

VERSION

LEA1

UJML3 - 2020-2021
Semestre 1

lucie.rataill@univ-lyon3.fr

NB :

Le cours « Anglais appliqué : version » est un TD (1h30/semaine) de traduction de documents de l'anglais vers le français.

Ce cours est évalué en période d'examens (après la fin des TDs) par un TE (terminal écrit) d'1h.

Ce fascicule est également disponible en ligne sur la plateforme Moodle de l'université ([‘Tou.te.s enseignant.e.s – L1 – TD Version LEA 1 S1’](#) dans la barre de recherches).

Conseils de bibliographie :

Vocabulaire : *The Big Picture* (Jean-Max Thomson, Ellipses, 2014)

Méthodologie : *Versus : la version réfléchie* (vol. 1) (Michel Ballard, Ophrys)

La traduction journalistique (Delphine Chartier, P.U. du Mirail)

Méthode pour traduire de l'anglais au français (Jean-Yves Le Dizez, Ellipses)

Fort en version (Geneviève Lafon, Bréal)

Entraînement au thème et à la version (Claire Bernas-Martel, Ellipses)

Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais (Jean-Paul Vinay et Jean Darbelnet, Didier)

Les règles d'or de la traduction (Jean-Marc Hiernard, Ellipses)

+ Dictionnaire unilingue anglais (Oxford English Dictionary, Cambridge Dictionary ..., papier ou en ligne) et bilingue français-anglais (Larousse, Harraps..., papier ou en ligne).

US Supreme Court backs protection for LGBT workers

The top court in the US has ruled that employers who fire workers for being gay or transgender are breaking the country's civil rights laws.

In a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court said federal law, which prohibits discrimination based on sex, should be understood to include sexual orientation and gender identity. The ruling is a major win for LGBT workers and their allies. And it comes even though the court has become more conservative.

Lawyers for the employers had argued that the authors of the 1964 Civil Rights Act had not intended it to apply to cases involving sexual orientation and gender identity. The Trump administration sided with that argument.

But Judge Neil Gorsuch, who was nominated to the court by President Donald Trump, said acting against an employee on those grounds necessarily takes sex into account. "An employer who fires an individual for being homosexual or transgender fires that person for traits or actions it would not have questioned in members of a different sex," he wrote.

Under the Obama administration, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which enforces the anti-discrimination law, said it included gender identity and sexual orientation. But the Trump administration has moved to roll back some protections in healthcare and other areas.

It's difficult to overstate the significance of the decision. While the court is establishing a long history of decisions expanding gay rights, this is the first time it spoke directly about the legal protections for transgender individuals. That the ruling comes out just days after the Trump administration announced it was removing transgender health-insurance protections only puts the issue in stark relief.

Adapted from *bbc.com*, published on the 15th of June 2020.

Bravo Marcus Rashford. But it shouldn't have taken a footballer to show the serious food poverty in this country

"He's a 22-year-old footballer. He shouldn't be the one having to do this." This was the opinion of Gary Lineker on the subject of Marcus Rashford's successful campaign to extend school meal **vouchers** through the summer holidays. And he's right. It shouldn't have required the Manchester United and England striker to make the point. But it was necessary.

Rashford is a rarity in modern Britain: he's a prominent figure who knows what it's like to rely on free school meals, and sometimes on food banks. People like him are extremely rare in government, the criminal justice system, the media, the BBC, big business, take your pick.

The original decision not to extend summer holiday meals vouchers had been signed off by a Conservative cabinet drawn from the ranks of the privileged and entitled elite. Around two thirds-of them went to private schools against roughly 7 per cent of the UK population. The Conservative Party sometimes likes to deny poverty exists, because there's Universal Credit

and all that (and yes, I could write a separate column about all the problems with Universal Credit).

If there were a few more “free kids” in government, maybe there wouldn’t have been the need for Rashford to stand up and become the de facto lead campaigner against food poverty in what remains a rich country by international standards. The government’s U-turn may be the most meaningful goal that Rashford scores this year. Thousands of children will get fed over the summer. That’s something we should all cheer. But the austerity-driven problem of food poverty remains.

Adapted from *The Independent*, published on the 16th of June 2020.

Why Uber's business model is doomed

Having threatened to pull out of California completely, Uber and Lyft recently won a temporary reprieve from orders to reclassify their drivers as employees rather than independent contractors. The companies argued they could not come up with a plan for doing so overnight, even though more than two years have passed since California’s supreme court ordered them to change their ways. The Californian labour law AB5 was supposed to end their non-compliance.

One might assume that misclassifying drivers as independent contractors enables rideshare companies such as Uber to make exorbitant profits. The reality is far weirder. In fact, Uber and Lyft are not making any profits at all. On the contrary, the companies have been haemorrhaging cash for years, undercharging users for rides in a bid to aggressively expand their market shares worldwide. Squeezing drivers’ salaries is not their main strategy for becoming profitable. Doing so merely slows the speed at which they burn through money.

The truth is that Uber and Lyft exist largely as the embodiments of Wall Street-funded bets on automation, which have failed to come to fruition. These companies are trying to survive legal challenges to their illegal hiring practices, while waiting for driverless-car technologies to improve. The advent of the autonomous car would allow Uber and Lyft to fire their drivers. Having already acquired a position of dominance with the rideshare market, these companies would then reap major monopoly profits. There is simply no world in which paying drivers a living wage would become part of Uber and Lyft’s long-term business plans.

The Guardian, 24 August 2020

House Votes to Block Postal Changes and Allocate Funds for Mail

The Democratic bill would send \$25 billion to the Postal Service and reverse changes that have slowed service until after November’s election.

The House interrupted its summer recess on Saturday for a rare weekend session to approve legislation blocking cost-cutting and operational changes at the Postal Service that Democrats, civil rights advocates and some Republicans fear could jeopardize mail-in ballots this fall.

The measure, put forward by Democratic leaders, would also require the Postal Service to prioritize the delivery of all election-related mail and grant the beleaguered agency a rare \$25 billion infusion to cover revenue lost because of the coronavirus pandemic and ensure it has the resources to address what is expected to be the largest vote-by-mail operation in the nation's history.

Democrats were joined by 26 Republicans in voting yes, passing the legislation 257 to 150, with more than 20 Republicans not voting. But the bill, as written, appeared unlikely to move through the Republican-controlled Senate. President Trump opposed the measure in last-minute tweets, calling it a “money wasting HOAX” by Democrats.

Democrats framed Saturday's action as an emergency intervention into the affairs of an independent agency to protect vital mail and package services that have seen significant delays this summer as the new postmaster general, Louis DeJoy, moved swiftly to cut costs to close a yawning budget gap. They said it was also necessary to instill confidence in American voters that the agency would safeguard their ballots despite near daily attacks by Mr. Trump on mail-in voting.

New York Times, 22 August 2020

How Algorithms Keep Workers in the Dark

Despite companies' constantly increasing reliance on data-churning tech, the way most algorithms work remains a mystery to many workers – which creates a power imbalance on the job.

In the movies, when a machine decides to be the boss – or humans let it – things go wrong. Yet despite myriad dystopian warnings, control by machines is fast becoming our reality.

Algorithms are helping design buildings. They are speeding up trading on financial markets, making and losing fortunes in micro-seconds. In the workplace, self-learning algorithmic computer systems are being introduced by companies to assist in areas such as hiring, setting tasks, measuring productivity, evaluating performance and even terminating employment.

Giving self-learning algorithms the responsibility to make and execute decisions affecting workers is called “algorithmic management”. It carries a host of risks in depersonalising management systems and entrenching pre-existing biases.

Granted, human assessments during job interviews are notoriously flawed. Algorithms, however, can also be biased. The classic example is the COMPAS software used by US judges, probation and parole officers to rate a person's risk of reoffending. In 2016 a ProPublica investigation showed the algorithm was heavily discriminatory, incorrectly classifying black subjects as higher risk 45% of the time, compared with 23% for white subjects.

Algorithms do what their code tells them to do. The problem is the code is rarely available. This makes them difficult to scrutinize, or even understand.

Understandings about impact of algorithms on all forms of work is still in its infancy. It demands greater scrutiny and research. Without human oversight based on agreed principles we risk inviting HAL into our workplaces.

Adapted from *BBC*, August 2020

Why Procrastination is About Managing Emotions, Not Time

Address the real reasons you procrastinate and you're more likely to start achieving your goals.

Experts like Tim Pynchyl at Carleton University in Canada and his collaborator Fuschia Sirois at the University of Sheffield in the UK have proposed that procrastination is an issue with managing our emotions, not our time. This fresh perspective on procrastination is beginning to open up exciting new approaches to reducing the habit; it could even help you improve your own approach to work. "Self-change of any sort is not a simple thing, and it typically follows the old adage of two steps forward and one step back," says Pynchyl.

Studies showed low mood only increases procrastination if enjoyable activities are available as a distraction, and only if people believe they can change their moods. The emotional view of procrastination also helps explain some strange modern phenomena, like the fad for watching online cat videos which have attracted billions of views on YouTube. A survey by Jessica Myrick at the Media School at Indiana University showed another emotional aspect to procrastination. While it might bring short-term relief, it only stores up problems for later.

On a positive note, if procrastination is an emotional regulation issue, this offers important clues for how to address it most effectively. An approach based on Acceptance and Commitment Therapy or 'ACT' seems especially apt. ACT teaches the benefits of 'psychological flexibility' – that is, being able to tolerate uncomfortable thoughts and feelings, staying in the present moment in spite of them, and prioritising choices and actions that help you get closer to what you most value in life.

Of course, most of us probably won't have the option of signing up to an ACT course, so how can we go about applying these principles today? "When someone finally recognizes that procrastination isn't a time management problem but is instead an emotion regulation problem, then they are ready to embrace my favourite tip," says Pynchyl.

The next time you're tempted to procrastinate, "make your focus as simple as 'What's the next action – a simple next step – I would take on this task if I were to get started on it now?'". Doing this, he says, takes your mind off your feelings and onto easily achievable action. "Our research and lived experience show very clearly that once we get started, we're typically able to keep going. Getting started is everything."

Adapted from *BBC*, May 2020

Jeff Bezos Is Now Worth A Record \$199.7 Billion

Jeff Bezos is closer than ever to a historic title: the first person ever to be worth \$200 billion.

On Tuesday, the shares of Amazon, which Bezos founded in 1994 and leads as chief executive, rose 1.2% – pushing Bezos’ net worth up by \$2.2 billion, to a record \$199.7 billion. Because he owns such a large percentage of the tech giant, even modest moves in the stock price can add or subtract billions from his fortune.

Since the pandemic shook the economy in mid-February, Amazon stock has risen by more than 55%, thanks to an increasing appetite for online shopping due to shelter-in-place orders. Bezos’ fortune has risen nearly \$86 billion in just under 12 months. He was worth \$114 billion on the 2019 Forbes 400 list of richest Americans, which used stock prices from early September 2019.

Bezos would have already surpassed the \$200 billion mark had he not gone through the costliest divorce in history. In July 2019, Bezos ended his 25-year marriage and transferred a quarter of his Amazon shares to his now ex-wife, MacKenzie Scott, who currently owns an estimated 3.8% of the company.

Unlike Bezos, Scott signed The Giving Pledge in 2019 and has promised to give away more than half her wealth. Last month, she announced that she has donated nearly \$1.7 billion to 116 nonprofits grappling with issues such as racial and gender equity, economic mobility and public health. While she has pledged to donate “until the safe is empty,” her net worth has grown more than \$25 billion since the 2019 Forbes 400 list. She is currently worth \$63.4 billion.

According to Forbes research, Bezos has donated about \$360 million to charity. In 2018, his Bezos Day One Fund donated \$97.5 million to two dozen organizations helping homeless families. On August 14, documents filed with the Securities Exchange Commission showed that Bezos gave 2,941 Amazon shares—worth \$9.3 million at the time—to an undisclosed nonprofit.

Adapted from *Forbes*, August 2020

Walmart Is Teaming up with Microsoft on TikTok Bid

TikTok’s Beijing-based parent company, ByteDance, is nearing an agreement to sell its U.S., Canadian, Australian and New Zealand operations in a deal that’s likely to be in the \$20 billion to \$30 billion range, sources say. It has not yet chosen a buyer, but could announce the deal in coming days, the sources say.

With Walmart’s confirmation, it joins several others trying to acquire the tech company, including Oracle.

Walmart spokesman Randy Hargrove declined to say how the two companies would split ownership of TikTok, if they had the winning bid, and whether the retailer would be the majority owner.

In a statement, the big-box retailer said TikTok’s integration of e-commerce and advertising “is a clear benefit to creators and users in those markets.”

The deal, if approved, would give Walmart and Microsoft access to hundreds of millions of consumers who could buy their products or become a lucrative audience for ads. In a filing this

week, TikTok said it has nearly 100 million monthly active U.S. users. That's up nearly 800% from January 2018.

TikTok was pushed to look for a buyer after U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo said in July that he was considering banning TikTok and other Chinese applications for security reasons. The U.S. government said it's concerned the Chinese government can access user data collected by TikTok.

On Thursday, TikTok CEO Kevin Mayer quit the company, citing political pressure and the forced sale. He announced his departure just months after starting in the role.

"I understand that the role that I signed up for – including running TikTok globally – will look very different as a result of the US Administration's action to push for a sell off of the US business," he said in the memo obtained by CNBC.

Adapted from *CNBC*, August 2020

Signatories of the Paris agreement say they will reduce emissions.

"It is a small hammer but I think it can achieve great things", proclaimed Laurent FABIUS on the morning of December 12th, 2015. France's then Foreign Minister had gaveled in the Paris agreement on climate change.

In some ways, it was a remarkable moment sealing the first international agreement on climate change since the Kyoto protocol of 1997 and the first ever to include commitments by both rich and developing countries alike. But in other ways, it was a bit of a let-down.

Although the text included a collective pledge to limit global warming to 1.5°-2°C above pre-industrial temperatures, that ambition was not matched by the sum of national promises to cut emissions.

The world as a whole committed itself to tackling climate change, but in practice none of the governments seemed willing to do enough to make that promise a reality. Aware of this contradiction, the architects of the Paris agreement built in a mechanism to encourage governments to declare new national climate goals (known as nationally-determined contributions (N.D.C.) to the agreement).

The "climate action" Summit held in New York in 2019 was meant to get this process moving. So far 81 countries, mostly small emitters in Africa and Latin America, have formally communicated their intentions to update their nationally-determined contributions (N.D.C.).

Collectively, they account for just 18.1% of global emissions. Among the big emitters, Australia, Brazil, Canada and Japan have remained silent on their emissions. Their contributions are key to the success or failure of any global climate pact.

Adapted from *The Economist*, January 2020

Promises, promises! In 2020, they must set tighter goals!

Donald TUSK, President of the European Council, said in New York that the EU would submit an ambitious long-term strategy in 2020. But earlier efforts to adopt a target of net-zero emissions by 2050 were blocked by the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary and Poland.

Commitment from China, the source of around 27% of global emissions in 2017, is also crucial. It was reluctant to make any promises unless America moved first. Its position softened during Barack OBAMA's presidency. Donald TRUMP's administration has clearly removed any peer pressure on climate matters, but Xi Jinping's government is still committed to the Paris process, judging by a joint statement published with France in June 2019.

Some analysts believe China may wait to see whether the American election delivers four more years of Mr TRUMP, or a Democratic administration with strong environmental policies. Mr TRUMP has promised to take America out of the Paris agreement. The earliest he could do that is November 2020, but a newly elected Democratic administration would probably rejoin it right away.

All the manoeuvring is a scientific assessment that global emissions should peak in 2020 to have the best chance of meeting the 1.50° C target. It would be a miracle for this to happen: emissions are rising by roughly 1.5% per year – which means they will have to fall faster still in future.

Adapted from *The Economist*, 2020

Trump administration pushing to reopen much of the U.S. next month

The Trump administration is pushing to reopen much of the country next month, raising concerns among health experts and economists of a possible covid-19 resurgence if Americans return to their normal lives before the virus is truly stamped out.

Behind closed doors, President Trump — concerned with the sagging economy — has sought a strategy for resuming business activity by May 1, according to people familiar with the discussions.

In phone calls with outside advisers, Trump has even floated trying to reopen much of the country before the end of this month, when the current federal recommendations to avoid social gatherings and work from home expire, the people said. Trump regularly looks at unemployment and stock market numbers, complaining that they are hurting his presidency and reelection prospects, the people said. Like others, they spoke on the condition of anonymity to reveal internal discussions.

Trump said at his daily briefing Thursday that the United States was at the “top of the hill” and added, “Hopefully, we’re going to be opening up — you could call it opening — very, very, very, very soon, I hope.”

Multiple Cabinet secretaries in recent days have publicly expressed hope that the various government orders directing residents to stay at home and forcing nonessential businesses to close could at least be partially eased next month.

Asked Thursday during an appearance on CNBC whether he thought it was possible that the country could be open for business next month, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin, said, "I do." A day earlier, Attorney General William P. Barr had called some of the stay-at-home orders and other restrictions "draconian" and suggested that they needed to be reevaluated next month. "When this period of time, at the end of April, expires, I think we have to allow people to adapt more than we have, and not just tell people to go home and hide under their bed, but allow them to use other ways — social distancing and other means — to protect themselves," Barr said on Fox News.

The White House cannot unilaterally reopen the country. Though the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has issued federal guidance advising people to avoid social gatherings, work from home and use pickup and delivery options for food, it is state officials who have put the force of law behind those suggestions.

The CDC guidance is set to expire April 30, but the states are free to choose their own paths. Already, the state directives have varied in timing and in severity, and that is certain to continue as they are rolled back.

White House advisers have contemplated scenarios in which some "hot spot" states will not be ready to reopen as quickly, the people familiar with the matter said. There have already been vigorous debates, with public-health experts and some presidential advisers warning against reopening too soon, while key members of the president's economic team — and some conservatives in the vice president's orbit — push for a quicker return to normality.

Adapted from *Washington Post*, April 10, 2020

Grocery Stores Are Avoiding Sales and Discounts During Coronavirus Pandemic

In an attempt to discourage crowded stores amid the coronavirus epidemic, numerous food companies and grocery retailers have decided not to promote sales and discounts until social distancing measures have lifted.

Despite that, purchases are expected to increase since widespread bar and restaurant closures have kept consumers visiting grocery stores and stocking their pantries to eat at home.

Among the companies who have pledged to stop offering discounts are Mondelez International Inc., one of the world's largest snack companies; Kellogg Co., a major producer of cereal and breakfast items and J.M. Smucker Co., a maker of numerous home and pet food products. In a letter to retailers, J.M. Smucker Co. said it would stop all promotions scheduled from April 17 to November 30.

"In a normal environment, reduced discounts—that is, higher prices—would lead to lower volumes, but we are not in normal times," investment banking company JPMorgan told MarketWatch.com. It added that it expects food sales to remain fairly consistent as states and cities maintain their stay-at-home and social distancing policies.

The financial research and analysis company S&P Global Ratings also predicts that sales of household cleaning products and foodstuffs that are "shelf-stable," that is, able to be safely stored at room temperature in a sealed container, will likely do well during the pandemic despite the turbulent economic market.

While retailers have canceled scheduled discounts to prevent crowding at stores, a lack of sales could potentially strain the pocketbooks of millions of Americans who've lost their jobs or income due to the coronavirus. Grocers that offer discounts of any kind could find themselves pressured to put purchasing limits on key products to discourage bulk buying or hoarding by customers.

Newsweek reached out to Kroger grocery stores to ask how they'll handle sales and special promotions during the epidemic. Kroger had not yet responded by the time of publication.

Even if all food retailers end special sales and promotions throughout the epidemic, JPMorgan analysts predict that retail sales will still increase by at least 5 percent over the next quarter. Their prediction takes into account that 22 percent of food products on store shelves are usually discounted, and those discounts are on average 23 percent below the usual retail price.

The initial rush to stockpile homes "sent sales of grocery and household necessities soaring in March," according to MarketWatch. Data from BMO Equity Research shows that grocery sales grew by 89 percent for the week ending on March 15 and 77 percent for the week ending on March 22.

Adapted from *Newsweek*, April 7, 2020