

SESSION 2018

---

**ÉPREUVE A OPTION**

---

ENS Ulm – ENS de Lyon

**ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE EN LANGUE VIVANTE ÉTRANGÈRE  
D'UN OU PLUSIEURS TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS  
RELATIFS À LA CIVILISATION D'UNE AIRE LINGUISTIQUE**

ALLEMAND – ANGLAIS – ARABE  
ESPAGNOL – HÉBREU – ITALIEN – RUSSE

---

Durée : 6 heures

*L'usage de la calculatrice n'est pas autorisé*

Les candidats doivent **obligatoirement** traiter le sujet correspondant à la langue qu'ils ont choisie au moment de l'inscription.

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

## ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

Durée: 6 heures

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

### Document 1

Populism has long been among the more fiercely contested yet promiscuously applied terms in the American political lexicon. It was coined by a Kansas journalist in 1890 as an adjectival form of the People's Party, a radical third party organized in Kansas that blossomed into a national force in 1892 (...).

As a critique, however, populism predated the movement and survived it, with important alterations. Central to the original critique was an antagonism between a large majority of *producers* and a tiny elite of *parasites*. Such oppositional terms were used by the Country Party in eighteenth century Britain and became powerful markers in American politics during the early nineteenth century. The producers were viewed as the creators of wealth and the purveyors of vital services; their ranks included manual workers, small farmers, small shopkeepers, and professionals who served such people. This mode of populism offered a vigorous attack on class inequality but one that denied such inequality had any structural causes. Populists have insisted that social hierarchies are artificial impositions of elites and are doomed to vanish with a sustained insurgency of the people.

Populism represents the antimonopolistic impulse in American history. Populists are generally hostile to large, centralized institutions that stand above and outside communities of moral producers. They have a romantic attachment to local power bases, family farms, country churches and citizen associations independent of ties to governments and corporations. The populist critique also includes an explicit embrace of "Americanism" that is both idealistic and defensive. In the United States, which most populists consider a chosen nation, all citizens deserve the same chance to improve their lot, but they must be constantly on their guard against aristocrats, empire builders, and totalitarians both within and outside their borders who would subvert American ideals.

The populist critique is usually most popular among the same social groups who originated it during the late nineteenth century: farmers and wage earners who believe the economy is rigged against them. For example, in the 1930s amid the first depression since the Populist era, Huey Long and Father Charles Coughlin gained millions of followers among desperate white workers, farmers, and small proprietors by denouncing "international bankers" and calling for a radical redistribution of wealth.

But populist discourse has often floated free of its social moorings. Anyone who believes, or pretends to believe, that democratic invective can topple a haughty foe and that the judgment of hardworking, God fearing people is always correct can claim legitimacy in the great name of "The People." Thus, in the era of World War I, socialists on the Great Plains remade themselves into champions of the same small farmers they had earlier viewed as anachronisms in an age of corporate capitalism. The organization they founded, the Nonpartisan League, captured the government of North Dakota and came close to winning elections in several other neighboring states. During the 1930s and 1940s, industrial union organizers, including thousands of members of the Communist Party, portrayed themselves as

40 latter-day Patrick Henrys battling such “Tory parasites” as Henry Ford and Tom Girdler, the antiunion head of Republic Steel.

From the 1940s through the 1980s, American conservatives effectively turned the rhetoric of populism to their own ends. During the “Red Scare” following World War II, they accused well-born figures in the federal government, such as Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson, of aiding the Soviet Union. In the 1950s and 1960s, the Right’s populist offensive shifted to  
45 the local level, where white homeowners in such cities as Detroit and Chicago accused wealthy, powerful liberals of forcing them to accept integrated neighborhoods and classrooms—with no intention themselves of living in such areas or sending their children to such schools. In four presidential campaigns from 1964 to 1976, George Wallace articulated this message when he championed “this average man on the street...this man in the steel mill...the  
50 beautician, the policeman on the beat.”

Michael Kazin “Populism”, *The Concise Princeton Encyclopedia of Political History*, 2011, 383-385.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Document 2

During the three years to which I have been adverting, the owners of the soil might have expected to have suffered in consequence of the bad seasons; but what has been the fact? The landlords have been revelling in prosperity—in a bloated and diseased prosperity—at the very time when the people have been suffering the greatest privations and want of food. Rents  
5 have been rising. I say it boldly—it cannot be denied—rents have been generally, if not universally, raised during the three years of which I have been speaking. How stands the case of the landowner during the years of short crops and suffering to the whole community? He then extorts his rents from the distress of the operative, from the capital of the employer, or from the savings of those who are living upon the accumulations of themselves or their  
10 forefathers. And when the season is favourable—when Heaven smiles upon the fields, and our harvests are again abundant—the landlord extorts his rent from the distress and the capital of the farmer. Nobody can deny that for a series of years the landowners have been raising their rents, not from the legitimate prosperity of the tillers of the soil, or the prosperity of the manufacturing classes. They have been raising their rents from the capital and the labour of  
15 the trading community, or from the capital of their own deluded victims, the farmers. The landowners—Oh, shame upon the order! I say shame upon the landowners and their order, unless they shall speedily rescue themselves from this pitiable—if they deserve pity—this degrading dilemma. The landowners will very soon be ashamed to hold up their heads and own themselves to be English landowners and members of our aristocracy in any enlightened  
20 and civilised country in Europe.

[...] Now there are riches slumbering in the soil—if the owners employ their capital and their intelligence, as other classes are forced to do, in other pursuits—there are undeveloped bounties even on the surface of the earth, and there are ten times more beneath the surface, which would make them richer, happier, and better men, if they would cast aside

25 this monopoly. Last week, in addressing the farmers of Cheshire, I said I would bring a jury  
of Scotch agriculturists before the House of Commons—if their verdict could be taken  
there—who would state upon oath that the surface of Cheshire would, if properly cultivated,  
yield three times the amount of its present produce. If you were travelling by the railroad, and  
30 marked the country from Stafford to Whitmore, and then from Whitmore to Crewe, and  
thence the thirty miles to Manchester, I challenge all England to show such a disgraceful  
picture—threefourths of the finest fields left to the undisputed dominion of rushes—not a  
shilling spent in draining, although it is now universally acknowledged that draining is the  
means of doubling the productions of such soils—hedge-rows of every imaginable shape but  
a straight line, and fields of every conceivable form but the right one. And these are the men  
35 who content themselves with sluggish indolence, and draw from the impoverishment of the  
people; who pick the pockets of the handloom weavers rather than by a right application of  
their intellect and their capital, double the quantity of grain, or butter, or cheese, which the  
land is capable of providing. And thus, if Free Trade did compel them to sell their articles at a  
less price, it would be the means of enabling the people of the country to have a double  
40 supply of food. The home market for food would be doubled, and the landowner might  
become an honest politician.

Richard Cobden, "Speech on Free Trade", Covent Garden, London, September 28th, 1843.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Document 3

On the 4th of March, 1895, a few Democrats, most of them members of Congress, issued an  
address to the Democrats of the nation asserting that the money question was the paramount  
issue of the hour; asserting also the right of a majority of the Democratic Party to control the  
position of the party on this paramount issue; concluding with the request that all believers in  
5 free coinage of silver in the Democratic Party should organize and take charge of and control  
the policy of the Democratic Party. Three months later, at Memphis, an organization was  
perfected, and the silver Democrats went forth openly and boldly and courageously  
proclaiming their belief and declaring that if successful they would crystallize in a platform  
the declaration which they had made; and then began the conflict with a zeal approaching the  
10 zeal which inspired the crusaders who followed Peter the Hermit. (...)

The gentleman who just preceded me [Governor Russell] spoke of the old state of  
Massachusetts. Let me assure him that not one person in all this convention entertains the  
least hostility to the people of the state of Massachusetts.

But we stand here representing people who are the equals before the law of the largest cities  
15 in the state of Massachusetts. When you come before us and tell us that we shall disturb your  
business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your action. We  
say to you that you have made too limited in its application the definition of a businessman.  
The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The attorney  
in a country town is as much a businessman as the corporation counsel in a great metropolis.

20 The merchant at the crossroads store is as much a businessman as the merchant of New York. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, begins in the spring and toils all summer, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the Board of Trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go 1,000 feet into the earth or climb 2,000 feet  
25 upon the cliffs and bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a backroom corner the money of the world.

• We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. Ah, my friends, we say not one word against those who live upon the Atlantic Coast; but those hardy pioneers who braved all the  
30 dangers of the wilderness, who have made the desert to blossom as the rose—those pioneers away out there, rearing their children near to nature's heart, where they can mingle their voices with the voices of the birds—out there where they have erected schoolhouses for the education of their children and churches where they praise their Creator, and the cemeteries where sleep the ashes of their dead—are as deserving of the consideration of this party as any  
35 people in this country.

It is for these that we speak. We do not come as aggressors. Our war is not a war of conquest. We are fighting in the defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came.

40 We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them! (...)

They tell us that this platform was made to catch votes. We reply to them that changing conditions make new issues; that the principles upon which rest Democracy are as everlasting as the hills; but that they must be applied to new conditions as they arise. Conditions have arisen and we are attempting to meet those conditions.

William Jennings Bryan, "Speech at the Democratic National Convention" ("Cross of Gold Speech"),  
Chicago, July 9th, 1896.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Document 4

A week or two ago I fell into conversation with a constituent, a middle-aged, quite ordinary working man employed in one of our nationalised industries.

After a sentence or two about the weather, he suddenly said: "If I had the money to go, I wouldn't stay in this country." I made some deprecatory reply to the effect that even this  
5 government wouldn't last for ever; but he took no notice, and continued: "I have three children, all of them been through grammar school and two of them married now, with family. I shan't be satisfied till I have seen them all settled overseas. In this country in 15 or 20 years' time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man."

I can already hear the chorus of execration. How dare I say such a horrible thing? How dare I  
10 stir up trouble and inflame feelings by repeating such a conversation?  
The answer is that I do not have the right not to do so. Here is a decent, ordinary fellow  
Englishman, who in broad daylight in my own town says to me, his Member of Parliament,  
that his country will not be worth living in for his children.  
I simply do not have the right to shrug my shoulders and think about something else. What he  
15 is saying, thousands and hundreds of thousands are saying and thinking - not throughout  
Great Britain, perhaps, but in the areas that are already undergoing the total transformation to  
which there is no parallel in a thousand years of English history.  
In 15 or 20 years, on present trends, there will be in this country three and a half million  
Commonwealth immigrants and their descendants. That is not my figure. That is the official  
20 figure given to Parliament by the spokesman of the Registrar General's Office.  
There is no comparable official figure for the year 2000, but it must be in the region of five to  
seven million, approximately one-tenth of the whole population, and approaching that of  
Greater London. Of course, it will not be evenly distributed from Margate to Aberystwyth and  
from Penzance to Aberdeen. Whole areas, towns and parts of towns across England will be  
25 occupied by sections of the immigrant and immigrant-descended population.  
As time goes on, the proportion of this total who are immigrant descendants, those born in  
England, who arrived here by exactly the same route as the rest of us, will rapidly increase.  
Already by 1985 the native-born would constitute the majority. It is this fact which creates the  
extreme urgency of action now, of just that kind of action which is hardest for politicians to  
30 take, action where the difficulties lie in the present but the evils to be prevented or minimised  
lie several parliaments ahead. [...]

Enoch Powell, "Rivers of Blood Speech", April 20th 1968.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Document 5

[...]

The choice we make in 1968 will determine not only the future of America but the future of  
peace and freedom in the world for the last third of the Twentieth Century.  
And the question that we answer tonight: can America meet this great challenge?  
For a few moments, let us look at America, let us listen to America to find the answer to that  
5 question.  
As we look at America, we see cities enveloped in smoke and flame.  
We hear sirens in the night.  
We see Americans dying on distant battlefields abroad.  
We see Americans hating each other; fighting each other; killing each other at home.  
10 And as we see and hear these things, millions of Americans cry out in anguish.  
Did we come all this way for this?



Did American boys die in Normandy, and Korea, and in Valley Forge for this?  
 Listen to the answer to those questions.  
 It is another voice. It is the quiet voice in the tumult and the shouting.  
 15 It is the voice of the great majority of Americans, the forgotten Americans—the non-shouters;  
 the non-demonstrators.  
 They are not racists or sick; they are not guilty of the crime that plagues the land.  
 They are black and they are white—they're native born and foreign born —they're young and  
 they're old.  
 20 They work in America's factories.  
 They run America's businesses.  
 They serve in government.  
 They provide most of the soldiers who died to keep us free.  
 They give drive to the spirit of America.  
 25 They give lift to the American Dream.  
 They give steel to the backbone of America.  
 They are good people, they are decent people; they work, and they save, and they pay their  
 taxes, and they care.  
 Like Theodore Roosevelt, they know that this country will not be a good place for any of us  
 30 to live in unless it is a good place for all of us to live in.  
 This I say to you tonight is the real voice of America. In this year 1968, this is the message it  
 will broadcast to America and to the world.  
 Let's never forget that despite her faults, America is a great nation.  
 And America is great because her people are great.  
 35 With Winston Churchill, we say: "We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries,  
 across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies because we are made of sugar  
 candy."  
 America is in trouble today not because her people have failed but because her leaders have  
 failed.  
 40 And what America needs are leaders to match the greatness of her people.  
 And this great group of Americans, the forgotten Americans, and others know that the great  
 question Americans must answer by their votes in November is this: Whether we shall  
 continue for four more years the policies of the last five years.  
 And this is their answer and this is my answer to that question.  
 [...]  
 45 We are a great nation. And we must never forget how we became great.  
 America is a great nation today not because of what government did for people—but because  
 of what people did for themselves over a hundred- ninety years in this country.  
 So it is time to apply the lessons of the American Revolution to our present problem.  
 Let us increase the wealth of America so that we can provide more generously for the aged;  
 50 and for the needy; and for all those who cannot help themselves.  
 But for those who are able to help themselves—what we need are not more millions on  
 welfare rolls—but more millions on payrolls in the United States of America.  
 Instead of government jobs, and government housing, and government welfare, let  
 government use its tax and credit policies to enlist in this battle the greatest engine of progress  
 55 ever developed in the history of man—American private enterprise.  
 Let us enlist in this great cause the millions of Americans in volunteer organizations who will  
 bring a dedication to this task that no amount of money could ever buy.  
 [...] For most of us the American Revolution has been won; the American Dream has come  
 true.

60 And what I ask you to do tonight is to help me make that dream come true for millions to whom it's an impossible dream today.

Richard Nixon, "Address accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention", Miami Beach, Florida, August 8th, 1968