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

Traduire en français le texte ci-dessous.

Fairly safe

What athletes may or may not do ought to be decided on grounds of safety, not fairness

Another Olympics, another doping debate. And this time it is a fervent one, as recent advances in medical science have had the side-effect of providing athletes with new ways of enhancing performance, and thus of putting an even greater strain on people's ethical sensibilities.

This is especially true of gene therapy. Replacing defective genes holds out great promise for people suffering from diseases such as muscular dystrophy and cancer. But administered to sprightly sportsmen, the treatment may allow them to heave greater weights, swim faster and jump farther. And that would be cheating, wouldn't it ?

Two notions are advanced against doping in sport: safety and fairness. The first makes sense, the second less so—particularly when it comes to gene therapy. For instance, some people have innate genetic mutations which give them exactly the same sort of edge. Eero Mantyranta, a Finn, was a double Olympic champion in cross-country skiing. His body has a mutation that causes it to produce far more of a hormone called EPO than a normal person would. This hormone stimulates the production of red blood cells. A synthetic version of it is the (banned) drug of choice for endurance athletes.

Mr Mantyranta was allowed to compete because his advantage was held to be a « natural » gift. Yet the question of what is natural is no less vexed than that of what is fair. What is natural about electric muscle stimulation ? Or nibbling on nutrients that have been cooked up by chemists ? Or sprinting in special shoes made of springy carbon fibre ? Statistically speaking, today's athletes are unlikely to be any more naturally gifted than their forebears, but records continue to fall. Nature is clearly getting a boost from somewhere. [...]

One condition of greater freedom would be to enforce transparency: athletes should disclose all the pills they take, just as they register the other forms of equipment they use, so that others can catch up. [...]

From *The Economist*, print edition,
July 31st, 2008