

**EXAMEN DE FIN D'ÉTUDES SECONDAIRES CLASSIQUES**  
**Sessions 2023 – QUESTIONNAIRE ÉCRIT**

Date :	16.05.23	Durée :	14:15 - 16:45	Numéro candidat :	
Discipline :	Anglais	Section(s) :	CB / CB-4LANG / CC / CC-4LANG / CD / CD-4LANG / CE / CE-4LANG / CE-MATF / CF / CG / CG-4LANG / CG-COMED / CG-URBS / CI		

I. **Task 1: Reading comprehension (10 marks)**

**For better or worse, billionaires now guide climate policy**

They are not elected to any office. But in the fight against global warming, the world's billionaires have more influence than many heads of state.

As governments struggle to move quickly to contain greenhouse gases, ultrawealthy investors and philanthropists are increasingly grabbing the reins, using their fortunes to guide the transition to cleaner energy toward their favored projects and market strategies.

They are men with household names like Jeff Bezos, Mike Bloomberg, and Bill Gates, along with other billionaires who have lower profiles but equally large climate ambition. Their role as shadow policymakers has grown amid the evolution of the Biden administration climate agenda and the recent U.N. Climate Change Conference in Egypt, **\_(a)\_**.

It is a growing point of tension in the climate movement, as the pursuits of billionaires come under heightened scrutiny more broadly. Some of the recent financial and philanthropic misadventures of figures such as crypto entrepreneur Sam Bankman-Fried and Tesla founder Elon Musk are leading the public to ask whether these people **\_(b)\_** — or if they are using their influence to steer public policy toward vanity projects.

Many of these men have benefited from the same industrialization they are now **purporting** to save us from. In a recent report, Oxfam International found that 125 billionaires create more emissions through their investments and lifestyle than all of France.

“They need to pay up, and not as philanthropy,” said Mitzi Jonelle Tan, a climate activist from the Philippines. “What they are doing is not solidarity or aid. They should not be praised for this. Their greed has caused the global climate crisis.”

Nevertheless, billionaire engagement in climate action is growing as nations lean evermore on private companies and philanthropists willing to make big — often financially risky — bets on decarbonization.

In the United States, in particular, an inability to **muster** the political support for robust regulations that limit emissions and force companies to reshape their operations has the government looking to billionaires to help redirect the economy to **\_(c)\_**. “You can’t expect every government to do everything or be on top of every issue,” Marc Benioff, chief executive of an enterprise software company, said in an interview. Benioff, an environmental philanthropist himself, has a net worth of nearly \$6 billion, according to Forbes. “There always have been philanthropists and this has been the role of philanthropy for generations: to help put a light on places where there is a darkness.”

“We can take on more risk and assume more failure than commercial organizations or governments or NGOs,” he said.

Benioff and Bezos are at the forefront of a U.S. initiative that puts faith in carbon trading to help solve the climate crisis. Carbon trading allows companies to pay a fee to compensate for their greenhouse gas emissions.

40 The Bezos Earth Fund and the Rockefeller Foundation were the Biden administration partners in creating the program U.S. climate envoy John F. Kerry touts as crucial to fighting warming. “No government in the world has enough money to get this job done,” Kerry said at the program’s unveiling. “We will only succeed with a massive infusion of private capital.”

45 The initiative got mixed reviews in Egypt at a time when many studies, including a major new one commissioned by the United Nations, find the credits are too often a sham covering up rather than **mitigating** the corporate contribution to global warming.

Kerry and the Bezos Earth Fund assure the new program will bring integrity to carbon credits, but critics said the initiative reflected an **\_(d)\_**, [dismissing] it as “a new veneer on the same old market-based carbon credit programs that have never reduced emissions at the source.”

50 Officials at the Earth Fund declined to comment. Bezos is **poised** to invest tens of billions of dollars in the fight against warming - beyond the \$10 billion he has already committed to the Earth Fund - after telling CNN last month it will be a major focus of his plan to give away most of his fortune. Billionaires have long been active in global warming policy. But no billionaire is more influential in charting the technological course of the transition than Gates, whose Breakthrough Energy organization is investing billions of dollars in dozens of next-generation clean-tech companies.

60 Many of them would fit right into sci-fi texts, making things like lab-cultivated meat, giant machines that vacuum carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and traveling wave nuclear reactors which use uranium 30 times more efficiently than current nuclear power technology. Another company Gates backs, Commonwealth Fusion Systems, is chasing fusion technology it hopes **\_(e)\_**. “One glass of water will provide enough fusion fuel for one person’s lifetime,” the company predicts on its website. Bezos also invests in fusion.

65 Yet not everyone is pleased to see government following the lead of Gates on some investments, such as technologies that aim to capture carbon dioxide emitted by factories, vehicles, and agriculture operations and bury it.

“Carbon capture and storage is not a climate solution,” said Julia Levin, national climate program manager at a Canadian nonprofit. “Despite decades of research, billions of dollars of investment, carbon capture’s track record is one of failure after expensive failure.”

70 Public money is getting poured into the technology, she said during a panel at the U.N. summit, because “governments are listening to the wrong people.”

Mikaela Loach also argued that the wrong people are **charting** the course for confronting climate change, at a forum in September in New York where the British climate activist said billionaires should not exist. The forum was hosted by the Gates Foundation, which paid Loach to speak.

(She says she donated the fee to charity.)

Source:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2022/12/12/billionaires-climate/>

(984 words, adapted)

by Evan Halper, 12<sup>th</sup> December 2022

**EXAMEN DE FIN D'ÉTUDES SECONDAIRES CLASSIQUES**  
**Sessions 2023 – QUESTIONNAIRE ÉCRIT**

Date :		Durée :		Numéro candidat :	
Discipline :	Error! Unknown document property name.- Error! Unknown document property name.	Section(s) :	Error! Unknown document property name.		

**READING COMPREHENSION QUESTIONS**

**A. Insert clauses into the text** (-1 per wrong or missing answer)

Choose which clauses (1-7) best fit into the gaps (a-e) in the text. Write the correct numbers into the box below. There are two sentences which you **do not** need to use.

1. are as well-equipped to solve the planet’s problems as they claim
2. where mainstream science says it needs to go
3. approach that has become a big factor in the way we are addressing climate change
4. approach to climate change that is unworthy of the moment
5. could ultimately provide limitless clean energy with almost zero pollution
6. where their projects were on prominent display
7. can be uniquely well positioned financially and intellectually

**Write your answers here:**

Gap in text	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Sentence					

**B. Vocabulary – mix and match** (-1 per wrong or missing item)

There are five words/expressions highlighted in bold in the text. There are three definitions which you do not need to use. Write the words/expressions next to their definition in the table below and a slash (/) into the boxes which are not needed. They are not necessarily in chronological order.

	to bring together, collect or call forth
	to intensify, reinforce, strengthen
	to lay out a plan, draft, or outline for something
	to be calm, controlled, and ready to act
	to claim or pretend to be or to do something

	to fall apart, break or become disorganised
	to voice your opinion, speak up without fear
	to lessen in intensity, force, or impact

**C. True / False / Not Stated** (-1 for incorrect answer)

*Decide if the statements are True (T), False (F) or Not Stated (NS) in the text. For each statement, circle T, F or NS.*

'Carbon trading' requires businesses to pay a charge relative to the emissions they have caused.	T	F	NS
The motives of influential billionaires are questioned: they are accused of causing more pollution than they admit to and of using their investments to hide that.	T	F	NS
A number of ultrawealthy people have formed ties with various governments and are essentially steering climate policies from the background.	T	F	NS
Using public capital is not just necessary to finance various new projects, it is indeed the safer option simply because it can endure potential losses.	T	F	NS
Some of the proposed strategies are actually counterproductive as their production and manufacturing cause significant amounts of pollution in and of themselves.	T	F	NS

**II. Task 2 – Reading into writing (20 marks)**

You are going to read two texts in which the authors tackle the issue of **youth protection and social media**.

**Text 1: How To Help Kids Think Critically In The Age Of The Internet**

The Reboot Foundation recently published a *Parents' Guide to Critical Thinking*. A group of experts spent more than a year pulling together the guide, relying on the latest research in the sciences, and the document brims with tips on how parents can help their children learn to reason in the Digital Age. Although the online world presents formidable challenges for kids, most of them are not new. Deliberate misinformation has long threatened our ability to think clearly, and good citizenship has always required an ability to vet sources, argue dispassionately and consider alternative points of view.

What's new is the idea that children can start learning to think critically early. Indeed, new research suggests that people can think logically at a very young age, and most children can reason before they can even talk. What's more, parents can promote the development of reasoning, even at early ages, by creating home environments that encourage intellectual curiosity, open-mindedness and free expression. All of these are vital to helping children develop full-fledged critical thinking skills. The key is to start early and give children engaging experiences that develop open-mindedness, and logical thinking. This is true for the physical world as well as the online world. One practical take-away is for parents to play cooperative games with their children. These games can encourage strategic thinking as well as provide ways to learn about the norms of play. The games also encourage kids to think out loud about their thinking, which is an important reasoning skill.

Next, it's crucial that children learn to manage their emotions and use them productively. This is important for social relationships, of course. But emotional management is also central to effective critical thinking online. After all, fake news runs on feelings of outrage. Same with weak reasoning. It's logic based on emotions.

To help children, parents should give kids the language to discuss their feelings. By learning how to express their emotions, children can gradually learn to externalize them. Kids will still feel emotions of course — as they should — but they will be better able to put them in the proper context. Kids learn social skills via their environment, and parents should model good emotional management.

As kids grow older, they will inevitably spend time online, and parents should work with their children to understand the risks of the internet. Even at a young age, children should know about the value of privacy — and the dangers of messaging with strangers.

Parents should be explicit about teaching their children about the internet, and encourage them to ask lots of questions about what they see online. When it comes to online news, for instance, one good practice is to confirm information with multiple sources.

Limiting digital time is also good practice. As our research — and the research of others — has shown, too much digital time can hurt academic outcomes, especially for young children.

In the end, critical thinking habits can counter the negative effects of online media and allow children to reap the rewards offered by the internet while avoiding the drawbacks. While the internet can be a dark place for kids, it need not be.

Source:

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/helenleebouygues/2019/09/12/how-to-help-kids-think-critically-in-the-age-of-the-internet/?sh=3c2efbf05969> (525 words, adapted)

Helen Lee Bouygues, September 12<sup>th</sup> 2019

**Text 2: The Guardian view on regulating social media: the internet should be safer**

What happened to Molly Russell, who took her own life aged 14, was a tragedy. Everything possible must be done to prevent similar events in the future. Molly's death was linked by a coroner to internet use after she was shown in a London court to have been deluged with algorithmically driven self-harm material. On the principle that this was wrong, and that social media companies must take more responsibility for what happens on their platforms, there is a good deal of agreement across party lines in parliament as well as among the public.

But beyond such painful case studies, and some generalisations drawn from them, consensus starts to break down. Legislating to fix the many problems created or exacerbated by social media is difficult. Digital technologies move fast and unpredictably. So far, societies and governments have not succeeded in restricting their harmful and destructive uses, while harnessing creative and productive ones. The UK's online safety bill, which returns to the House of Commons on Tuesday, has already been several years in the making, and further changes are needed before it becomes law. Even then, no one should imagine that this is a job done. Instead, the bill should be viewed as an awkward step on an arduous journey.

The new law's emphasis was altered markedly by last year's decision to weaken the duties related to the protection of adults from harmful content, and focus on children. This was driven by concerns around free speech, particularly the contested nature of "hate" and who gets to define it. For now, the wider degradation of the public realm by social media, including the amplification of abusive language and imagery, will remain unchallenged. Labour's Lucy Powell has already said that if the government rejects amendments aimed at increasing tech companies' accountability, Labour will seek to do so in the future.

There is a good chance that one change sought by backbenchers, making individual executives criminally liable for child protection breaches, will be accepted. This is important, not least in sending a clear signal that the public will understand. But the prospect of prosecution must form part of a wider framework of sanctions that forces digital businesses to put children's safety first. Until now, they have got away with treating this as someone else's problem.

It is only because the coroner in Molly Russell's case compelled Meta and others to give evidence that we know what we do about her mistreatment. It took the courage of a whistleblower, Frances Haugen, to reveal that Facebook (now Meta) knew Instagram was making teenage girls feel worse about their bodies. This week, Ian Russell, Molly's father, described the platforms' responses to the notice issued by the coroner in his daughter's case as "business as usual". This laissez-faire approach must end.

Media businesses have been associated with harm as well as good in the past. Never before have they pushed themselves so aggressively at children while being so careless of the effects. The online safety bill must rewrite the rules and deliver an ultimatum.

Source:

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jan/16/the-guardian-view-on-regulating-social-media-the-internet-should-be-safer> (505 words, adapted)

January 16<sup>th</sup> 2023

**Writing task**

Write a structured analysis of 200-250 words in which you do the following:

- Compare and contrast the overall points of view expressed in the two texts (referring to 2-3 main arguments put forward in each text). Your analysis must represent  $\pm 2/3$  of your answer, i.e.  $\pm 140-170$  words.
- Explain which point of view you agree with more, and why. If you agree with both or neither, explain why. Your personal opinion must represent  $\pm 1/3$  of your answer, i.e. 60-80 words.

Use your own words as far as possible. Do not copy from the texts, except for short quotes (with quotation marks) to support your statements.

Indicate your word count at the end.

**Task 3: Essay writing (30 marks)**

***Write a well-structured essay of between 300 and 400 words on ONE of the topics below. Indicate your choice of topic clearly and include the word count.***

1. With the rise of AI and the Internet of Things, many of us are creating digital prisons for ourselves. Discuss the validity of this statement.
2. “Cancel culture” is the practice of censoring, publicly shaming or withdrawing support for people with a message deemed unacceptable.  
What are the advantages and disadvantages of this practice?
3. Fear causes paralysis, inspiration moves mountains.  
Should this idea influence parents’ choices when raising their kids?