

## ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

Durée: 6 heures

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

### MODERNITY AND ITS DISCONTENTS

**Document 1: G. M. Trevelyan<sup>1</sup>, *English Social History: A Survey of Six Centuries: Chaucer to Queen Victoria*, 1942.**

The close of the reign and the end of the century saw the so-called 'feudal' society of the countryside still in being, but under changing conditions indicative of the advance of democracy even in rural England, and the penetration of village life by forces and ideas from the cities. In the following generation, with the coming of motor transport, the intrusion of urban life upon the rural parts became a flood, turning all England into a suburb. But when Victoria died (1901) the process had not gone so far; country roads and lanes were still country roads and lanes, with all their sleepy charm come down from countless centuries, which the invading bicyclist could enjoy without destroying. The 'country houses', great and small, still flourished, with their shooting-parties and their week-end guests from town; and the estate system was still the method by which English agriculture was organized.

But the country houses and the country estates were less than ever supported by agricultural rents, which American imports had lowered and brought into arrear. The pleasures of the country house and the business of the estate system were now financed by money which the owner drew from industry or other investments, or from his income as ground landlord of more distant urban areas. He was still a country gentleman, but he paid for himself by being other things as well. For British agriculture as an economic proposition had collapsed.

Under these circumstances, the estate system, 'feudal' as it might be, was fairly popular in the countryside, because it brought money from the industrial world to support decadent agriculture, and because the squire and his family brought into village life educated interests and friendly leadership.

But even before the coming of the motor-car with the advent of the new century, the old village life was being transformed into something half suburban by newspapers, ideas, visitors, and new residents from the cities. The contrast between the democratic city and the 'feudal' countryside, which had characterized Trollope's England in the middle of Victoria's reign, was less marked in the last decades of the century. As the result of the Education Act of 1870 the agricultural labourer of the next generation and his women-folk could all read and write. Unfortunately, this power was not directed to foster in them an intelligent and loving interest in country life. The new education was devised and inspected by city folk, intent on producing not peasants but clerks. Before Victoria died, the *Daily Mail* was being read on the village ale-bench and under the thatch of the cottage. The distinctive rural mentality was suffering urbanization, and local traditions were yielding to nation-wide commonplace.

---

<sup>1</sup> G.M. Trevelyan came from a distinguished family of Whig social reformers and was a great-nephew of T.B. Macaulay.

In the realm of politics also, town and country were becoming assimilated. In 1884 the agricultural working man received the parliamentary vote, which had been denied to him in 1867 when his brother of the town was enfranchised. Protected by the ballot, the agricultural labourer could vote as he wished, regardless of farmer, and landlord. Proof of this was given in the General Election of 1885, the first held under the new Franchise Bill. On that occasion the boroughs voted Conservative, but the counties unexpectedly voted Liberal, in defiance of squire and farmer. The control over English country life which the squire had exercised for so many centuries was in fact drawing to an end, as far as parliamentary elections were concerned. It followed inevitably that the local government of the counties must also be put on an elective basis.

In 1888 therefore the Local Government Act established elected county councils as the administrative organs of country life, in place of the patriarchal rule of the justices of the Peace. The Justices of the Peace were preserved in their judicial capacity as magistrates. But their administrative functions were handed over to the elected county councils, strengthened a few years later by the creation of elective urban and rural district councils. Thus, more than fifty years after the Municipal Reform Act of 1835 had set up democratic local government in the boroughs, the same principle was applied to the rural districts. It was an irony of fate that the farm hand was given the parliamentary and local franchise only after the destruction of English agricultural life had set in, with American competition and the fall of food prices. The agricultural labourers, if they stayed in the countryside, could now take part in its government, but in fact they were trooping off to the towns.

The Municipal Reform Act of 1835 had affected only a limited number of towns, but the scheme of urban self-government was made general throughout England by the Local Government Act of 1888.

## **Document 2: Twelve Southerners, *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, 1930 (Adapted).**

Nobody now proposes for the South, or for any other community in this country, an independent political destiny. That idea is thought to have been finished in 1865. But how far shall the South surrender its moral, social, and economic autonomy to the victorious principle of Union? (...).

Industrialism is the economic organization of the collective American society. It means the decision of society to invest its economic resources in the applied sciences. But the word science has acquired a certain sanctitude. It is out of order to quarrel with science in the abstract, or even with the applied sciences when their applications are made subject to criticism and intelligence. The capitalization of the applied sciences has now become extravagant and uncritical; it has enslaved our human energies to a degree now clearly felt to be burdensome. The apologists of industrialism do not like to meet this charge directly; so they often take refuge in saying that they are devoted simply to science! They are really devoted to the applied sciences and to practical production. Therefore it is necessary to employ a certain skepticism even at the expense of the Cult of Science, and to say, It is an Americanism, which looks innocent and disinterested, but really is not either.

The contribution that science can make to a labor is to render it easier by the help of a tool or a process, and to assure the laborer of his perfect economic security while he is engaged upon it. Then it can be performed with leisure and enjoyment. But the modern laborer has not exactly received this benefit under the industrial regime. His labor is hard, its tempo is fierce, and his employment is insecure. The first principle of a good labor is that it must be effective, but the second principle is that it must be enjoyed. Labor is one of the largest items in the human career; it is a modest demand to ask that it may partake of happiness (...).

We have more time in which to consume, and many more products to be consumed. But the tempo of our labors communicates itself to our satisfactions, and these also become brutal and hurried. The constitution of the natural man probably does not permit him to shorten his labor-time and enlarge his consuming-time indefinitely. He has to pay the penalty in satiety and aimlessness. The modern man has lost his sense of vocation.

Religion can hardly expect to flourish in an industrial society. Religion is our submission to the general intention of a nature that is fairly inscrutable; it is the sense of our role as creatures within it. But nature industrialized, transformed into cities and artificial habitations, manufactured into commodities, is no longer nature but a highly simplified picture of nature. We receive the illusion of having power over nature, and lose the sense of nature as something mysterious and contingent. The God of nature under these conditions is merely an amiable expression, a superfluity, and the philosophical understanding ordinarily carried in the religious experience is not there for us to have (...).

It is an inevitable consequence of industrial progress that production greatly outruns the rate of natural consumption. To overcome the disparity, the producers, disguised as the pure idealists of progress, must coerce and wheedle the public into being loyal and steady consumers, in order to keep the machines running. So the rise of modern advertising along with its twin, personal salesmanship is the most significant development of our industrialism. Advertising means to persuade the consumers to want exactly what the applied sciences are able to furnish them. It consults the happiness of the consumer no more than it consulted the happiness of the laborer. It is the great effort of a false economy of life to approve itself. But its task grows more difficult every day (...).

Opposed to the industrial society is the agrarian, which does not stand in particular need of definition. An agrarian society is hardly one that has no use at all for industries, for professional vocations, for scholars and artists, and for the life of cities. Technically, perhaps, an agrarian society is one in which agriculture is the leading vocation, whether for wealth, for pleasure, or for prestige—a form of labor that is pursued with intelligence and leisure, and that becomes the model to which the other forms approach as well as they may. But an agrarian regime will be secured readily enough where the superfluous industries are not allowed to rise against it. The theory of agrarianism is that the culture of the soil is the best and most sensitive of vocations, and that therefore it should have the economic preference and enlist the maximum number of workers.

### Document 3: Clark Kerr<sup>2</sup> et al., *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, 1960.

The industrial society and individual freedom are not to be regarded as antagonists. A high degree of discipline in the workplace imposed by a web of rules and a large range of governmental activities is fully consistent with the larger freedom of the individual in greater leisure, a greater choice in occupations and place of residence, a greater range of alternatives in goods and services on which to use income, and a very wide range of subgroups or associations in which to chose participation.

The industrial society, as any established society, develops a distinctive consensus which relates individuals and groups to each other and provides as common body of ideas, beliefs, and value judgments integrated into a whole. There must be a consensus to permit the industrial society to function. Various forms of the industrial society may create some distinctive features of an ideology, but all industrialized societies have some common values. In the pure industrial society

---

<sup>2</sup> Clark Kerr was an American professor of economics and an expert on industrial relations. He was the first chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley (1952-1958), and twelfth president of the University of California (1958-1967).

science and technical knowledge have high values, and those engaged in advancing science and in applying it to industrial processes have high prestige and receive high rewards in the society. The pure industrial society eliminates taboos against technical change, and it places high values on being “modern”, “up to date” and in “progress,” for their own sake (...)

The individual will be in a mixed situation far removed either from that of the independent farmer organizing most aspects of his own life or from that of the Chinese in the commune under total surveillance (...)

For most people, any true scope for the independent spirit on the job will be missing. However, the skilled worker, while under rules, does get some control over his job, some change to organize it as he sees fit, some possession of it. Within the narrow limits of this kind of “job control”, the worker will have some freedom. But the productive process tend to regiment. People must perform as expected or it breaks down. This is now and will be increasingly accepted as an immutable fact. The state, the manager, the occupational association are all disciplinary agents. But discipline is often achieved by a measure of persuasion and incentive. The worker will be semi-independent with choice among jobs, some control of the job, and some scope for the effects of morale; but he will also be confined by labor organizations, pensions, and seniority rules, and all sorts of rules governing the conduct of the job.

Outside his working life the individual may have more freedom under pluralistic industrialism than in most earlier forms of society. Politically he can be given some influence. Society has achieved consensus and it is perhaps less necessary for Big Brother to exercise political control. Nor in this Brave New World need genetic and chemical weapons be employed to avoid revolt. There will not be any revolt, anyway, except little bureaucratic revolts that can be handled piecemeal. An educated population will want political choice and can be given it.

The great new freedom may come in the leisure of individuals. Higher standards of living, more leisure, more education make this not only possible but almost inevitable. This will be the happy hunting ground for the independent spirit. Along the bureaucratic conservatism of economic and political life may well go a New Bohemianism in the other aspects of life and partly as a reaction to the confining nature of the productive side of society. There may well come a new search for individuality and a new meaning to liberty. The economic system may be highly ordered and the political system barren ideologically; but the social and recreational and cultural aspects of life diverse and changing.

#### **Document 4: Barbara Castle<sup>3</sup>, Speech to the House of Commons, Second Reading of the Equal Pay Bill, 9 February 1970.**

There can be no doubt that this afternoon we are witnessing another historic advance in the struggle against discrimination in our society, this time against discrimination on grounds of sex. In introducing the Bill, I hope that there will be no difference between the two sides of the House about the principle. The only difference is that the present Government have had the will to act.

5 While other people have talked—lots of people have talked—we intend to make equal pay for equal work a reality, and, in doing so, to take women workers progressively out of the sweated labour class. We intend to do it, if the House will back us, in ways which will give a lead to other countries whose governments have left us behind in adopting the principle but who are still striving or effective ways of implementing it.

10 The concept of equal pay for equal work is so self-evidently right and just that it has been part of our national thinking for a very long time. Here, as in other things, it was the Trade Union

---

<sup>3</sup> Barbara Castle was elected to Parliament in 1945, the youngest woman member, one of 24 women MPs. She was one of the key figures in the Harold Wilson Labour administrations of the 1960s and 1970s.



Movement which gave the lead. Indeed, as far back as 1888 the T.U.C. [Trade Union Congress] first endorsed the principle of the same wages for the same work—a very courageous *avant garde* thing to do in those days, long before Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, when women who worked  
15 in industry were certainly not considered respectable, even if they were regarded as human beings at all.

Since then the struggle against discrimination against women in rates of pay has had a chequered course. There was that great moment during the war when Mrs. Thelma Cazalet Keir<sup>4</sup>, with strong Labour support, led a successful revolt against the Government on the issue of sex discrimination in  
20 teachers' pay, and the great man himself, Winston Churchill, had to come down to the House the next day to make the reimposition of sex discrimination a vote of confidence.

Since then, the cause of equal pay has had its partial victories: the non-industrial Civil Service, non-manual local authority workers and teachers all got the first of seven instalments towards equal pay in 1955, and full equality in 1961. But its extension to that far greater number of women in industry  
25 for whom the T.U.C. fought so long ago has so far eluded us. The Trade Union Movement has realised that this can be done only by legislation, and previous Governments have refused to legislate. Up to now, the extension of equal pay in industry has always foundered on three arguments: how should we define equal pay for equal work? How can we enforce it? And: "The economic situation is not right." It is a tremendous credit to this Government that they have found  
30 the answer to all three.

**Document 5 : Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton University Press, 2000.**

The phenomenon of "political modernity"—namely, the rule by modern institutions of the state, bureaucracy, and capitalist enterprise—is impossible to think of anywhere in the world without invoking certain categories and concepts, the genealogies of which go deep into the intellectual and even theological traditions of Europe. Concepts such as citizenship, the state, civil society, public  
5 sphere, human rights, equality before the law, the individual, distinctions between public and private, the idea of the subject, democracy, popular sovereignty, social justice, scientific rationality, and so on all bear the burden of European thought and history. One simply cannot think of political modernity without these and other related concepts that found a climactic form in the course of the European Enlightenment and the nineteenth century. These concepts entail an unavoidable—and in  
10 a sense indispensable—universal and secular vision of the human. The European colonizer of the nineteenth century both preached this Enlightenment humanism at the colonized and at the same time denied it in practice.

(...)

Historicism enabled European domination of the world in the nineteenth century. Crudely, one  
15 might say that it was one important form that the ideology of progress or "development" took from the nineteenth century on. Historicism is what made modernity or capitalism look not simply global but rather as something that became global *over time*, by originating in one place (Europe) and then spreading outside it. This "first in Europe, then elsewhere" structure of global historical time historicist; different non-Western nationalisms would later produce local versions of the same  
20 narrative, replacing "Europe" by some locally constructed center. It was historicism that allowed Marx to say that the "country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed,

---

<sup>4</sup> Thelma Cazalet-Keir was a feminist and a Conservative politician. Her proposed amendment to the Education Bill, demanding for equal pay for women teachers, passed by one vote on 28 March 1944. Churchill made the amendment a matter of confidence, and attended in person to ensure its defeat on 30 March.

the image of its own future.” It is also what led prominent historians such as Phyllis Deane to describe the coming of industries in England as the *first* industrial revolution. Historicism thus posited historical time as a measure of the cultural distance (at least in institutional development) that was assumed to exist between the West and the non-West. In the colonies, it legitimated the idea of civilization. In Europe itself, it made possible completely internalist histories of Europe in which Europe was described as the site of the first occurrence of capitalism, modernity, or Enlightenment. These “events” in turn are all explained mainly with respect to “events” within the geographical confines of Europe (however fuzzy its exact boundaries may have been). The inhabitants of the colonies, on the other hand, were assigned a place “elsewhere” in the “first in Europe and then elsewhere” structure of time.

Historicism- and even the modern, European idea of history- one might say, came to non-European peoples in the nineteenth century as somebody’s way of saying “not yet” to somebody else. Consider the classic liberal but historicist essays by John Stuart Mill, “On Liberty” and “On Representative Government”, both of which proclaimed self-rule as the highest form of government and yet argued against giving Indians or Africans self-rule on grounds that were indeed historicist. According to Mill, Indians or Africans were *not yet* civilized enough to rule themselves. Some historical time of development and civilization (colonial rule and education, to be precise) had to elapse before they could be considered prepared for such a task. Mill’s historicist argument thus consigned Indians, Africans, and other “rude” nations to an imaginary waiting room of history. In doing so, it converted history itself into a version of this waiting room. We were all headed for the same destination, Mill averred, but some people were to arrive earlier than others. That was what historicist consciousness was: a recommendation to the colonized to wait. Acquiring a historical consciousness, acquiring the public spirit that Mill thought absolutely necessary for the art of self-government, was also to learn this art of waiting. This waiting was the realization of the “not yet” of historicism.

**Document 6: John Aloysius Farrell, “Scopes and Evolution Lost the Trial, But Modernity Won”. *US News*, April 9, 2009 (Adapted).**

It was July 1925. The streets of little Dayton were jammed with flivvers; the sidewalks with grifters and Bible-waving preachers. Children were delighted by the showmen with trained chimps, and adults by a pair of blind minstrels, singing spirituals. Hucksters sold fried chicken sandwiches and watermelon, and an infinite variety of monkey knick-knacks. Dozens of reporters were on hand, from all the big-city papers. Many slept on cots (and shared the single outhouse) at Bailey’s hardware store, which they filled with the clacks and dings of typewriters. Wires were strung from the courthouse and two dozen telegraph operators moved 400,000 words a day. Microphones were set to broadcast the proceedings by radio: an American first.

There was more at stake than John Scopes and the eighth grade biology class he taught. Modernity was on trial. The advances of recent decades—the airplane, the car, the telephone, and the radio—were no longer novelties. They were serving as accelerants, shrinking time and distance. And in war, when mixed with more insidious invention, they had brought slaughter. Darwin and his like offered disconcerting propositions: Sigmund Freud with his excuses for aberrant human behavior; the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, who sought to take man “beyond good and evil,” and physicist Albert Einstein, who shattered the notion of absolute truths. A “Roaring” decade was rocking America with its jazz joints, short skirts, and speakeasies.

Reaction came in the guise of Fundamentalism. From the precarious farms of the Cumberland ridges, the pious folk arrived in their buggies—women in gingham and men in slouched felt hats and overalls—to swear to the power of the Book, the faith of their fathers, and the majesty of William Jennings Bryan. Bryan was a legend—a three-time presidential candidate who

had seized the Democratic nomination with a single speech in 1896. He was horrified by the World War, and traced German militarism to the teachings of Darwin and Nietzsche. "Science has proven itself an evil genius," he said. At 65, Bryan's once vibrant baritone was diminished. But he still had the fight of a snapping turtle, a species which, with the dome of his forehead, beak nose, and broad mouth, he somewhat resembled. It would be, Bryan prophesized, "a duel to the death."

From its inception, the trial was a stunt. The town's civic leaders had gathered at a table in Robinson's Drug Store and hatched a scheme to win drowsy Dayton some attention. Scopes agreed to take the fall. Bryan signed on with the prosecution, spurring Clarence Darrow to join the defense (...).

That Sunday, Darrow joined co-counsel Arthur Garfield Hays and Harvard geologist Kirtley Mather at the old mansion that served as defense headquarters. The lawyers had Mather play the role of Bryan, and quizzed him about Adam's rib, Jonah and the whale, and other tales. "I'm going to put a Bible expert on the stand," Darrow told a friendly minister. "Greatest in the world—he thinks." (...). In the course of that famous clash, Darrow got Bryan to admit that Genesis might be allegorical—not literal—and not science. It was a body blow to Fundamentalism; more so when the Monkey Trial—and Bryan's resultant death—was popularized by Broadway and Hollywood, 30 years later, in *Inherit the Wind*.

Yes, Scopes was convicted. And, yes, the statue erected outside the Rhea County courthouse is of Bryan, not Darrow. And when the Republican candidates were asked if they believed in evolution in the 2008 campaign, three contenders for the presidency actually said no.

But modernity triumphed. And freedom of thought and scientific inquiry was secured.