**PC\* DS type Mines-Ponts**

**24 – 03 – 2023**

**durée 1h30**

**☞** *Merci de composer sur deux feuilles doubles différentes, une pour chaque partie, et de sauter des lignes pour les deux exercices.*

**Partie 1 Traduction**

Réécriture de Roald Dahl : une démarche très controversée

Peut-on revisiter les textes d’un auteur pour les adapter aux ­sensibilités contemporaines sans dénaturer son style et altérer son message ? S’agit-il d’une censure pure et simple, ou d’une modernisation nécessaire pour des écrits datés susceptibles, désormais, d’offenser ? Le débat a été relancé au Royaume-Uni après que le quotidien *The Telegraph*a révélé, le 17 février, qu’une quinzaine d’ouvrages de Roald Dahl, auteur mondialement connu de *Charlie et la chocolaterie* , avaient été modifiés dans une réédition conçue par des relecteurs ‘pour ne blesser personne’.

À l’annonce de cette réédition, un débat enflammé n’a pas tardé à éclater. Si la réflexion et les principes derrière ces changements sont évidemment compréhensibles – il s’agit de combattre le racisme, le sexisme, et toutes les formes de stigmatisation, de nombreuses personnes s’indignent que de tels classiques soient modifiés et affirment que nous ferions mieux produire des œuvres qui reflètent la complexité du monde, plutôt que de maquiller le passé.

Car en effet, des centaines de changements ont été apportés aux textes originaux, portant sur le genre ou l’apparence des personnages, à la suite de quoi les mots «gros», «fou» et «moche» ont été supprimés, tandis que certains passages ont été entièrement réécrits.

**Partie 2 Expression écrite**

**Now AI can write students’ essays for them, will everyone become a cheat?**

[Rob Reich](https://www.theguardian.com/profile/rob-reich) *The Guardian* Mon 28 Nov 2022

Parents and teachers across the world are rejoicing as students have returned to classrooms. But unbeknownst to them, an unexpected insidious academic threat is on the scene: a revolution in artificial intelligence has created powerful new automatic writing tools. These are machines optimised for cheating on school and university papers, apotential siren song for students that isdifficult, if not outright impossible, to catch.

The breakthrough technology is a new kind of machine learning system called a large language model. Give the model a prompt, hit return, and you get back full paragraphs of unique text. These models are capable of producing all kinds of outputs – essays, blogposts, poetry, op-eds, lyrics and even computer code.

In the past six months, easy-to-use commercial versions of these powerful AI tools have proliferated, many of them without the barest of limits or restrictions. For a high school pupil, a well written and unique English essay on Hamlet or short argument about the causes of the first world war is now just a few clicks away.

While it’s important that parents and teachers know about these new tools for cheating, there’s not much they can do about it. It’s almost impossible to prevent kids from accessing these new technologies, and schools will be outmatched when it comes to detecting their use. This also isn’t a problem that lends itself to government regulation.

In this situation, the solution lies in getting technology companies and the community of AI developers to embrace an ethic of responsibility. Unlike in law or medicine, there are no widely accepted standards in technology for what counts as responsible behaviour. In law and medicine, standards were a product of deliberate decisions by leading practitioners to adopt a form of self-regulation. In this case, that would mean companies establishing a shared framework for the responsible development, deployment or release of language models to mitigatetheir harmful effects, especially in the hands of adversarial users.

What could companies do that would promote the socially beneficial uses and deter or prevent the obviously negative uses, such as using a text generator to cheat in school?

There are a number of obvious possibilities. Perhaps all text generated by commercially available language models could be placed in an independent repository to allow forplagiarism detection. A second would be age restrictions and age-verification systems to make clear that pupils should not access the software. Finally, and more ambitiously, leading AI developers could [establish an independent review board](https://hai.stanford.edu/news/time-now-develop-community-norms-release-foundation-models) that would authorize whether and how to release language models, prioritising access to independent researchers who can help assess risks and suggest mitigation strategies, rather than speeding toward commercialisation.

After all, it’s high time tech companies realised that their products need to go through a social assurance process before being released, to anticipate and mitigate the societal problems that may result.

In an environment in which technology outpaces democracy, we need to develop an ethic of responsibility on the technological frontier. Powerful tech companies cannot treat the ethical and social implications of their products as an afterthought. If they simply rush to occupy the marketplace, and then apologise later if necessary – a story we’ve become all too familiar with in recent years – society pays the price for others’ lack of foresight.

**Questions** *(do not forget to indicate the number of words for each question)*

1. What are in Rob Reich’s opinion the most appropriate ways to limit the detrimental effects of the AI tools he mentions in his article ? Answer the question in your own words. (80 words +/- 10%)

2. In your opinion, should we be afraid of digital technology and more particularly of AI and its uses ? Illustrate your answer with relevant examples. (180 words +/- 10%)