

CONCOURS A BCPST - SESSION 2019

ADMISSION

QUELQUES EXEMPLES DE TEXTES DE L'ÉPREUVE ORALE D'ANGLAIS

Texte 1 - Why do so many mediocre men rise to the top?

Oliver Burkeman, The Guardian, Friday, 10 May 2019

Why do so many incompetent men become leaders? This question, which the psychologist Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic uses as the title of his new book, seems designed to provoke. But it's a subtler matter than you might think. The obvious answer, of course, is sexism. But that can't be the whole story. Nobody doubts that there are at least *some* competent men – and presumably a sufficient number of them to lead the world's corporations and governments. So even if the world is horribly sexist, why aren't *those* men running it? In most walks of life, sexism lowers the bar that men must clear in order to succeed. But you'd still expect the talented ones to clear it more easily than the idiots. And yet: look around.

The answer emerging from Chamorro-Premuzic's work is that there are two things going on here. One is sexism; but the other is a general difficulty in selecting competent leaders, of either sex, over incompetent ones. We habitually interpret traits such as overconfidence and self-absorption as signs of high ability, though in fact they're negatively correlated with it. They "should be seen as red flags", but "instead, they prompt us to say, 'Ah, there's a charismatic fellow! He's probably leadership material.'" Men come to dominate the upper echelons because they're more likely to manifest such traits. Research does also confirm that women are more harshly judged for displaying confidence. But the striking point here is that even a perfectly nonsexist hiring committee, or electorate, would still end up promoting a disproportionate number of mediocre men, provided they continued to take bluster and self-belief as proof of talent.

This way of viewing things also lets us put aside, for now, the endless debate about nature versus nurture, and how far – if at all – genetics might play some role in the fact that more men than women gravitate toward certain careers and positions. Wherever you stand on all that, you surely prefer competent people over incompetent ones; we can all agree that leaders should be selected on the basis of real leadership ability. And if we got better at doing that, Chamorro-Premuzic's logic implies, we'd end up with far more women in top jobs anyway – not to mention more competent men, since they currently lose out to the narcissistic blowhards, too.

All of which suggests a problem with the advice directed at women to "lean in", display ambition, and advertise their abilities, in order to push back against workplace bias and rise through the ranks: it risks being an exhortation to women to get better at mimicking the dysfunctional traits of precisely those men who make the worst leaders. Perhaps it would be progress of a sort to replace half the world's terrible male presidents and crappy male bosses with equally crappy female ones. But it would surely be best of all to replace the crappy people with effective people – a shift that would necessitate the elevation of many more women. Just don't expect our current crop of leaders to want to lead the revolution.

Texte 2 - NYC schools to embrace Meatless Monday

Robin Shreeves, *Mother Nature Network* (www.mnn.com), March 15th, 2019

We still can't seem to get school lunches right in this country. Celebrity chef Jamie Oliver came to the United States in 2010 and tried to start a Food Revolution to tackle school lunches, but he faced heavy opposition. Former first lady Michelle Obama made improving school lunches a top priority in 2012. Both of those initiatives seem like a long time ago, yet the majority of lunches in public schools are still heavy on pizza and French fries.

Still, some individual school districts are doing what they can to improve the quality and nutrition of school lunches. New York City Public Schools, which is one of the country's largest districts and serves over 1 million children daily, is cutting meat from the menu one day a week. Starting in the fall when the new school year begins, Meatless Monday will be standard in every school lunchroom in all five boroughs.

Mayor Bill de Blasio made the announcement on March 11 that the entire school district would adopt the once-a-week meatless lunches. A successful pilot program in 15 schools in Brooklyn in the spring of 2018 set the stage. "Cutting back on meat a little will improve New Yorkers' health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions," he said during the announcement. "We're expanding Meatless Mondays to all public schools to keep our lunch and planet green for generations to come."

Mark Chambers, director of the NYC Mayor's Office of Sustainability, said "reducing our appetite for meat is one of the single biggest ways individuals can reduce their environmental impact on our planet." He also mentioned that Meatless Mondays would introduce all of the district's students to the concept that "small changes in their diet can create larger changes for their health and the health of our planet."

I can't argue with that, but the North American Meat Institute can. That group issued a statement in opposition to the announcement, saying it's "misguided" and that "meat and poultry products are excellent and affordable sources of complete protein, vitamins, and minerals that students enjoy in school cafeterias across the country." Their statement said nothing about the environmental impact of meat. Nor did it mention that beans are also an excellent and even more affordable source of protein, vitamins and minerals.

This is good progress, but as with anything, there's still room for improvement. Take for example the actual plates that many students eat from. They're disposable, as are the plastic utensils that come wrapped in plastic and are used by the students each day. And remember: the city's public schools serve over 1 million students each day. (And yes, not all students eat lunch from the cafeteria, but they do eat in the cafeteria.)

If New York City Public Schools want to take the next step in teaching students how to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, they'll work on bringing back durable, washable trays, plates and utensils so they eliminate the greenhouse gasses created from all that plastic that ends up in a landfill. New York City sets a lot of trends for the rest of the country. Now that they've embraced Meatless Monday, cutting back on disposables could be the next big trend for them to start.

[*Mother Nature Network* is an online network for news and information related to the environment and responsible living.]

Texte 3 - AI offers a unique opportunity for social progress,
MUSTAFA SULEYMAN. The Economist. September 20th 2018.

As a global community, we've made stunning strides in recent decades, tackling some of the world's cruellest tragedies. Consider one: child mortality. Every day 17,000 new lives get to be lived by children who would have died just a quarter-century ago. Peace and innovation have been the driving forces of this spectacular progress.

Yet some of our toughest challenges, like inequality, haven't improved—they've actually become worse. Malnutrition and preventable disease continue to kill millions, straining health-care systems in both rich and poor countries. And the devastating threat of climate change looms, hitting the poorest the hardest.

If we are to reduce this suffering, then humanity will need to come up with bold new solutions. But to have any chance of solving these problems, what is feasible today will not be enough. Instead, we must look at what is currently impossible, and do all we can to overcome the limits of what humanity can accomplish. These limits are real, and they cap our aspirations for change.

Our efforts to tackle disease are capped by a desperate shortage of trained nurses and doctors, in the rich West as well as in developing countries. Our efforts to reduce energy consumption are held back by the insatiable demand for new products and services, and what appear to be hard limits on how efficient our energy infrastructure can become.

This is why science and technology have been so critical in the history of civilisation. Technological progress expands the possibilities of human achievement, increasing our collective capability to solve problems that were once considered unsolvable.

My message is simple. First, the progress of science and technology is about to go through the greatest acceleration of all time. And second, this is the greatest opportunity we have had for generations to advance the causes of social justice, equality and the reduction of human suffering.

My confidence is based on what I see every day at places like DeepMind, where some of our brightest technological minds are working at the frontier of artificial-intelligence research and application. AI means different things to different people. What I mean is technology that people can use in complex domains to discover new knowledge, ideas and strategies by dint of algorithms that learn from data.

This AI-enabled future has already begun. Take energy, where AI is making a dramatic impact. At DeepMind, we developed a "safety-first" AI system to autonomously manage the cooling in Google's big data centres. The system delivers around 30% energy savings, with further improvements expected over time. The achievement stunned experts who thought that this scale of improvement was impossible. Industrial systems make up one-third of the world's total energy consumption, so there is widespread potential for these AI techniques in the fight against climate change. This is the greatest opportunity we have had for generations to advance the causes of social justice, equality and the reduction of human suffering.

What is at stake is something world-changing. And we need it to be. Together, we have the opportunity to put AI—the next phase of the technological revolution and one of the most important of all time—at the service of societal needs. If we can create the right structures, ethics and incentives, then the scientific and social progress could be truly incredible.

Texte 4 - Europe's meat and dairy production must halve by 2050, expert warns

Policy makers, farmers and consumers face 'deeply uncomfortable choices', says author of report advising urgent reduction of unsustainable livestock sector

Arthur Neslen, The Guardian, 15 Sep 2018

Europe's animal farming sector has exceeded safe bounds for greenhouse gas emissions, nutrient flows and biodiversity loss, and urgently needs to be scaled back, according to a major report. Pressure on livestock farmers is set to intensify this century as global population and income growth raises demand for meat-based products beyond the planet's capacity to supply it.

The paper's co-author, Professor Allan Buckwell, endorses a Greenpeace call for halving meat and dairy production by 2050, and his report's broadside is squarely aimed at the heart of the EU's policy establishment. Launching the report, the EU's former environment commissioner Janez Potocnik said: "Unless policymakers face up to this now, livestock farmers will pay the price of their inactivity. 'Protecting the status quo' is providing a disservice to the sector."

The study calls for the European commission to urgently set up a formal inquiry mandated to propose measures – including taxes and subsidies – that "discourage livestock products harmful to health, climate or the environment".

Livestock has the world's largest land footprint and is growing fast, with close to 80% of the planet's agricultural land now used for grazing and animal feed production, even though meat delivers just 18% of our calories. Europeans already eat more than twice as much meat as national dietary authorities recommend – far beyond a "safe operating space" within environmental limits, says the Rise foundation study.

As a result, huge sectoral "adjustments" will be needed by 2050 to rebalance the sector, including a 74% drop in greenhouse gas emissions and a 60% cut in nitrate-based fertiliser use, it finds.

Long before then, policymakers, farmers and society as a whole face "deeply uncomfortable choices", according to Buckwell. "We're talking about fewer meat meals, less meat portions and moving to flexitarian diets without being dogmatic about it," he said. "There is a role for softer public health messaging but harder messages are necessary too."

Such a transformation "won't happen spontaneously", he added. "It requires strong signals from government so the policy proposal must include measures to discourage consumption of livestock products harmful to public health and the environment."

Buckwell called for targeted taxes on harmful practices, with subsidised meat for low-income consumers, and a realignment of funding regimes to advise, retrain and hire more farmers for work in rural landscape management and animal welfare.

The hope is that consumers will eventually pay more for high quality meat produced in environmentally safe conditions, where countryside protection and animal welfare have been guaranteed.

The study follows angry condemnation of the EU's recent common agricultural policy reform, which ignored a growing clamour for moves to more sustainable food systems.

Addressing the launch in a video message, the EU's agriculture commissioner, Phil Hogan – who dismissed the sector's emissions footprint earlier this year – said that he too wanted it to become "smarter, greener and cleaner, and do so fast". (...)

Texte 5 - I'm striking from school to protest inaction on climate change – you should too,

Greta Thunberg, *The Guardian*, Mon 26 Nov 2018

I first learnt about climate change when I was eight years old. I learnt that this was something humans had created. I was told to turn off the lights to save energy and recycle paper to save resources. I remember thinking it was very strange that we were capable of changing the entire face of the Earth and the precious thin layer of atmosphere that makes it our home.

Because if we were capable of doing this, then why weren't we hearing about it everywhere? As soon as you turned on the television, why wasn't the climate crisis the first thing you heard about? If burning fossil fuels threatened our very existence, then how could we continue to burn them? Why were there no restrictions? Why wasn't it illegal to do this? And what about the fact that up to 200 species are going extinct every single day?

I hear people saying that climate change is an existential threat, yet I watch as people carry on like nothing is happening. We can no longer save the world by playing by the rules because the rules have to be changed. Countries like Sweden need to start reducing our emissions by at least 15% every year if we consider the aspect of equality or climate justice – a principle that is clearly stated everywhere in the Paris Agreement. And that is just so we can stay below 2 degrees, which we now know will still create misery for so many people and ecosystems around the world.

For Australia – given its even larger carbon footprint – that percentage is likely to be higher still. Now the Secretary General of the United Nations argues that we should aim for 1.5 degrees. Change on a scale we've never imagined.

If I live to be 100, I will be alive in 2103. Adults often don't think beyond the year 2050. But by then, I will, in the best case, not have lived half of my life. What we do or don't do right now will affect my entire life and the lives of my friends, our children and their grandchildren.

When school started in August, I decided enough was enough. Sweden had just experienced its hottest summer ever. The election was coming up. No one was talking about climate change as an actual consequence of our way of life. So I decided to walk out of school and sit on the ground outside the Swedish parliament to demand our politicians treat climate change for what it is: the biggest issue we have ever faced.

Because if climate change has to stop, then *we* must stop it. Either we continue as a civilisation or we don't. One way or another, we have to change. Countries like mine and Australia must start reducing our emissions dramatically if we believe in equality and climate justice. But instead of talking about this, all our politicians go on about is economic growth, energy prices and shareholder value. [...]

We are running out of time. Failure means disaster. The changes required are enormous and we must all contribute to the solutions. The adults have failed us. And since most of them, including the press and the politicians, keep ignoring the situation, we must take action into our own hands, starting today.

- Greta Thunberg is 15 years old and lives in Stockholm, Sweden

Texte 6 - A Lesson of Sandy Hook: 'Err on the Side of the Victims'

By Elizabeth Williamson, May 25, 2019, The New York Times

NEWTOWN, Conn. — Scarlett Lewis sees reminders of her son Jesse — who died at age 6 with 19 classmates and six educators in the 2012 Sandy Hook school shooting — in photographs on her refrigerator door, in portraits she painted of him from memory and now, uncomfortably, in the Newtown Community Center, a soaring new complex.

Built with a \$15 million grant from General Electric, the employer of the father of the gunman who killed Jesse, the center will open this summer as an anchor meant to bring the community together. But to Ms. Lewis and some others who lost family at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the new center feels more like a wound.

"It's painful to see," Ms. Lewis said, "because I know what I lost in order to pay for it."

In the six and a half years since the deadliest elementary school shooting in American history, more than \$100 million in federal, state, corporate and private money flowed into this community of about 28,000 in southwestern Connecticut. Although the tidal wave of aid bore witness to the power of human kindness, so much money engulfed the vulnerable, wounded Newtown that it inevitably sowed division. The town became a case study of how Americans' material expressions of grief can become more an obstacle than an aid to recovery.

At the heart of the trouble was a question: Should donations in the aftermath of tragedy go to the victims' families or be shared with the entire community?

After the shooting in December 2012, a dispute over that question broke out between the United Way and the families of some victims, and scars from that battle fed anger about the community center. Adding to the tension were donations that poured in to 77 recipients, including not only local charities, houses of worship and parent-teacher associations, but also ad hoc fund-raising websites that were unprepared to track or distribute the largess.

Merchandise arrived by the truckload, including 60,000 teddy bears and more bicycles than Newtown has children. So many flowers and stuffed toys clogged intersections that the town gathered, composted and burned them, aiming to incorporate the resulting "sacred soil" into a memorial to the victims.

The families embraced acts directly memorializing their loved ones. Firefighters built 26 playgrounds dedicated to the victims in towns ravaged by Hurricane Sandy. Monte Frank, Newtown's counsel, founded "Team 26," which each year makes a long-distance bicycle trek to other communities touched by gun violence; this month the group rode to the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh.

And virtually all of the relatives of the 26 who died established foundations or public service endeavors in their loved ones' memory.

"We really are grateful for the love and support we received," Ms. Lewis said.

But Newtown remains a lesson in the unintended consequences of well-intended generosity. Part of its legacy has been a shift in approach by other communities grappling with the fallout from mass shootings and attacks.

Texte 7 - San Francisco just banned facial-recognition technology

Rachel Metz, Business correspondent, CNN (www.edition.cnn.com), May 14th, 2019

San Francisco, long one of the most tech-friendly and tech-savvy cities in the world, is now the first in the United States to prohibit its government from using facial-recognition technology.

The ban is part of a broader anti-surveillance ordinance that the city's Board of Supervisors approved on Tuesday. The ordinance, which outlaws the use of facial-recognition technology by police and other government departments, could also spur other local governments to take similar action.

Facial-recognition systems are increasingly used everywhere from police departments to rock concerts to homes, stores and schools. They are designed to identify specific people from live video feeds, recorded video footage or still photos, often by comparing their features with a set of faces (such as mugshots).

San Francisco's new rule, which is set to go into effect in a month, forbids the use of facial-recognition technology by the city's 53 departments — including the San Francisco Police Department, which doesn't currently use such technology but did test it out between 2013 and 2017. However, the ordinance carves out an exception for federally controlled facilities at San Francisco International Airport and the Port of San Francisco. The ordinance doesn't prevent businesses or residents from using facial recognition or surveillance technology in general — such as on their own security cameras.

"We all support good policing but none of us want to live in a police state," San Francisco Supervisor Aaron Peskin, who introduced the bill earlier this year, told CNN Business ahead of the vote.

The ordinance adds yet more fuel to the fire blazing around facial-recognition technology. While the technology grows in popularity, it has come under increased scrutiny as concerns mount regarding its deployment, accuracy, and even where the faces come from that are used to train the systems.

In San Francisco, Peskin is concerned that the technology is "so fundamentally invasive" that it shouldn't be used.

"I think San Francisco has a responsibility to speak up on things that are affecting the entire globe, that are happening in our front yard," he said.

Facial recognition has improved dramatically in recent years due to the popularity of a powerful form of machine learning called deep learning. In a typical system, facial features are analyzed and then compared with labeled faces in a database.

Yet AI researchers and civil rights groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union are particularly concerned about accuracy and bias in facial-recognition systems. There are concerns that they are not as effective at correctly recognizing people of color and women. One reason for this issue is that the datasets used to train the software may be disproportionately male and white.

The ACLU is one of many civil-rights groups supporting the ordinance. Matt Cagle, a technology and civil liberties attorney at the ACLU of Northern California, said the raft of issues posed by facial-recognition systems mean the city's legislation would prevent harm to community members. He also expects that the rule will prompt other cities to follow suit.

Texte 8 - The baby crisperer

The Economist. 29 November 2018

Humanity's power to control the four-letter code of life has advanced by leaps and bounds. A new gene-editing technology called CRISPR-Cas9, which was not discovered until 2012, has been the subject of particular excitement. It allows DNA to be edited easily, raising hopes that it could eventually be used to relieve human suffering. This week, however, CRISPR has caused more unease than optimism, because of claims by a Chinese scientist that he edited the genomes of twin girls when they were embryos, as part of IVF treatment.

He Jiankui, of the Southern University of Science and Technology, in Shenzhen—which was not involved in the work—says he edited a gene, CCR5, that allows HIV to infect human cells. Mr He claims to have created one baby resistant to HIV infection, and a twin who is not. (Another woman is apparently carrying an edited embryo.) If reproductive cells were affected, any such modifications will be passed on to subsequent generations. There is still uncertainty over what Mr He has done. But it is just a matter of time before someone, somewhere, edits human embryos that are grown into babies. Governments and regulators need to pay heed.

Presume that Mr He's assertions are truthful. One day it may make sense to edit an embryo—to cure genetic diseases, say. That day has not arrived. The technology is so new that the risks to human subjects cannot possibly justify the benefits. Scientists do not fully understand the scope of the unintended damage CRISPR does to DNA elsewhere in the genome or how deactivating CCR5 might leave you vulnerable to other diseases (it may, for instance, make death from flu more likely).

Mr He's work appears to have had the scantiest oversight and a vice-minister says it violates regulations.

The idea that one scientist could make the leap towards editing reproductive cells has been condemned, but it has not been ruled out. Even if Mr He turns out to be a fraud, others have the means, the motive and the opportunity to do similar work. CRISPR is not a complex technology. That leads to two responses.

The first is practical: better oversight of places such as fertility clinics, where back-room genome-tinkers may lurk. That applies not just in China, where Mr He has attracted vocal condemnation, but also in America, where IVF clinics could use greater regulatory scrutiny.

The second is proper debate about when gene-editing is warranted. Editing the unhealthy cells of those suffering from genetic diseases such as Duchenne's muscular dystrophy and cystic fibrosis will alleviate their suffering. It is less clear when it is necessary to edit embryos, but Mr He's experiment obviously fails the test. Fertility treatments already screen embryos for unwanted genes.

It may even be that editing will one day be used on embryos to enhance genomes (to make people cleverer, say), rather than to cure disease. But that requires regulators, policymakers, scientists and civil society to think through deep ethical questions. Earlier this year the Nuffield Council on Bioethics, a think-tank in Britain, outlined two: that the changes brought about by gene-editing should not increase "disadvantage, discrimination or division in society" and that such changes should not harm the welfare of the future person. Such debate was always going to be needed. Now it is urgent.

Texte 9 - Women in STEM: Without Female Role Models, We Risk Losing Brilliant Minds in the Field

By Margaret A. Hamburg and Nicole Small. Newsweek. 5 May 2019

As viral images go, scientists couldn't have asked for a better one-two combo. On April 10, the first-ever image of a black hole and its burning ring of gas was seen around the world. Next came a different kind of caught-in-the-moment radiance—the overjoyed reaction of Katherine Bouman, whose algorithm played a role in the black hole's capture.

It was a good day for science, as well as for women in STEM (science, technology, engineering and math). It was also, unfortunately, a rare day, with the black hole representing a troubling metaphor. That term might describe the experience of many girls who, despite their love of STEM, don't receive the same encouragement that boys do. Often called the "leaky pipeline," this problem grows during the high school years, when interest in STEM drops from 15.7 percent among freshmen girls to 12.7 percent among seniors and only gets worse in college. More than 6.7 million men in the U.S. have a degree in STEM subjects compared with 2.5 million women. By graduate school, men and women might as well be operating in separate galaxies.

The result is a world in which women constitute just 25 percent of the STEM industry, according to federal data. Female STEM professionals are less visible and paid less than their male counterparts.

One solution to the problem, both now and for the next generation, is to provide girls with STEM role models. In other words, we need more viral images like Katie Bouman's. For girls, seeing someone who looks like them, as well as understanding how that woman got to where she is, buoys them with courage to chase their dreams. It's a proven approach. According to a 2018 Microsoft survey, for example, STEM role models increase girls' interest in STEM careers from 32 percent to 52 percent.

That concept spills into pop culture, confirmed by a 2018 study by the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media, which found that nearly two-thirds of women working in STEM cite X-Files protagonist Dana Scully as a personal role model who increased their confidence to excel in a male-dominated profession.

There are already thousands of female STEM professionals doing groundbreaking work, but how do we make them role models? By establishing programs that think out of the box. Earlier this year, we launched an initiative that aims to empower female STEM role models from a diverse array of fields. The initiative is called If/Then— If we support a woman in STEM, then she can change the world.

Over the next few months, the American Association for the Advancement of Science will lead a selection process, wherein 100 female STEM professionals, representing both conventional and unique careers, will be named AAAS If/Then Ambassadors. For two years, they'll be coached on how to engage with middle-school girls on a national platform, develop their own press kits, engage in photo and video shoots and receive tutorials from communications experts. From there, they'll fan out to share their inspirational backstories in person and on platforms consumed by girls, including popular YouTube channels and Saturday morning television shows. Without female STEM role models, we risk acquiescing to a world where even brilliant minds like Bouman are dragged into discriminatory devolutions.

Texte 10 - Disney accused of colonialism over 'hakuna matata' trademark

The Guardian, 19 December 2018

More than 50,000 people have signed a petition accusing Disney of “colonialism and robbery” after it trademarked the Swahili phrase “hakuna matata”. The expression means “no problem” in Swahili, which is spoken across east Africa and is a national language of Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The petition, which calls on Disney to drop its trademark, precedes the release of the company’s motion capture remake of *The Lion King* next summer, which will be voiced by Beyoncé, Donald Glover and Chiwetel Ejiofor.

The phrase was popularised in 1982 by the Kenyan band Them Mushrooms, whose platinum-selling single *Jambo Bwana* (Hello, Mister) featured the phrase “hakuna matata”. It was later featured in the 1994 version of *The Lion King*, which spawned a hit musical and became one of Disney’s most valuable franchises. The film included the song *Hakuna Matata*, written by Elton John and Tim Rice. Disney was granted a US trademark in 2003, protecting use of the phrase on clothing or footwear.

Shelton Mpala, who created the petition, accused the company of appropriation. “Disney can’t be allowed to trademark something that it didn’t invent,” he wrote. The petition has so far been signed by more than 52,000 people.

Professor Kimani Njogu, who chairs the creative economy working group, which aims to advance cultural and linguistic rights in Kenya, suggested Disney’s trademark was unethical. “These big companies located in the north are taking advantage of cultural expressions and lifestyles and cultural goods coming from Africa. “They know very well that this expression is really the people’s property, created by people, popularised by people,” said Njogu, founder of Twaweza Communications, a thinktank that specialises in public policy, media and culture.

Hakuna matata is more than just an expression, added Njogu. “[Them Mushrooms] made hakuna matata a lifestyle – of fun, of leisure, of happiness.” The phrase is popular across east Africa, with merchandise featuring the phrase sold to tourists. It is unfair, Njogu added, that Kenyans are not able to sell such goods in the US.

Njogu added that such countries should ask: “Is it ethical to appropriate products that come from the south, in Africa, and appropriate those, without the creators of those products benefiting – or without the permission of those who created the products in the first place?”

The trademark has prompted calls for African governments to do more to protect heritage and culture. Writing in *Business Daily Africa*, Cathy Mputhia, a lawyer based in Kenya, said: “It is unfortunate that there has been a lot of pilferage of African culture over the years, through the use of intellectual property rights.” Government agencies such as Brand Kenya should do more to protect indigenous slogans, she added.

Disney previously dropped attempts to trademark the traditional Mexican Day of the Dead festival following angry protests online. The studio had applied to trademark the term “*Día de los Muertos*” for merchandising purposes before the release of the Pixar animation *Coco*. At the time, Disney said that it had changed the title of the film and would therefore no longer be pursuing efforts to trademark the term.

Disney has not yet responded to a request for comment.

Texte 11 - Bristol University to confront its links with the slave trade

The Guardian, Michael Savage, Sunday 5 May 2019

The University of Bristol is to become the latest top education institution to order a new examination of its historical links to slavery, amid wider attempts by the city to get to grips with its ties to the trade.

The city was one of three key ports for British slave traders, along with London and Liverpool. Now, as the city's political leaders draw up plans for a "permanent memorial" to its historical role, the university is to advertise for a permanent academic post examining the history of slavery. Whoever gets the job will oversee efforts by staff and community groups to "explore, investigate and determine the university's historical links to slavery", a university spokesperson said. "As an institution founded in 1909, we are not a direct beneficiary of the slave trade, but we fully understand and acknowledge that we financially benefited indirectly," they added.

Last week, Cambridge University announced that it was launching a two-year study into its own historical links with slavery. Trevor Philips, the former chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, has criticised Cambridge for appointing a white professor to oversee the study. Some staff at Bristol would like to see a similar investigation. "While Bristol is taking tentative steps in this direction, I think as a university it needs to look seriously," said Mark Horton, professor of archaeology. "It is a different situation from that of Cambridge as Bristol has been in existence for just over 100 years, but it is a leading institution funded from city families, and lives in 18th-century buildings put up with proceeds from the slave trade."

In 2017, the university rejected a petition to change the name of its Wills Memorial Building, which was built in honour of Henry Overton Wills III, the first chancellor of the university, whose family made its money from the tobacco industry, which used slave labour.

Some also want the university to change its crest, which features Edward Colston, a slave trader. Last year, it was estimated that 85% of the wealth used to found the university had depended on slave labour.

This week Asher Craig, one of the city's deputy mayors, will hold a public meeting in an attempt to decide what form a permanent memorial to its slave trade links should take. Firmer plans are expected to be drawn up by the end of the year.

"Identifying and exploring Bristol's slave trade legacy isn't something for one organisation or one group of people or one individual to do," Craig said. "Previous efforts to memorialise and capture the legacy of the trade have been done in isolation and although they retain a value today the entire story must be brought together and told by a diverse range of voices for a diverse audience."

Texte 12 - Felicity Huffman pleads guilty in college admissions scandal

BBC News, 13 May 2019

US actress Felicity Huffman has pleaded guilty to fraudulently conspiring to win a college place for her daughter. In a Boston court, the *Desperate Housewives* star admitted paying \$15,000 (£11,500) to have her daughter's exam answers secretly corrected in 2017. In a statement last month, she said she was in "full acceptance" of her guilt. Prosecutors recommended a four-month prison term and a \$20,000 fine. Huffman, 56, was among 50 charged in the college admissions scandal.

The wealthy parents charged in the investigation allegedly paid bribes, had exams altered, and even had their children edited into stock photos to fake sporting talents. They managed to fraudulently secure spots for the teenagers at elite US universities including Yale, Georgetown and Stanford. Parents and college athletics coaches were charged in the scheme, but none of the children were indicted.

Huffman did not speak to reporters outside court as she arrived to Monday's hearing holding hands with her brother. She admitted one count of mail fraud and honest services mail fraud. The Emmy-winning actress cried while speaking to the judge, according to reporters in the courtroom. Her plea deal recommendation of four months in prison was at the lower end of sentencing guidelines, which could have carried a custodial term of up to 20 years. According to court documents, she was secretly recorded by the scam's confessed mastermind, William Singer, after he began co-operating with investigators. Singer helped Huffman falsify a college entrance exam score for her oldest daughter, Sophia Macy. When Sophia's school initially wanted to invigilate as she sat her test, Huffman expressed concern to Singer. The actress emailed to him, "Ruh Ro!" - the catchphrase of cartoon dog Scooby-Doo when he was in trouble. Singer arranged so that Sophia could complete the SAT, which is the US college entrance test, elsewhere. Sophia scored an SAT score of 1420 out of a possible 1600 on the doctored test, about 400 points higher than a preliminary SAT she had taken a year earlier.

The actress made arrangements to cheat a second time, for her younger daughter, before deciding not to do so, according to prosecutors. Her husband - actor William H Macy - also had contact with Singer, though Mr Macy was spared charges. Huffman said her daughter was unaware of the cheating, and that she felt "regret and shame" for having "betrayed" her. She will be sentenced on 13 September.

Last month, Netflix announced it would postpone the release of a movie, *Otherhood*, starring Huffman that was originally set for release on 26 April. It did not specify a new premiere date. Though Huffman was among the most high-profile figures indicted, the \$15,000 she parted with was among the smallest sums allegedly paid by any of the other parents charged in the scandal, according to court documents.

Lori Loughlin, another Hollywood actress ensnared in the scandal along with her husband, has pleaded not guilty to paying \$500,000 in bribes to have their daughters accepted to the University of Southern California as members of the rowing team.

Texte 13 - It's not just Meghan and Kate – all women need social media protection

Kimberly McIntosh, The Guardian, Wed 30 Jan 2019

Being a royal secures unfathomable perks. Whether it's getting a £1m home refurbishment gifted by the taxpayer, or a lifetime of inherited privilege, royal status shields the bestowed from life's mundane troubles. But even a five-metre Givenchy wedding veil couldn't save Meghan, Duchess of Sussex from misogynoir and a barrage of trolling. This week, Kensington Palace had to reach out for help from Twitter and Instagram, as staff members were spending hours each week reporting sexist and racist comments and threats aimed at Meghan and Kate, Duchess of Cambridge. The diatribe is so dire that Hello! magazine has started a campaign #HelloToKindness. Meghan is subjected to the same racially coded and straight-up racist abuse faced by all black women in public life .

Being a woman in public life is not without challenge. Female MPs, athletes and actors are subjected to abuse on and offline. And both Kate and Meghan have been the targets of sexist criticism on the Kensington Palace platforms and in tabloid comment sections. But it should surprise no one that there has been a spike in hateful comments in October and November, following the announcement of Meghan's pregnancy.

Although a strongly worded letter from Prince Harry in 2016 had put the tabloid media on pause, the reality of a more-melanin-infused royal baby joining the House of Windsor has unleashed the hounds once more. Meghan isn't the first royal to be hounded by the press and criticised frequently. Diana, Princess of Wales was never far away from a front page and faced intense scrutiny. She was also read as a rebel who didn't follow protocol. But Meghan has the added bonus of being biracial, which brings with it a different type and intensity of abuse.

Online trolling of Meghan has included six knife emojis and claims that Meghan has bleached her skin to look whiter. A Daily Mail headline referred to her as being from a "gang-scarred" home. Comments on the Kensington Palace Instagram called her "trashy" and "ghetto". Like the recent Sunday Times article that referred to the two schools in "gangland" – known to the rest of us as Newham, east London, where the 2012 Olympics were held – that got a number of black teenagers Oxbridge places, the media, and the trolls that follow them, will associate black people with gangs and crime for the most tenuous of reasons.

Meghan is still subjected to the same racially coded and straight-up racist abuse faced by all black women in public life. Research by Amnesty International found that black women were 84% more likely to be mentioned in abusive tweets than white women. The shadow home secretary, Diane Abbott, received almost half of all the abusive tweets sent to female MPs in the run-up to the 2017 general election. Race and gender are a potent mix. So when will social media companies finally take some action? Racism and sexism are social problems. But social media companies could do more to help protect their users. Charities such as Amnesty and Glitch UK are left to campaign for change. After a fortnight of news on self-harm and suicides it's high time they responded seriously to the abuse perpetuated on their platforms. All communities need some norms, values and standards to make them safe. Online ones are no exception.

Texte 14 - Nan Goldin threatens London gallery boycott over £1m gift from Sackler fund Joanna

Walters and Vanessa Thorpe,

The Guardian, Sun 17 Feb 2019

US art photographer and activist Nan Goldin has declared she will refuse a prestigious retrospective of her work at Britain's National Portrait Gallery if it accepts a gift of £1 million from a branch of the multibillionaire Sackler family made wealthy by addictive prescription painkillers. Goldin is threatening to boycott the gallery if it accepts the donation from the owners of the American pharmaceutical company that makes OxyContin, the *Observer* has learned.

The artist last weekend staged a major protest at the Guggenheim Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York over their links to the large family of arts philanthropists, one group of which profits from the ongoing opioid crisis in the US. "My message is for all institutions everywhere, which are taking Sackler money," said Goldin, 65. "They are not going [to be able to] continue to operate 'business as usual'. People are pushing back and, if they want to maintain their standing as cultural institutions and educational institutions, they have to listen to the people and they have to do the right thing. They have to make a decision."

The Sackler name is prominently displayed among key donors at many British arts institutions and has been behind hefty financial support for many more. From the Royal Opera House, National Gallery, National Theatre, Shakespeare's Globe, the Royal Ballet School, Tate, Old Vic and the Royal College of Art, to smaller institutions, such as the Serpentine, Royal Court, Museum of London, Dulwich Picture Gallery, Design Museum, the Courtauld and the Roundhouse venue.

Last summer the V&A Museum unveiled an extensive £2m entrance courtyard named after the donors. The three Sackler brothers who made the family fortune, Arthur, Mortimer and Raymond, are dead, and some of their descendants have spoken out against the trade in opioids still plied by part of the family.

In 2007, Purdue Pharma was fined in the US for marketing OxyContin "with intent to defraud or mislead" regulators. Recent lawsuits have also named members of the family that benefit from the pharmaceutical company. In America the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that so far this century about 400,000 people have died of overdoses in which prescription or illicit opioids were implicated.

Goldin said she had talked to Nicholas Cullinan, director of the National Portrait Gallery, by phone last week. "He acknowledged they are in discussion [about the donation] and there will be a final decision in March," she said, praising Cullinan for addressing the issue. "I was very surprised at his openness. I really feel it's so important museums listen to their artists, rather than their philanthropists. What is the museum for? Art is transcendent and that makes it very, very dirty if they take the money; it's failing the whole idea of a museum as a place to show art.

Goldin began her campaign against the Sacklers after recovering from an addiction to powerful prescription painkillers. In 2014 she was prescribed OxyContin for tendonitis in her left wrist. She now demands that arts institutions in America and Britain refuse further Sackler donations and argues the family should instead start paying for treatment and rehabilitation for opioid addicts.

Texte 15 - Robocrop: world's first raspberry-picking robot set to work

Julia Kollewe and Rob Davies, *The Guardian*, Sun 26 May 2019

Quivering and hesitant, like a spoon-wielding toddler trying to eat soup without spilling it, the world's first raspberry-picking robot is attempting to harvest one of the fruits. After sizing it up for an age, the robot plucks the fruit with its gripping arm and gingerly deposits it into a waiting punnet. The whole process takes about a minute for a single berry. It seems like heavy going for a robot that cost £700,000 to develop but, if all goes to plan, this is the future of fruit-picking.

Each robot will be able to pick more than 25,000 raspberries a day, outpacing human workers who manage about 15,000 in an eight-hour shift, according to Fieldwork Robotics.

The robot has gone on trial in the UK, as the farming industry battles rising labour costs and Brexit-related shortages of seasonal workers. Numbers of seasonal workers from eastern Europe have diminished, partly due to Brexit fears but also because Romania and Poland's surging economies have persuaded their own workers to remain in their home countries.

The robot has been developed in partnership with Hall Hunter, one of Britain's main berry growers which supplies Tesco, Marks & Spencer and Waitrose. Standing at 1.8 metres tall, the wheeled machine with its robotic arm has begun field trials at a Hall Hunter farm near Chichester in West Sussex.

Guided by sensors and 3D cameras, its gripper zooms in on ripe fruit using machine learning, a form of artificial intelligence. When operating at full tilt, its developers say the robot's gripper picks a raspberry in 10 seconds or less and drops it in a tray where the fruit gets sorted by maturity, before being moved into punnets, ready to be transported to supermarkets.

As robots don't get tired, they can pick for 20 hours a day. Rui Andres, manager at Frontier IP, one of the main backers of Fieldwork says UK farmers typically pay £1 to £2 for a kilogram of raspberries picked by human workers. Fieldwork intends to lease its robots to farmers for less.

The robot is the brainchild of Dr Martin Stoelen, a lecturer in robotics at Plymouth University, who moved from aerospace engineering into robots and took inspiration from his grandparents' farm in Norway. By tackling one of the most difficult soft fruits first, he hopes to be able to tweak the technology so the robot can be used to pick other berries, fruit and vegetables. Separate field trials in China have shown the robot can pick tomatoes, and it has also been let loose on cauliflower.

Some growers have already expressed interest, under pressure from the rising minimum wage, with labour accounting for half of their costs. They have also been spurred into action by a decline in seasonal pickers coming from Bulgaria, Romania and Poland since the UK's vote to leave the EU in June 2016. Berry and apple growers have been the hardest hit by the labour shortages. Many EU workers are staying away because their earnings have been eroded by the sharp drop in the value of the pound since the referendum. Nicholas Marston, chairman of the British Summer Fruits trade body, says fruit growers were 15%-30% short of seasonal pickers last summer. "It's a struggle. There were definitely crop losses last year and the year before."