

Sujet Centrale 2021 : propositions d'introduction

Proposition 1

3/5

The future of controversial memorials

A 2020 cartoon from 'The Philadelphia Inquirer' ironizes ~~the fact of leaving~~ in public spaces memorials of characters who ~~were involved in social issues~~ while a 2020 editorial from 'The Economist' argues for keeping those statues with added context instead of **destroying (?)** them | ~~as in~~ a 2017 op-ed from 'The Washington Post' depicting that ~~La Nouvelle-Orléans~~ will put them in museums. Finally, through a 2020 op-ed also from 'The Washington Post' a black woman living near such statues **ponders about their future (?)**.

~~Looking at the corpus~~, what to do with those statues in public spaces? We will explain why ~~were they~~ erected, then showing that destroying them is seen as a solution even if the genuine fix is to educate people through them.

(129 words)

The pb with those memorials is not made explicit. The editorialist's point (The Economist) is not clearly nailed. The point of the second op-ed is not to ponder about the future of the statues. The main issue is a bit vague but coherent with the title, and the strategy is not binary and rather convincing. However, no announcement is expected: instead, write topic sentences at the beginning of each paragraph.

Proposition 2

2/5

Educate people about the past for a better future

In a 2017 op-ed from the Washington Post, the ~~former~~ mayor of New Orleans explains why tearing down confederate monuments ~~of his city~~ is required to build a better future, ~~when~~ a June 2020 testimony, published by the Washington Post, ~~from~~ a former member of the White House, deals with the evolution of Richmond's Monument Avenue through the decades and how people ~~tries~~ to change things despite the ~~segregational~~ background ~~of this place~~ | ~~while~~ a June 2021 Economist op-ed argues that a consensus needs to be ~~finded~~ concerning the decision of keeping or not **racist (?)** statues, a June 2020 drawing from the Philadelphia Inquirer suggest **that keeping them is possible but not without contextualizing them in a first place (?)**. The corpus thus raises the following question: in which way ~~do we have to~~ look at ~~our~~ past to better understand it and then improve ~~our~~ future?

(157 words)

The pb in New Orleans is not quite clear. The link with Barnes's op-ed is too implicit. The cartoonist's irony is not perceived. The main issue repeats the title and is awkward, but to the point. There are no topic sentences.

Proposition 3

2/5

Removing memorials: respecting the present without forgetting the past

A May 2017 Washington Post ~~open letter~~ explains why the ~~New Orleans mayor~~ is removing memorials. ~~Following~~ this opinion, a July 2020 **testimony (?)** from the same newspaper shows how ~~Richmond's avenue~~ is shredding its signs of white supremacy by removing Confederate generals memorials. However, a June 2020 article from the Economist queries the relevance of removing **them (?)** asking for consensus and context, ~~idea~~ followed in a June 2023 cartoon from the Philadelphia Inquirer which pictures **a BLM activist asking for context next to the memorials surrounded with their victims (?)**.

The corpus ~~queries thus~~ the relevance of removing memorials. ~~Indeed keeping them is glorifying a shameful past however removing them could led us to forget the past so one of the solution could be to find a consensus and adding context.~~

*In a world that no longer shares certain values of the past, the presence of certain monuments glorifying **Confederate (?)** generals is a source of concern.*

But some worry that removing memorials is ~~synonym to~~ forgetting our past and ~~prevent~~ future generation from fulfilling their duty of remembrance.

To resolve this issue, consensus ~~have to be taken~~.

(139 words + topic sentences)

The link between the two op-eds is not dynamic. The link between the editorial and the cartoon reveals a misunderstanding of the latter and of its irony. The link between the main issue and the title is sloppy: the latter is the answer to the (indirect) question raised at the end of the introduction. The passage after the main issue is useless: no announcement is expected. The topic sentences proposed next elaborate on the same ideas. The first focuses on the US only. The three of them work in a rather binary fashion (in favour of removal / against removal / in-between): this is not where the corpus stops!