

Devoir surveillé – Science, éthique et progrès

Axe culturel 3 — Art et pouvoir : innovation scientifique, responsabilité et limites éthiques dans le monde anglophone (programme de Tle, LVA)

Durée : 120 min – Sans document – Sur 20 points · Anglais (LVA) Terminale

Nom : _____ Date : _____ Note : _____ / 20

Les réponses doivent être rédigées et justifiées. Soigne l'orthographe et la présentation.

Exercice 1 – Compréhension écrite — The Price of a Breakthrough (4 pts)

Read the following opinion column, then answer the four questions in English, in your own words. When the Halverson Institute announced last spring that it had cured a rare form of blindness in three children, the news travelled round the world in a single afternoon. The treatment rewrites a faulty gene inside the retina ; one injection, and sight returns. For the families involved, the word 'miracle' did not seem excessive. Yet the story that reached the front pages left something out. The trial had been approved for ten children, and only three were treated. The other seven were sent home because their parents had refused to sign a consent form that ran to forty-two pages of legal English. 'We were not asked to understand,' one mother told a parliamentary committee in London. 'We were asked to agree.' That sentence has haunted the debate ever since. Informed consent is supposed to be the wall between research and experiment, between a patient and a guinea pig. When the science becomes too complex for the very people it is meant to serve, that wall turns into a formality, and a signature replaces a decision. Nobody seriously argues that the Institute should stop its work. The question is narrower and harder : who is accountable when a breakthrough outruns the public's ability to judge it ? Progress, after all, is not a destination. It is a series of choices, and choices belong to everyone.

- a) a) What did the Halverson Institute announce, and how many of the ten approved children were finally treated ? (repérage)
- b) b) In your own words, explain why the seven other children were not treated. (sens global)
- c) c) What does the mother mean by 'We were not asked to understand. We were asked to agree.' ? (inférence)
- d) d) Explain the expression 'between a patient and a guinea pig' and say what it reveals about the author's position. (expression à expliquer)

Exercice 2 – Lexique de la recherche et de la bioéthique (4 pts)

Complète chaque phrase par le mot ou groupe de mots anglais correspondant à la traduction donnée entre parenthèses. Recopie la phrase entière.

- a) a) No treatment may be tested on a patient without ... (le consentement éclairé).
- b) b) The paper was rejected after ... (l'évaluation par les pairs).
- c) c) Critics fear that the first authorisation will be the beginning of ... (une pente glissante).
- d) d) The company claims to have reached ... (la neutralité carbone) three years early.

Exercice 3 – Les tournures du débat argumenté*(4 pts)*

Complète chaque phrase par la tournure argumentative qui convient au sens indiqué entre parenthèses. Une seule réponse par phrase.

- a) a) ... (Certes), gene editing could eliminate several inherited diseases.
- b) b) The real issue is ... (savoir si) such research should be funded by private companies.
- c) c) ... (Les preuves suggèrent que) the effects will last for several generations.
- d) d) ... (Tout bien pesé), a public moratorium seems the wisest option.

Exercice 4 – Faux amis et indéénombrables*(4 pts)*

Traduis en anglais les phrases suivantes. Chacune contient un faux ami ou un nom indéénombrable.

- a) a) Actuellement, très peu de pays autorisent cette recherche.
- b) b) Les recherches montrent qu'il serait raisonnable d'attendre.
- c) c) Le comité a fini par vérifier toutes les données.
- d) d) Nous avons trop peu d'informations et pas assez de preuves.

Exercice 5 – Expression écrite — Should there be limits to scientific research ?*(4 pts)*

Write a structured answer of 150 to 180 words to the question: 'Should there be limits to scientific research ?' Respect the four requirements below.

- a) a) Introduce the issue in two sentences, using one of these openers : The issue at stake is whether... / This raises the question of...
- b) b) Concede one argument in favour of unlimited research (Admittedly... / While it is true that...).
- c) c) Object with a counter-argument and support it with one dated anglophone reference (Frankenstein 1818, Silent Spring 1962, Dolly 1996, the Human Genome Project 2003...).
- d) d) Conclude with a nuanced position, using On balance... or Ultimately..., and at least one modal of recommendation (should, ought to).

Bon courage !