MPI — DS 3 — Type Centrale
04/02/26 - 4 heures

Rédiger en anglais et en 500 mots une synthèse des documents proposés, qui devra obligatoirement comporter un titre comptabilisé dans le nombre de mots.Indiquer avec précision, à la fin du travail, le nombre de mots utilisés ; un écart de 10% en plus ou en moins sera accepté.
Ce sujet propose les 4 documents suivants :

- un extrait d'un article de Rachel DIXON paru dans *The Guardian Weekly*, le 23 avril 2025
- un dessin de presse de Graeme MACKAY provenant de *The Hamilton Spectator,* réalisé le 1er juillet 2023
- un extrait d'un article de Bee WILSON paru dans *The Guardian*, le15 mars 2025
- un extrait d'un livre de Tim SPECTOR : *Spoon-Fed: Why Almost Everything We've Been Told About Food is Wrong,* (Penguin Random House, 2020), pp 73-75

L'ordre dans lequel se présentent les documents est aléatoire.

The Wholegrain Revolution! How Denmark changed the diet – and health – of their entire nation
Rachel Dixon, *The Guardian Weekly*, 23 April 2025

Lunchtime in Copenhagen, Denmark. The place is packed and staff are talking customers through the menu. Would we like the slow-roasted pork with pearl barley and mushrooms? How about the rye pancakes with salmon, cream cheese and avocado?

This isn't a fancy new Nordic restaurant – it's a work canteen. These chefs feed 900 workers from DSB (Danish State Railways) every weekday. As well as looking and tasting great, each dish served here contains fuldkorn (whole grains), from breakfast smoothies with oats to afternoon treats such as today's wholemeal scones. There's a good reason for this: DSB recently signed up to a national programme that aims to get more whole grains into employees.

The initiative is spearheaded by the Danish Whole Grain Partnership, a group on a mission to make Danes healthier, one slice of rye bread at a time. Its members include the government, health NGOs (the Danish Cancer Society, the Danish Heart Foundation and the Danish Diabetes Association) and industry (bakers, food companies, supermarkets). It has been incredibly successful. When the partnership began in 2008, the average Dane ate 36g of whole grains a day. By 2019, they were eating 82g, the highest intake in Europe. In contrast, the average Briton eats 20g a day, and one in five don't eat any whole grains. In the US, just 15% of grain consumption comes from whole grains (dietary guidelines recommend at least 50%).

What's so good about whole grains? "Eating whole grains helps to reduce your risk of cardiovascular diseases, cancer, type 2 diabetes and hypertension. They help lower your cholesterol, stabilise your blood glucose levels and improve the health of your gut microbiota," says Natasha Selberg of the Danish Heart Association. Rikke Neess, the campaign's leader, adds: "Whole grains make you feel full, so can help prevent obesity." (Denmark has some of the lowest obesity rates in Europe.) "They add texture to your food – and taste really good."

[…] Eating a grain's whole kernel, which includes the bran, germ and endosperm, means you benefit from "all the good parts", says Neess – the fibre, vitamins and minerals. "The project started because of the [low-carbohydrate] Atkins diet, which was very popular in Denmark," Neess says. "Sales of bread were decreasing. At the same time, there was increasing evidence that whole grains decreased the risk of cancer."

One of the Whole Grain Partnership's first moves was to create an orange logo for products high in whole grains. In 2010, 190 products carried the symbol; by 2019, it was 1,097. In a 2024 survey, seven out of ten Danes recognised it. "The logo makes it really easy for consumers to choose whole grains," says Neess. "We've also had a very positive response from industry. It gives them a competitive advantage to have the logo on their products." According to a 2022 report from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), these products are no more expensive than their refined grain equivalents.

The government has supported the initiative by updating official dietary guidelines. In 2009, it recommended four servings of whole grains a day. In 2013, it set a more specific target of at least 75g a day, and in June last year that was increased to 90g.

I visit Lantmännen Schulstad, the biggest producer of rye bread, a Danish staple. "Rye bread has been part of our culture for 1,000 years," says Neess. But young people are increasingly choosing white bagels, wraps and burger buns over boring old rectangular rye bread. In response, Lantmännen Schulstad is bringing out new shapes and sizes that are more convenient for children's lunch boxes. "We have to make rye bread great again," jokes Neess. Pernille Bang-Löwgren, Lantmännen Schulstad's chief executive, shows me a

table heaped with different kinds of bread. They are set out in varying amounts, illustrating how much of each type you'd need to eat to get your daily wholegrain quota. Dark rye bread? Just four small slices. White rolls? You'd have to munch your way through a towering pile of 50.

For some people, that knowledge is enough to make them choose the rye bread. But many others base their choice on taste, or price, or what the kids will eat, and may even be put off by a virtue-signalling wholegrain logo. For that reason, the partnership has encouraged producers to put a little bit of wholegrain flour in all their products, even the white sliced bread. Most started with 3% – nowhere near enough to see or taste – and are increasing very gradually: 5%, 7%, maybe as much 9%. These stealth whole grains are listed in the ingredients, but not trumpeted anywhere else on the label. This tactic is aimed at the 6% of Danes who eat less than 25g of whole grains a day.

The EU and the OECD have awarded the partnership best-practice status for promoting public health, in 2019 and 2022 respectively. The OECD report said: "Given there is strong evidence to support the link between high wholegrain consumption and lower risk of developing certain cancers (eg colorectal cancer), type 2 diabetes and cardiovascular diseases, the DWGP plays an important role in improving population health."

How easy is it to change the diet of an entire nation? "It's very difficult to change eating habits on a population level," says Selberg. "You need industry partners who can increase the availability of wholegrain products and reformulate recipes to increase the amount of wholegrain. You have to ensure customers can make healthy choices in supermarkets, and increase consumer awareness and demand." Neess agrees that the most important thing is availability: "It should be easy to make a wholegrain choice everywhere we go."

Neess stresses the importance of cooperation. "Not all countries can work together with government. It's not a political project. Leftwing and rightwing governments have all been very supportive. Our public/private partnership is a very Danish thing, and it's very successful," adds Selberg. "Most of Europe is moving more to the right. Politicians are not allowed to decide what's on people's plates."

Indeed, Denmark is leading the way with this kind of alliance. In October 2023, the country drew up the world's first action plan for plant-based food, an unlikely agreement between farmers, politicians and environmental groups, aimed at reducing meat consumption for environmental as well as health reasons. Whole grains are a part of this – they are filling but require far less water, land or energy to produce than meat or dairy. "Whole grains have a low carbon footprint," says Neess. "Only 25% of Danes are aware of that."

'From Addictive Bliss to Nutritional Abyss: Unraveling the Dangers of Ultra-processed Foods'

Editorial Cartoon by Graeme MacKay, *The Hamilton Spectator* – Saturday July 1, 2023

Ultra-processed babies: are toddler snacks one of the great food scandals of our time?
Bee Wilson, *The Guardian*, Sat 15 Mar 2025

A couple of years ago, nursery manager Melanie Smith, who runs Portland Kindergarten in Lincoln, noticed that many children were eating in a new way. Or rather, they were not eating in a new way. A significant percentage of the toddlers in her care were now refusing to try any element of the nursery's small morning meal (which always includes fresh fruit) or their lunch, which might be something like spaghetti bolognese, fishcakes with vegetables, or mild chillies and curries.

This new generation of infants "just don't seem to like texture", comments Smith, who has been involved with the nursery for 35 years (before she took over, her mother ran it for 25 years). In the most extreme cases, Smith and her staff found themselves feeding three-year-olds who vomited at the very sight of a cooked lunch.

A degree of "fussiness" about food is nothing new for this age group – it can be an entirely natural developmental stage. It's called neophobia: fear of the new. Smith says it was a normal part of nursery life to have children who struggled with certain vegetables or ones who "liked dry food but not wet food". The difference now, Smith says, is that the nursery is seeing a lot of three-year-olds for whom follow-on milk plus commercial baby food and other packaged snacks form "100% of their diet".

At the same time, Smith says there has been a "massive increase" in toddlers with tooth decay, as well as a rise in the number of children reaching the age of three who are more or less non-verbal. She attributes this speech delay to the fact that the skills and muscles needed for chewing are related to those needed for speech.

Has this generation of children – who were born from 2020 onwards – become scared of real food? As with anything to do with post-pandemic life, the answers are not simple.

Eating is a deeply social activity and we will never fully get to the bottom of the ways in which children born during or after Covid were affected by dozens of forms of social dislocation, including the closure of baby groups and play areas, the masking of faces, the rising use of screens and the isolation of their parents from friends and family. Smith says when it comes to child-rearing, "people have lost their village".

For many families now, these are exceptionally difficult times. New parents of all social classes are feeling time-poor and uncertain, and one of the great beneficiaries of this collective state of parental anxiety has been the commercial baby food industry. Manufacturers have done a spectacular job of convincing many parents that feeding a baby with ultra-processed pouches, powders and crisp-like snacks is not just the convenient option but the healthier and better one. Does your baby refuse greens? A pouch will provide all the veg they require. Worried about your child choking? Give them a "melty" snack.

The damage done to child health by commercial baby food in the UK – and the failure of government to do anything to protect families from the marketing of it – is one of the great untold food scandals of our time. If anyone should be protected from the ultra-processed world we are now living in, you might think it would be babies.

As the World Health Organization states, good infant nutrition in the first three years of life is critical to how a child will grow and develop. Apart from meeting a child's needs in the short term, the food they eat during their first few years of life is also equipping them with preferences for the future.

Yet by the age of two to five, the average UK toddler is getting 61% of their energy from ultra-processed foods, according to a 2022 study – a significantly higher percentage than UK adults, and higher even than for children in the US (where it is 58%), let alone countries that still have a relatively strong cooking culture, such as Argentina (where it is 27%) or Colombia (18%). […]

Baby snacks are huge business. Over the past decade, they have risen from 10% of the total UK baby food market to 21%. Pushing snacks on babies and their parents has been one of the ways the food industry has continued to make a tidy profit out of babies despite declining birthrates. These finger food snacks are easily the most lucrative form of baby food for manufacturers, and half of them are ultra-processed (whether organic or not). [...]

Someone who has been trying to get the government to take the problem seriously is Dr Vicky Sibson, director of First Steps Nutrition Trust, a charity that provides resources and reports on children's food. Sibson tells me Smith's experiences in Lincoln are far from unique. Two years ago, she co-authored a report for First Steps on ultra-processed food in the diets of infants and young children in the UK. She found that between the ages of four and six months – when the official health advice is for babies not to have even started solid food yet – 34% of all babies in the UK are fed some form of industrially produced baby snacks.

Myth: Food labelling helps us make healthier choices

Food labels supposedly nudge us towards healthier choices, but only a third of Americans frequently pay attention to them, and less than a quarter of Brits bother. Food labelling started appearing on packets in the 1970s when information on the calorie or sodium content appeared on some foods for people with medical conditions who had 'special dietary needs'. Back then, food was generally prepared at home from basic ingredients, meaning there was little demand for nutritional information. Nowadays, around 40 per cent of Americans eat fast food on any given day, with a fifth of meals eaten in the car, while more than half of the food purchased in the UK is classified as ultra-processed. This reliance on convenience foods, combined with our paradoxical increased interest in diet and health, has led to demands for nutritional information.

A 2015 global health and well-being survey of 30,000 people found that 8 per cent said they were prepared to pay more for 'healthier' products, including functional foods, GMO-free, and 'all natural' products. However, the food industry have manipulated science and nutritional information to make heavily processed foods appear superficially healthier.

It's clear that food labelling isn't improving our health, as obesity and diabetes levels continue to rise in developed countries. There are few (if any) high-quality studies supporting the use of food labelling, and most of the studies available are either poor-quality or biased due to sponsorship from the food and drink industry. Although I'm strongly in favour of better, more transparent food labelling when it comes to ingredients and the origins of foods, independent reviews suggest that there's now too much information on food labels, confusing and overloading consumers. The food industry latched onto our interest in nutrition, and before long, ambiguous claims such as ‘extremely low in saturated fats' were appearing on food labels and in marketing campaigns. Today, pretty much any foods can call themselves 'all natural' or 'superfoods' as these words have no clear definitions or regulation, and are ideal for marketing. A ‘natural superfood' like a goji berry, for example, can be sold for ten times more than the humble strawberry despite similar properties.

Kellogg's were one of the first big food companies to legally manipulate the system. They joined forces with the National Cancer Institute in the US and in 1984 used the back of a cereal package to advertise cornflakes as a high-fibre breakfast cereal associated with reduced risk of certain cancers. Their campaign was unimpeded by the FDA, and it paved the way for other companies to follow suit around the world. Nowadays, while there is slightly better regulation, we are still being misled. For example, most cereal bar companies can market what are essentially sugary biscuits as ‘high fibre’, providing their 20-g bar contains a mere 1.2 g of fibre (recommended daily amount is 30 g). You can call a loaf of bread 'healthy sourdough' even if it contains less than 1 per cent sourdough flour, while a sugar-laden chocolate bar containing 20 per cent protein can be labelled as being 'high protein'. These pathetically low cut-off guidelines allow the food industry to cash in without adding any real health benefit. Another well-known trick is the 'halo' effect, where a nutrition claim such as something being a 'source of calcium' tricks consumers into thinking a product is healthy, meaning that they overlook the high levels of saturated-fat, sugar or salt. They want you to believe that a milkshake labeled as a source of calcium is healthy, despite the fact it's loaded with sugar and you probably don't need the calcium. Many customers scan labels to check for additives and other perceived 'deadly' chemicals such as those with E numbers, but manufacturers have simply given these additives more natural-sounding names such as carrot concentrate or rosemary extract, which are more appealing, despite being equally refined and processed. [...]

There is very little regulation, and foods that boast about their health on the front of the package are often the unhealthiest. Many labels pretend the food comes from homely-sounding local farms that are purely fictional. Essentially, never trust a food label.

Excerpt of *Spoon-Fed: Why Almost Everything We've Been Told About Food is Wrong*, Tim SPECTOR, (Penguin Random House, 2020, pp 73-75)