blanchard-Lafayette, Harry Cross, and James Reeves) contributed as interns. The publication in Nature synthesises and highlights the assessment's main results, which were based on a review of more than 50,000 scientific publications, policy documents, and Indigenous and local knowledge sources.

Over a million species threatened

Professor Jasper Kenter, who was a lead author of the IPBES report, said: "We are in the sixth wave of mass extinction of species on the planet, with over a million species threatened.

"Our report identifies social values associated with a narrow focus on economic growth and short-term profits as important underlying drivers for environmental destruction.

"A sustainable and just future for people and planet will not be possible unless we rebalance the values that are being prioritised in policy and economic decision making away from the predominant focus on short-term profits and economic growth to recognise multiple values, including the ways nature is important for life support processes, culture, community and health and wellbeing."

Values-centred approaches

The paper identifies four 'values-centred approaches' that could foster the necessary conditions for such a transformative change. These include recognising the diversity of nature's values, embedding these diverse values in decision-making, reforming policies, and stimulating institutional change, and shifting society-level norms and goals to support sustainability-aligned values across sectors.

Professor Roland Gehrels, Head of the Department of Environment and Geography, at The University of York, said: "Having Tobias's research published in this prestigious journal is a great testament to the vitality of his brilliant research. His passion for conservation and the power of nature was always evident, so it is fantastic to see the rigour of Tobias's research and powerful ideas recognised in such an important journal.

"I'm sure his work will live on, and inspire new generations of researchers and academics to build a better understanding of how and why nature can be better valued by decision makers."

Participatory approaches to biodiversity

One particularly timely aspect of the study published in Nature is the support it provides to recent efforts, such as those expressed in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, to create more respectful and participatory approaches to environmental and development decision-making. In this context, the study emphasises that recognizing and incorporating the worldviews and values of Indigenous peoples and local communities and the institutions that support their rights and territories also allow policies to be more inclusive, and crucially this also translates into better outcomes for both people and nature. […]

Posted on August 17, 2023, on the website of the University of York (UK)

Nature – Chapter II – "Commodity"

[…]

Nature, in its ministry to man, is not only the material, but is also the process and the result. All the parts incessantly work into each other's hands for the profit of man. The wind sows the seed; the sun evaporates the sea; the wind blows the vapor to the field; the ice, on the other side of the planet, condenses rain on this; the rain feeds the plant; the plant feeds the animal; and thus the endless circulations of the divine charity nourish man.

The useful arts are reproductions or new combinations by the wit of man, of the same natural benefactors. He no longer waits for favoring gales, but by means of steam, he realizes the fable of Aeolus's bag, and carries the two and thirty winds in the boiler of his boat. To diminish friction, he paves the road with iron bars, and, mounting a coach with a ship-load of men, animals, and merchandise behind him, he darts through the country, from town to town, like an eagle or a swallow through the air. By the aggregate of these aids, how is the face of the world changed, from the era of Noah to that of Napoleon! The private poor man hath cities, ships, canals, bridges, built for him. He goes to the post-office, and the human race run on his errands; to the book-shop, and the human race read and write of all that happens, for him; to the court-house, and nations repair his wrongs. He sets his house upon the road, and the human race go forth every morning, and shovel out the snow, and cut a path for him.

But there is no need of specifying particulars in this class of uses. The catalogue is endless, and the examples so obvious, that I shall leave them to the reader's reflection, with the general remark, that this mercenary benefit is one which has respect to a farther good. A man is fed, not that he may be fed, but that he may work.

Excerpt of Chapter II of *Nature*, Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1849

