

## ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

Durée : 6 heures

Analysez et commentez, **en anglais**, les cinq documents suivants :

### DOCUMENT 1

**Randolph Bourne, "War and the Intellectuals", *The Atlantic Monthly*, 1916**  
(Excerpt)

The failure of the melting-pot, far from closing the great American democratic experiment, means that it has only just begun. Whatever American nationalism turns out to be, we see already that it will have a color richer and more exciting than our ideal has hitherto encompassed. In a world which has dreamed of internationalism, we find  
5 that we have all unawares been building up the first international nation. The voices which have cried for a tight and jealous nationalism of the European pattern are failing. From that ideal, however valiantly and disinterestedly it has been set for us, time and tendency have moved us further and further away. What we have achieved has been rather a cosmopolitan federation of national colonies, of foreign cultures, from whom  
10 the sting of devastating competition has been removed. America is already the world-federation in miniature, the continent where for the first time in history has been achieved that miracle of hope, the peaceful living side by side, with character substantially preserved, of the most heterogeneous peoples under the sun. Nowhere else has such contiguity been anything but the breeder of misery. Here, notwithstanding our  
15 tragic failures of adjustment, the outlines are already too clear not to give us a new vision and a new orientation of the American mind in the world.

It is for the American of the younger generation to accept this cosmopolitanism, and carry it along with self-conscious and fruitful purpose. [...] Indeed, it is not uncommon for the eager Anglo-Saxon who goes to a vivid American university to-day to find his  
20 true friends not among his own race but among the acclimatized German or Austrian, the acclimatized Jew, the acclimatized Scandinavian or Italian. In them he finds the cosmopolitan note. In these youths, foreign-born or the children of foreign-born parents, he is likely to find many of his old inbred morbid problems washed away. These friends are oblivious to the repressions of that tight little society in which he so provincially  
25 grew up. He has a pleasurable sense of liberation from the stale and familiar attitudes of those whose ingrowing culture has scarcely created anything vital for his America of today. He breathes a larger air. In his new enthusiasms for continental literature, for unplumbed Russian depths, for French clarity of thought, for Teuton philosophies of power, he feels himself citizen of a larger world. He may be absurdly superficial, his  
30 outward-reaching wonder may ignore all the stiller and homelier virtues of his Anglo-Saxon home, but he has at least found the clue to that international mind which will be essential to all men and women of good-will if they are ever to save this Western world of ours from suicide. His new friends have gone through a similar evolution. America has burned most of the baser metal also from them. Meeting now with this common  
35 American background, all of them may yet retain that distinctiveness of their native

culture and their national spiritual slants. They are more valuable and interesting to each other for being different, yet that difference could not be creative were it not for this new cosmopolitan outlook which America has given them and which they all equally possess.

40 A college where such a spirit is possible even to the smallest degree, has within itself already the seeds of this international intellectual world of the future. It suggests that the contribution of America will be an intellectual internationalism which goes far beyond the mere exchange of scientific ideas and discoveries and the cold recording of facts. It will be an intellectual sympathy which is not satisfied until it has got at the heart of the different cultural expressions, and felt as they feel. It may have immense preferences, but it will make understanding and not indignation its end. Such a sympathy will unite and not divide.

45 Against the thinly disguised panic which calls itself 'patriotism' and the thinly disguised militarism which calls itself 'preparedness' the cosmopolitan ideal is set. This does not mean that those who hold it are for a policy of drift. They, too, long passionately for an integrated and disciplined America. But they do not want one which is integrated only for domestic economic exploitation of the workers or for predatory economic imperialism among the weaker peoples. They do not want one that is integrated by coercion or militarism, or for the truculent assertion of a mediæval code of honor and of doubtful rights.

55

## DOCUMENT 2

**Clive Parry, Fellow and Tutor of Dowling College and Lecturer in the University of Cambridge, “British Nationality Law and the History of Naturalisation”, University of Milan, 1954 (Excerpt)**

<http://www.uniset.ca/naty/parry.htm>

### I. — Introduction.

The history of the law of British, or English nationality offers many curious and puzzling problems. In the first place, much difficulty arises in connection with the concept of allegiance, which remained the basis of the law even after the introduction of a more or less complete statutory scheme of nationality and which may still influence the interpretation of the latest statutory formulation, though in that the concept has been formally abandoned. That concept was elaborated in Calvin’s Case, the essence of the decision in which was ‘One King, one allegiance’. The application of this doctrine resulted, perhaps paradoxically, in the holding that the Scots *antenati* were not subjects, though the *postnati* were. But the paradox is explained if account is taken of the further rule that a man’s allegiance is determined for all time at his birth. This was why the English and the Scots *postnati* had to be fellow-subjects: they were born under the allegiance of the same King. It was also why both English and Scots *antenati* could not be fellow-subjects to each other: they had been born under different allegiances. It seems to have involved the assumption, as a principle of politics if not of law, that the Scottish personal union could never be dissolved. Yet in view of the departure from the common law rules as to the descent of the Crown made in the Acts of Settlement the English and Scottish crowns might have divided again—and in fact nearly did so. [...]

In the final analysis the question in any nationality case is whether a person is a subject or an alien. He may be the former because born within the dominions of the sovereign or Crown in virtue, that is to say, of the general presumption that the allegiance is co-extensive with those dominions, or in virtue of the *jus soli*. Or he may be such by descent—because born of liege parents, or *iure sanguinis*. And the principles of the *jus soli* and the *jus sanguinis* do not stand opposed to one another. In most legal systems they are to be found intertwined, each supplying the limitations of the other. But the degree to which one or the other has been emphasised at any time may well have varied. Considering the complexity of the problems described, this would seem to have been very likely the case and to account for the difficulty which exists in finding ready solutions for them. There exists, however, one approach to them which has not hitherto been much employed but which, though it has its limitations, is an obviously useful one. This is to test the rules relating to the acquisition and loss of the status of a subject by reference to the categories of persons who sought to have that status conferred upon them by *ad hoc* legislative or executive action and who therefore must have been looked on as not already being subjects. [...] Despite the introduction of the Imperial naturalisation certificate in 1914, the Act of that year saved the power of colonies etc. to issue local certificates. All ‘local British subjects’ were, however, transformed into citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies by the British Nationality Act, 1948.

### DOCUMENT 3

#### **Enoch Powell, Birmingham Speech, April 20, 1968 (Excerpt)**

<http://theoccidentalquarterly.com/vol1no1/ep-rivers.html>

Nothing is more misleading than comparison between the Commonwealth immigrant in Britain and the American Negro. The Negro population of the United States, which was already in existence before the United States became a nation, started literally as slaves and were later given the franchise and other rights of citizenship, to the exercise of which they have only gradually and still incompletely come. The Commonwealth immigrant came to Britain as a full citizen, to a country which knew no discrimination between one citizen and another, and he entered instantly into the possession of the rights of every citizen, from the vote to free treatment under the National Health Service. Whatever drawbacks attended immigrants—and they were drawbacks which did not, and do not, make admission into Britain by hook or by crook appear less than desirable—arose not from the law or from public policy or from administration but from those personal circumstances and accidents which cause, and always will cause, the fortune and experience of one man to be different from another's.

But while to the immigrant entry to this country was admission to privileges and opportunities eagerly sought, the impact upon the existing population was very different. For reasons they could not comprehend, and in pursuance of a decision by default, on which they were never consulted, they found themselves made strangers in their own country. They found their wives unable to obtain hospital beds in childbirth, their children unable to obtain school places, their homes and neighbourhoods changed beyond recognition, their plans and prospects for the future defeated; at work they found that their employers hesitated to apply to the immigrant worker the standards of discipline and competence required of the native-born worker; they began to hear, as time went by, more and more voices which told them that they were now the unwanted. On top of this, they now learn that a one-way privilege is to be established by Act of Parliament: a law, which cannot, and is not intended, to operate to protect them or redress their grievances, is to be enacted to give the stranger, the disgruntled and the *agent provocateur* the power to pillory them for their private actions. [...]

The other dangerous delusion from which those who are wilfully or otherwise blind to reality suffer, is summed up in the word 'integration'. To be integrated into a population means to become for all practical reasons to be indistinguishable from its other members. Now, at all times where there are marked physical differences, especially of colour, integration is difficult though, over a period, not impossible. There are among the Commonwealth immigrants who have come to live here in the last fifteen years or so, many thousands whose wish and purpose is to be integrated and whose every thought and endeavour is bent in that direction. But to imagine that such a thing enters the head of a great and growing majority of immigrants and their descendants is a ludicrous misconception, and a dangerous one to boot.

We are on the verge here of a change. Hitherto it has been force of circumstance and of background which has rendered the very idea of integration inaccessible to the greater part of the immigrant population—that they never conceived or intended such a thing, and that their numbers and physical concentration meant the pressures towards integration which normally bear upon any small minority did not operate. Now we are seeing the growth of positive forces acting against integration, of vested interests in the preservation and sharpening of racial and religious differences, with a view to the exercise of action domination, first over fellow-immigrants and then over the rest of the

population. The cloud no bigger than a man's hand, that can so rapidly overcast the sky, has been visible recently in Wolverhampton and has shown signs of spreading quickly. The words I am about to use, verbatim as they appeared in the local press on February 17, are not mine, but those of a Labour Member of Parliament who is a minister in the present Government :

50  
55  
'The Sikh communities' campaign to maintain customs inappropriate in Britain is much to be regretted. Working in Britain, particularly in the public services, they should be prepared to accept the terms and conditions of their employment. To claim special communal rights (or should one say rites?) leads to a dangerous fragmentation within society. This communalism is a canker: whether practised by one colour or another it is to be strongly condemned.'

60 All credit to John Stonehouse for having had the insight to perceive that, and the courage to say it.

65 For these dangerous and divisive elements the legislation proposed in the Race Relations Bill is the very pabulum they need to flourish. Here is the means of showing that the immigrant communities can organize to consolidate their members, to agitate and campaign against their fellow citizens, and to overawe and dominate the rest with the legal weapons which the ignorant and the ill-informed have provided. As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding. Like the Roman, I seem to see 'the River Tiber foaming with much blood'. That tragic and intractable phenomenon which we watch with horror on the other side of the Atlantic but which there is interwoven with the history and existence of the States itself, is coming upon us here by our own volition and our own neglect. Indeed, it has all but come. In numerical terms, it will be of 70 American proportions long before the end of the century. Only resolute and urgent action will avert it even now. Whether there will be the public will to demand and obtain that action, I do not know. All I know is that to see, and not to speak, would be the great betrayal.

## DOCUMENT 4

**“President [G.W. Bush] Discusses Border Security and Immigration Reform in Arizona”**, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona, November 28, 2005 (Excerpt)

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/11/print/20051128-7.html>

As we work to secure the border, comprehensive immigration reform also requires us to improve enforcement of our laws in the interior of the country. Catching and deporting illegal immigrants along the border is only part of the responsibility. America’s immigration laws apply across all of America, and we will enforce those laws throughout our land. Better interior enforcement begins with better work site enforcement. American businesses have an obligation to abide by the law, and our government has the responsibility to help them do so. (Applause.)

Enforcing our immigration laws in the interior of the country requires a sustained commitment of resources. Since I took office, we’ve increased funding for immigration enforcement by 44 percent. We’ve increased the number of immigration and customs investigators by 14 percent since 2001. And those good folks who are working hard, too. Last year, the—this year, federal agents completed what they called Operation Rollback. It’s the largest work site enforcement case in American history. This operation resulted in the arrest of hundreds of illegal immigrants, criminal convictions against a dozen employers, and a multi-million dollar payment from one of America’s largest corporations.

Our skilled immigration security officers are also going against some of the most dangerous people in our society—smugglers, terrorists, gang members and human traffickers. In Arizona, we have prosecuted more than 2,300 smugglers bringing drugs, guns and illegal immigrants across the border. As a part of Operation Community Shield, federal agents have arrested nearly 1,400 gang members who were here illegally, including hundreds of members of the violent Latin American gangs like MS-13.

Since the Department of Homeland Security was created, agents have apprehended nearly 27,000 illegal immigrant fugitives. Thanks to our determined personnel, society is safer. But we’ve got more work to do. The legislation I signed last month more than doubled the resources dedicated to interior enforcement. We understand that border security and interior enforcement go hand in hand. (Applause.) We will increase the number of immigration enforcement agents and criminal investigators.

We’re confronting the problem of document fraud, as well. When illegal workers try to pass off sophisticated forgeries as employment documents, even the most diligent businesses find it difficult to tell what’s real and what’s fake. Business owners shouldn’t have to act like detectives to verify the legal status of their workers. So my administration has expanded a program called Basic Pilot. This program gives businesses access to an automated system that rapidly screens the employment eligibility of new hire against federal records. Basic Pilot was available in only six states five years ago; now this program is available nationwide. We’ll continue to work to stop document fraud, to make it easier for America’s businesses to comply with our immigration laws. (Applause.)

As we enforce our immigration laws, comprehensive immigration reform also requires us to improve those laws by creating a new temporary worker program. This program would create a legal way to match willing foreign workers with willing American employers to fill jobs that Americans will not do. Workers would be able to

45 register for legal status for a fixed period of time, and then be required to go home. This program would help meet the demands of a growing economy, and it would allow honest workers to provide for their families while respecting the law.

This plan would also help us relieve pressure on the border. By creating a legal channel for those who enter America to do an honest day's labor, we would reduce the number of workers trying to sneak across the border. This would free up law enforcement officials to focus on criminals, drug dealers, terrorists and others that mean to harm us. Our plan would create a tamper-proof identification card for the temporary legal worker, which, of course, would improve work site enforcement.

Listen, there's a lot of opinions on this proposal—I understand that. But people in this debate must recognize that we will not be able to effectively enforce our immigration laws until we create a temporary worker program. The program that I proposed would not create an automatic path to citizenship, it wouldn't provide for amnesty—I oppose amnesty. Rewarding those who have broken the law would encourage others to break the law and keep pressure on our border. (Applause.)

A temporary worker program, by contrast, would decrease pressure on the border. I support the number of—increasing the number of annual green cards that can lead to citizenship. But for the sake of justice and for the sake of border security, I'm not going to sign an immigration bill that includes amnesty. (Applause.)

I look forward to continue working with the United States Congress on comprehensive immigration reform. In the House of Representatives, your Arizona congressmen are building strong support for border enforcement among their colleagues. Judiciary Committee Chairman Sensenbrenner and Homeland Security Chairman King are moving bills that include tough provisions to help secure this border. The House plans to vote on this legislation soon; I urge them to pass a good bill.

The Senate is continuing to work on border legislation, as well. This legislation improves border security and toughens interior enforcement and creates a temporary worker program. Senators McCain and Kyl have taken the lead. It's two good men taking the lead, by the way. I'm confident something is going to get done that people of Arizona will like, with these two Senators in the lead. (Applause.)

Majority Leader Frist and Judiciary Committee Chairman Specter said they're going to take action in early 2006. See, we have a chance to move beyond the old and tired choices of the immigration debate, and come together on a strategy to enforce our laws, secure our country, and uphold our deepest values.

We make good progress, but you know like I know, there's a lot more to be done. And we've got to continue to work together to get that done, and I'm optimistic that Congress will rise to the occasion. By passing comprehensive immigration reform, we will add to this country's security, to our prosperity, and to justice.

Our nation has been strengthened by generations of immigrants who became Americans through patience and hard work and assimilation. In this new century, we must continue to welcome immigrants, and to set high standards for those who follow the laws to become a part of our country. Every new citizen of the United States has an obligation to learn our customs and values, including liberty and civic responsibility, equality under God and tolerance for others, and the English language. (Applause.) We will continue to pursue policies that encourage ownership, excellence in education, and give all our citizens a chance to realize the American Dream.

## DOCUMENT 5

### **Gordon Brown, “The Future of Britishness”, Keynote Speech to the Fabian Future of Britishness Conference, Imperial College, London, January 14th, 2006 (Excerpt)**

[http://www.fabian-society.org.uk/press\\_office/news\\_latest\\_all.asp?pressid=520](http://www.fabian-society.org.uk/press_office/news_latest_all.asp?pressid=520)

When we take time to stand back and reflect, it becomes clear that to address almost every one of the major challenges facing our country—our relationships with Europe, America and the rest of the world; how we equip ourselves for globalisation; the future direction of constitutional change; a modern view of citizenship; the future of local government, ideas of localism; and, of course, our community relations and multiculturalism and, since July 7th, the balance between diversity and integration; even the shape of our public services—you must have a clear view of what being British means, what you value about being British and what gives us purpose as a nation.

10       Being clear what Britishness means in a post-imperial world is essential if we are to forge the best relationships with the developing world and in particular with Africa. [...]

15       Take also the unity of the United Kingdom and its component parts. While we have always been a country of different nations and thus of plural identities—a Welshman can be Welsh and British, just as a Cornishman or woman is Cornish, English and British—and may be Muslim, Pakistani or Afro-Caribbean, Cornish, English and British—there is always a risk that, when people are insecure, they retreat into more exclusive identities rooted in 19th century conceptions of blood, race and territory—when instead, we the British people should be able to gain great strength from celebrating a British identity which is bigger than the sum of its parts and a union that is strong because of the values we share and because of the way these values are expressed through our history and our institutions.

20       And take the most recent illustration of what challenges us to be more explicit about Britishness: the debate about asylum and immigration and about multiculturalism and inclusion, issues that are particularly potent because in a fast changing world people who are insecure need to be rooted. Here the question is essentially whether our national identity is defined by values we share in common or just by race and ethnicity—a definition that would leave our country at risk of relapsing into a wrongheaded ‘cricket test’ of loyalty.

25       Equally, while the British response to the events of July 7th was magnificent, we have to face uncomfortable facts that there were British citizens, British born, apparently integrated into our communities, who were prepared to maim and kill fellow British citizens, irrespective of their religion—and this must lead us to ask how successful we have been in balancing the need for diversity with the obvious requirements of integration in our society.

30       But I would argue that if we are clear about what underlies our Britishness and if we are clear that shared values—not colour, nor unchanging and unchangeable institutions—define what it means to be British in the modern world, we can be far more ambitious in defining for our time the responsibilities of citizenship; far more ambitious in forging a new and contemporary settlement of the relationship between state, community and individual; and it is also easier too to address difficult issues that sometimes come under the heading ‘multiculturalism’—essentially how diverse cultures, which inevitably contain differences, can find the essential common purpose without which no society can flourish.

45        So Britishness is not just an academic debate—something just for the historians, just  
for the commentators, just for the so-called chattering classes. Indeed in a recent poll, as  
many as half of British people said they were worried that if we do not promote  
Britishness we run a real risk of having a divided society.

50        And if we look to the future I want to argue that our success as Great Britain, our  
ability to meet and master not just the challenges of a global economy, but also the  
international, demographic, constitutional and social challenges ahead, and even the  
security challenges, requires us to rediscover and build from our history and apply in  
our time the shared values that bind us together and give us common purpose.

55        I believe most strongly that globalisation is made for a Britain, that is stable, outward  
looking, committed to scientific progress and the value of education. And that by taking  
the right long term decisions Britain can stand alongside China, India and America as  
one of the great success stories of the next global era.

60        But it is also obvious to me that the nations that will meet and master global change  
best are not just those whose governments make the right long term decisions on  
stability, science, trade and education, but whose people come together and, sharing a  
common view of challenges and what needs to be done, forge a unified and shared  
sense of purpose about the long term sacrifices they are prepared to make and the  
priorities they think important for national success.

65        And just as in war time a sense of common patriotic purpose inspired people to do  
what is necessary, so in peace time a strong modern sense of patriotism and patriotic  
purpose which binds people together can motivate and inspire.

70        And this British patriotism is, in my view, founded not on ethnicity nor race, not just  
on institutions we share and respect, but on enduring ideals which shape our view of  
ourselves and our communities—values which in turn influence the way our institutions  
evolve.