



CONCOURS CENTRALE-SUPÉLEC

Anglais

TSI

2018

4 heures

Calculatrices interdites

L'usage de tout système électronique ou informatique est interdit dans cette épreuve.

Rédiger en anglais et en 400 mots une synthèse des documents proposés, qui devra obligatoirement comporter un titre. Indiquer avec précision, à la fin du travail, le nombre de mots utilisés (titre inclus), un écart de 10% en plus ou en moins sera accepté.

Ce sujet propose les documents suivants :

- le résumé d'une interview paru le 10 janvier 2016 dans *Global News* ;
- un article paru dans le *Huffington Post (US Edition)* le 3 avril 2017 ;
- un article de *USA Today* du 16 août 2017 ;
- un article paru dans *Forbes* le 16 novembre 2015.

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



January 10, 2016

Is there a political cost to being politically correct?

Is there such a thing as being too politically correct? And is even asking that question enough to elicit raised eyebrows and accusations of racism, sexism or other forms of discrimination?

Ujjal Dosanjh, the former premier of British Columbia and a former federal cabinet minister, set out to tackle those issues in an article penned for the *National Post* last week entitled "By silencing white men, Canada can't have an honest debate about equality, race and culture."

Suffice it to say, it got people talking.

Dosanjh joined the West Block's Tom Clark this weekend to discuss his article and where we go from here.

"I think one of the problems is that on issues of language, race, culture, ethnicity, religion, white politicians in power particularly, silence themselves for fear of rebuke from guys like me," said Dosanjh, who is of Indian background.

"And the issue of political correctness comes up, you know, with all of my friends, no matter what colour or ethnicity they're from. Be they Chinese, be they Indians, be they brown, be they white, be they black, and all of us talk about it in our private lives, but nobody really wants to speak about it because of what happens. You are ridiculed and you get a lot of abuse."

Dosanjh said the main trigger for his article was comments made by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, in which he stated that Canada had no core identity — only shared values. Dosanjh said he believes Canada does indeed have a central identity that should be talked about and defended. He explained that many people seemed to misinterpret the point of his article, believing that he was advocating for white men to have more influence.

"They don't need more power. They just need to freely express themselves on issues they don't express themselves on, like language, race, ethnicity, culture or religion ... that's the problem with this concept of multi-culturalism that we misunderstand. If it is to work, it is about everyone having a conversation, and everyone being included. All of us have ethnicities and cultures."

Asked if the kind of open dialogue he is advocating could give rise to more bigotry of the kind seen in Donald Trump's presidential campaign, Dosanjh said there's a difference between open dialogue and outright racism.

According to Listverse, a school in California sent five students home after they refused to remove their American flag t-shirts on Cinco de Mayo, the day that marks Mexico's victory over the French at the Battle of Puebla. An Xbox player who put his homeplace, Fort Gay, West Virginia, on his Xbox Live profile was banned by Microsoft because it was "inappropriate in any context". Santa Clauses in Australia were forced to stop saying the traditional phrase of "ho ho ho" because it could "frighten children" and be "derogatory to women".

George Washington once said, "If the freedom of speech is taken away then dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep to slaughter." Our contemporary society has no defined limitations on free speech, however, there is an undertow threatening to erode this sacred principle: political correctness.

To comprehend how political correctness is shaping the privilege of free speech, one must first understand several major aspects of this concept. The basic premise is that if intellectuals and pundits can influence how individuals think and act, then they can also influence what is socially 'acceptable' language. By imposing their political views on some subjects, they create a pressure to conform to these standards. But generally, a person does not want to be labeled as an objector of popular opinion, thereby forcing them to subject their own ideas to the prevailing ideology.

In addition, political correctness encourages the pursuit of conformity. Through social intimidation, a diverse body of ideas and expressions no longer flourishes in the diminishing world of American free speech. A growing aspect of societal multiculturalism only fur-

ther contributes to this problem. Proponents of political correctness obsess over their belief that language should not be injurious to any ethnicity, race, gender, religion or other social group. They attempt to eliminate what they consider to be offensive remarks and actions and replace them with harmless substitutes that come at the expense of free expression.

Several institutions have come under fire for issues relating to political correctness. One of the more recent controversies has been about Amherst College's decision to drop "Lord Jeff"¹ as their mascot. Many of the college's students viewed Lord Jeff as a racist and oppressive white symbol. The institution was "encouraged to cut its ties with Lord Jeff, who came to be seen as an inappropriate symbol and offensive to many members of the student body", as per the New York Times. The Lord Jeffery Inn, a local campus hotel, is also going to be renamed. However, there has been an understandable backlash stemming from current students and alumni. The opposition criticized the incident because of how it affronted the legacy of Lord Jeffery, who was a respected war general, as well as the college itself. William H. Scott, a member of the class of 1979, said, "We sterilize history by eliminating the mascot...It's...censorship."

Declaring that some thoughts, phrases, and actions are 'correct' while others are not is creating an ever-tightening noose around the freedom of speech and expression. No matter how uncomfortable we are with inflammatory language or actions, it's crucial to recognize that this is a small price to pay to maintain a democratic system that promotes free expression as a basic pillar of society.



Richard Wolf

Aug. 16, 2017

From cross burning to funeral protests, hate speech enjoys broad protection

WASHINGTON — The white supremacists and neo-Nazis who marched through Charlottesville last week have the Supreme Court on their side.

In a series of cases dating back to the 1960s, the high court has struck down restrictions on so-called "hate speech" unless it specifically incites violence or is intended to do so.

The First Amendment², the justices have said, protected a Ku Klux Klan member decrying Jews and blacks in Ohio in 1969. It protected neo-Nazis seeking to march through heavily Jewish Skokie, Ill., in 1977. It protected a U.S. flag burner from Texas in 1989, three cross burners from Virginia in 2003 and homophobic funeral protesters in 2011.

¹ The mascot is named for 18th-century British General Jeffery Amherst, known for suggesting a plan to deliver smallpox-infected blankets to Native Americans. Amherst was the commander of British forces in North America during the French and Indian War.

² "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Just two months ago, the high court ruled unanimously that even derogatory trademarks deserve First Amendment protection — a victory for an Asian-American rock band dubbed The Slants³ as well as the Washington Redskins.

You wouldn't know it from the public condemnation that has followed the events in Charlottesville, which led to the death of a 32-year-old female counter-protester and two state troopers.

Faced with the racist and anti-Semitic speeches and symbols of the marchers, the violence that resulted and President Trump's equivocal denunciation of "all sides," Republican as well as Democratic officials have said the groups should not be welcomed anywhere.

Ah, but they are — by virtue of Supreme Court precedent.

"I don't quarrel with the president's recognition that people had a right to march," said Burt Neuborne, a professor of civil liberties at New York University School of Law who represented Ku Klux Klan members and others as an American Civil Liberties Union lawyer. "This is a time to distinguish legal rights from moral condemnation."

Why Do Millennials Love Political Correctness? Generational Values



Neil Howe⁴, CONTRIBUTOR

Forbes Nov 16, 2015

Of all the cultural themes that have inspired lengthy thinkpieces this year, perhaps none have spilled more ink — or generated more criticism — than political correctness. [...] The latest development has taken place on college campuses: Students at the University of Missouri and Yale are speaking out against racial discrimination, demanding an inclusive, protective campus culture.

Critics warn of a resurgent political correctness that threatens to suffocate free expression and leaves young people unprepared for the real world. We see it as a sign of something else: a demographic changing-of-the-guard that has been approaching ever since the first Millennials came of age — one that will set the tone in any public arena for years to come.

Most of the recent commentary on political correctness has referenced incidents on college campuses. But this debate is resonating far beyond the ivory tower. For example, at least a dozen popular comedians, mostly Boomers and Gen Xers claim that oversensitive young audiences are ruining their profession.

The current frontrunners in the Republican presidential race — Donald Trump and Ben Carson — have made "anti-P.C." rhetoric central to their campaigning, with Trump declaring during the first primary debate

that "the big problem this country has is being politically correct." And the public is inclined to agree: According to a Rasmussen poll, 71% of Americans think "political correctness is a problem in America today," up from 58% four years ago — with little difference across age groups.

[...]

P.C. policies today are supported and reinforced by an increasingly diffuse "victimhood culture" that transcends ideology. Conservatives as well as liberals champion these policies, which are less often about enforcing a worldview or uplifting oppressed groups than about protecting individuals from emotional distress — for example, when Yale's Intercultural Affairs Committee urged students to steer clear of any Halloween costumes with the potential to offend. Also to be avoided are "microaggressions": subtle displays of racial or sexual bias.

These requests are largely coming from college students who are bringing their concerns to faculty and often getting them enforced by administrators. The ultimate goal, in the words of authors Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt, "is to turn campuses into 'safe spaces' where young adults are shielded from words and ideas that make some uncomfortable."

³ Slant (offensive slang): used as a disparaging term for a person of East Asian birth or ancestry.

⁴ Neil Howe is a historian, economist, and demographer, and a leading authority on generational trends. He coined the term "Millennial Generation" and is the bestselling author of over a dozen books, including *Generations*, *The Fourth Turning*, *Millennials Rising*, and *The Graying of the Great Powers*. Howe is the Managing Director of Demography at Hedgeye and president of Saeculum Research, which helps managers and investors anticipate changes in markets, consumer preferences, and the public mood.

In turn, the nature of anti-P.C. criticism has shifted. What was once a debate centered on free speech and censorship along partisan lines now includes exasperated calls from all sides for students to toughen up. Critics presume a certain level of emotional fragility among young people that the last P.C. movement did not — exacerbated, some say, by a more consumer-oriented mindset at colleges that leads administrators and professors to bend over backwards to cater to students.

Why has political correctness returned as a flashpoint nearly two decades later? Behind its resurgence are a number of long-term explanations. The first and perhaps most obvious is the rise of social media, whose speed and enormous reach have amplified a bottomless outrage cycle that rewards the most strident voices.

Another factor is widespread disaffection with the political establishment. Voters fed up with years of public-sector paralysis are buying into the argument that political correctness stifles the ability of our nation's leaders to speak freely and act decisively. To supporters, Trump's devil-may-care attitude and out-

sider status feel like a welcome rebuke to elites who would rather squabble over terminology (e.g. President Obama's controversial refusal to use the phrase "Islamic terrorism").

[...]

The most powerful driver, however, may be generational change. Where Boomers once sought to promote progressive values, Millennials want to minimize hurt feelings. Where Gen Xers once touted resilience and grit, Millennials tout tolerance and inclusiveness. Young adults' lifelong reliance on institutional support, combined with the formal implementation of two decades' worth of P.C. thinking in curriculums and classrooms, has also led them to expect those in authority to help them in their quest — an impulse that prompted a Times columnist to remark, "[It's] disconcerting to see students clamor for a kind of intrusive supervision that would have outraged students a few generations ago."

[...]

• • • FIN • • •
