

## ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENT EN ANGLAIS

—  
Durée : 6 heures  
—

Analyse and discuss the contents of the following documents

### Document n°1

(...) It is a glorious history our God has bestowed upon His chosen people; a history heroic with faith in our mission and our future; a history of statesmen who flung the boundaries of the Republic out into unexplored lands and savage wilderness; a history of soldiers who carried the flag across blazing deserts and through the ranks of hostile mountains, even to the gates of sunset; a history of a multiplying people who overran a continent in half a century; a history of prophets who saw the consequences of evils inherited from the past and of martyrs who died to save us from them; a history divinely logical, in the process of whose tremendous reasoning we find ourselves today.

Therefore, in this campaign, the question is larger than a party question. It is an American question. It is a world question. Shall the American people continue their march toward the commercial supremacy of the world? Shall free institutions broaden their blessed reign as the children of liberty wax in strength, until the empire of our principles is established over the hearts of all mankind?

Have we no mission to perform no duty to discharge to our fellow man? Has God endowed us with gifts beyond our deserts and marked us as the people of His peculiar favor, merely to rot in our own selfishness, as men and nations must, who take cowardice for their companion and self for their deity-as China has, as India has, as Egypt has...

Hawaii is ours; Porto Rico is to be ours; at the prayer of her people Cuba finally will be ours; in the islands of the East, even to the gates of Asia, coaling stations are to be ours at the very least; the flag of a liberal government is to float over the Philippines, and may it be the banner that Taylor unfurled in Texas and Fremont carried to the coast.

The Opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, The rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government We govern the Indians without their consent, we govern our territories without their consent, we govern our children without their consent. How do they know what our government would be without their consent? Would not the people of the Philippines prefer the just, humane, civilizing government of this Republic to the savage, bloody rule of pillage and extortion from which we have rescued them?

And, regardless of this formula of words made only for enlightened, self-governing people, do we owe no duty to the world? Shall we turn these peoples back to the reeking hands from which we have taken them? Shall we abandon them, with Germany, England, Japan, hungering for them? Shall we save them from those nations, to give them a self-rule of tragedy?

They ask us how we shall govern these new possessions. I answer: Out of local conditions and the necessities of the case methods of government will grow. If England can govern foreign lands, so can America. If Germany can govern foreign lands, so can America. If they can supervise protectorates, so can America. Why is it more difficult to administer Hawaii than New Mexico or California? Both had a savage and an alien population: both were more remote from the seat of government when they came under our dominion than the Philippines are to-day. (...)

*Albert Beveridge (US Senator from Indiana, 1899-1911)  
Campaign speech delivered on September 16, 1898*

**Tournez la page S.V.P.**

The Industrial Revolution marks the most fundamental transformation of human life in the history of the world recorded in written documents. For a brief period it coincided with the history of a single country, Great Britain. An entire world economy was thus built on, or rather around, Britain, and this country therefore temporarily rose to a position of global influence and power unparalleled by any state of its relative size before or since, and unlikely to be paralleled by any state in the foreseeable future. There was a moment in the world's history when Britain can be described, if we are not too pedantic, as its only workshop, its only massive importer and exporter, its only carrier, its only imperialist, almost its only foreign investor; and for that reason its only naval power and the only one which had a genuine world policy. Much of this monopoly was simply due to the loneliness of the pioneer, monarch of all he surveys because of the absence of any other surveyors. When other countries industrialized, it ended automatically, though the apparatus of world economic transfers constructed by, and in terms of, Britain remained indispensable to the rest of the world for a while longer. Nevertheless, for most of the world the 'British' era of industrialization was merely a phase – the initial, or an early phase – of contemporary history. For Britain it was obviously much more than this. We have been profoundly marked by the experience of our economic and social pioneering and remain marked by it to this day. [...]

Economists and economic historians have discussed the characteristics, advantages and disadvantages of being an industrial pioneer at great length. [...] What is at least equally important is the peculiar, indeed the unique, position of this country in the world economy, which was partly the cause of our early success and which was reinforced by it. We were, or we increasingly became, the agency of economic interchange between the advanced and the backward, the industrial and the primary-producing, the metropolitan and the colonial or quasi-colonial regions of the world. Perhaps because it was so largely built round Britain, the world economy of nineteenth-century capitalism developed as a single system of free flows, in which the international transfers of capital and commodities passed largely through British hands and institutions, in British ships between the continents, and were calculated in terms of the pound sterling. And Britain began with the immense advantages of being indispensable to underdeveloped regions (either because they needed us or because they were not allowed to do without us), and indispensable also to the systems of trade and payments of the developed world.

### Document n°3

There have been many empires in world history, on almost all of the continents of the world, and yet certain similarities bind them together. The question is posed often: how does one create an empire, or put in another way, what are the conditions needed to create an empire?

An empire is a large collection of nations and peoples ruled by a dominant group, which through economic strength and military power, controls the destinies of subject nations. Empires tend to be politically conservative and heavily militaristic, as well as very competitive.

But enough about the characteristics of empires. The question is how can an empire be created. The first step in creating an empire is ethnocentrism. For a nation to become an empire it must develop a strong sense of national pride. For the United States, this was called "Manifest Destiny". For Britain it was called the "White Man's Burden." In any nation there are individuals that desire to rule the world, but the majority of people tend to be less imperialistic. However, when an educated imperialist supports his or her views for conquest with a rhetoric of helping those poor, underdeveloped (insert ethnic group here), then imperialism can begin. Imperialism can also begin when the people begin to see other nations as a threat or when the people believe that an empire would make them wealthier. Either way, it is the people who must support any plans for an empire or at least not violently oppose it. However, this is only the first step.

The next step in developing an empire after building up popular support is developing a strong military and diplomatic corps. Both of these serve basically the same function in creating an empire. A strong military is needed to kill/capture charismatic native leaders and garrison conquered nations to ensure their obedience. A strong diplomatic corps is necessary to convince other nations that no one is threatening the balance of power. However, for an empire to develop, even when an imperialistic nation has a strong military and savvy diplomats, there have to be places to conquer.

Fortunately, this is fairly easy. At any given point there are nations who are experiencing economic and political difficulty, and division makes an area ripe for conquest. Civil disorder does too. Also, there are often leaders in impoverished areas willing to sell their nations for some money and a position, so patience and diplomatic/military/economic pressure will often create an empire.

If one has the boldness and patience to keep fighting, an empire can be yours. Also, it helps to be united and be fighting against an unimaginative foe. But if a decadent empire or war-torn nation is in your area and you want some land, you just might have yourself an empire.

'What Makes an Empire?'

Nathan Albright

University of California at Los Angeles, USA

<http://library.thinkquest.org:17120117.html>, 2000

## WTO IS ENEMY OF COLONIALISM

Mike Moore (*Freelance*)

Many people, especially those who have just recently won their political independence, express to me their concerns about the World Trade Organization. They suggest that the principles at stake are their political and economic sovereignty, thus their independence. I read outrageous statements that we override parliaments, that trade is a new form of colonialism and that we are the servants of multinationals. The opposite is true.

I believe that sovereignty is enhanced by international agreements and structures. Rules contain the powerful; the law is the leveler.

The old, colonial days meant special privileges for the powerful. They sought privilege in banking, airline routes, ownership of certain industries and convenient access to government purchasing, whether it be the railways or the military. Not

all of this was sinister. It is natural to deal more easily with those with whom you have historic ties of culture and commerce. But it can end up with comfortable market dominance at best, privilege at worst.

The multilateral system, far from being the new colonialism, opens up the privileged positions of the powerful to transparency and competition. In open societies, the powerful elites have to try harder to get business, to provide better service, to offer better deals.

Research shows that red tape is now their biggest impediment to trade. Small-business costs are 30 to 45 per cent higher than the big corporations, with their cozy, crony contacts. The WTO can reach binding agreement that assists smaller enterprises.

The multilateral system is not a new form of colonialism. It is, in fact, the final nail in the coffin of imperial and domestic privilege.

### Optimistic Reaction

Imperialism and colonialism were the curse of

centuries. This was followed, often in optimistic reaction, by the cruelest hoax of the last century - Marxist economics. Its failures are manifest. However, the Cold War did give sad and terrible leverage to many countries. This was misused by all sides. Debts mounted and resources were diverted as this grim game of chess was played out.

It is beginning to dawn on some that the only game in town, where the poorest have leverage, where there is no security council, where nations have equal rights under the law, is the WTO.

However, all power is limited. Power without responsibility does not work. If people cannot get satisfaction and progress in a multinational negotiation, they will seek progress elsewhere in bilateral and regional arrangements. Then the most vulnerable nations will suffer the most. (...)

Mike Moore is director-general of the World Trade Organization.

*Montreal Gazette*  
Tuesday 26 June 2001