

R 20 – 82

École normale supérieure de Rennes

---

**Département Droit-économie-management**

Concours d'admission en 1<sup>re</sup> année

**Session 2020**

---

**Épreuve de langue vivante étrangère**

Durée : 2 heures

---

**Aucun dictionnaire n'est autorisé**

---

Ce document comporte les sujets des 4 langues proposées lors de l'inscription, à savoir :

- allemand
- anglais
- espagnol
- italien

Chaque candidat doit obligatoirement traiter le sujet qui correspond à la langue vivante étrangère choisie irréversiblement au moment de son inscription et l'indiquer sur sa copie.

---

## ANGLAIS

### I. VERSION

In 231 years, only three US presidents have been impeached. Now Donald Trump faces two courts. The case against him is simple, and established not only by officials speaking under oath, but by his own words and actions. It is that he attempted to pressure Ukraine's government into interfering in a US election, withholding military aid. His administration attempted to cover matters up. He refused to cooperate with a constitutionally authorised congressional inquiry.

Yet the first court is almost guaranteed to acquit. The wrangling over the terms for the president's trial in the Senate continues, but the forum is so rigged that it is vanishingly unlikely to convict him and end his presidency. It is not simply the Republican majority in the Senate that is to blame – a two-thirds majority is needed for conviction – but the way that Republicans cling to a man many of them despise. The jury's foreman, Senate majority leader Mitch McConnell, has proudly stated that he will take his cues from the accused's lawyers. Lindsey Graham, who with other senators must swear to deliver impartial justice, blithely announced: "I'm not trying to pretend to be a fair juror here."

The second court is that of public opinion. While overall polls suggest slightly more people now support impeachment than oppose it, the gap is small and may be closing again. Broadly speaking, Democrats continue to support his trial; Republicans oppose it; Independents are divided. In a CNN poll, more people thought the charges would help Mr Trump than harm him. (*The Guardian*, 19 December 2019)

### II. THÈME

Le 19 décembre 2019, depuis une Chambre des communes largement renouvelée et désormais majoritairement conservatrice à la suite de sa victoire électorale une semaine plus tôt, Boris Johnson a promis un « *nouvel âge d'or* » à ses compatriotes. Qu'entend par là concrètement le premier ministre britannique, alors que le Royaume-Uni s'apprête à solder quarante-sept années d'appartenance à l'Union européenne (UE), vendredi 31 janvier au soir ?

La réponse est d'autant plus compliquée à articuler que « *nous ne sommes pas tout à fait sûrs qu'il y ait une vraie stratégie à Downing Street* », confie un diplomate européen. « *Je ne crois pas que le gouvernement ait une quelconque vision pour le futur du pays*, renchérit Nick Wright, chercheur en sciences politiques à l'University College de Londres. *Nous avons passé trois ans et demi à nous déchirer sur le Brexit sans un véritable débat national sur le rôle et la place du Royaume-Uni dans le monde après le divorce avec l'UE.* »

La première ministre Theresa May avait bien insisté sur le concept de « *Global Britain* », mais M. Johnson l'a peu utilisé jusqu'à présent, et « *on attend toujours de savoir ce qu'il recouvre précisément, son ambition et les moyens concrets d'y parvenir* », ajoute Sophia Gaston, directrice du British Foreign Policy Group. (*Le Monde*, 28 janvier 2020)

### III. EXPRESSION ÉCRITE

#### **Barack Obama is going after old men. His real target is Bernie Sanders**

*Jessa Crispin*

*The Guardian, Tue 17 Dec 2019*

While you won't see former president Barack Obama appearing at any town halls or any public events as the Democrats seek to oust Donald Trump from the White House, you can, if you can afford it, see him in a series of rooms – ballrooms, conference rooms, small theaters – talking to donors about what he thinks everyone else is doing wrong. His exasperation has found several targets at these private events, from the young activists he accused of just being mad online to the old white men running for office he accused of “not getting out of the way”.

At this latest event in Singapore, Obama announced that women were “indisputably” better leaders than men. If the whole world was run by women, Obama speculated, “you would see a significant improvement across the board on ... living standards and outcomes”.

While potentially opening himself up to a million hate tweets by Hillary Clinton supporters still upset about 2008 and 2016, the comments seem pointed at one old white man in particular: Bernie Sanders.

There are two old white men in running for the nomination: Sanders and his good ole pal best bud forever, Joe Biden. The billionaires Michael Bloomberg and Tom Steyer don't count here because I'm not convinced they're not both Spider-Man villains. And while Obama's withholding of an official endorsement for his former vice-president does seem pointed, the more likely target of his continued frustration is Sanders.

Just last month, it was reported by Politico that Obama had privately spoken about the Vermont senator seeking the Democratic presidential nomination, saying that while he is mostly taking a hands off approach to the primary, if Sanders started to win he would “speak up to stop him”.

It's not clear what Obama's interference could do that the media's strange silence about Sanders's campaign hasn't already done. The mass media has been avoiding using Sanders's name like they're trying to avoid summoning Beetlejuice. But Obama's hostility is understandable, given that Sanders is the candidate most outspoken about putting a stop to the great neoliberal experiment that privatized all services, hollowed out the middle class and removed most social welfare safety nets, an experiment Obama was an enthusiastic facilitator of. This isn't the first verbal subtweet the former president has made, insisting earlier this year that the electorate didn't want revolution – which is I guess how someone like him sees a project like nationalized health insurance – only “improvement”.

What makes this latest statement even odder is that there is no clear candidate he could be supporting with his championing of women leaders. Elizabeth Warren is the highest woman in the polls, but his administration was excessively antagonistic toward her back when she was pushing for them to create the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It's unlikely a lovefest will develop between the two now.

Maybe it was just vague virtue signalling and scoring easy points with centrist feminists? Just another bland platitude they can slap on a T-shirt and sell on Etsy? It would be boring to list all of the women leaders who would immediately disprove Obama's claims about women leaders. Margaret Thatcher! Imelda Marcos! We gave Aung San Suu Kyi both a Nobel peace prize and a whole U2 song about her and even that couldn't keep her from committing crimes against humanity.

It's almost – almost – like the real problem here is power and its morally corrupting qualities and not who is doing the wielding of it.

The Obama legacy is still in flux. He exited the White House with a rosy glow, and in the early days of the Trump administration, one could easily look back at the Obama administration with a nostalgic longing for its dignity, its lack of scandal and its "good" taste.

But as the offenses of the Trump administration mounted, from highly visible mass deportations to the Muslim ban to military interventions overseas, more and more people started to notice many of these policy positions were either started or continued by the Obamas.

Michelle Obama recently announced that she can be friends with the former president George W Bush because "our values are the same". People were outraged, but if you compare administrations, you start to see what those values they share truly are. They both valued waging war in foreign countries and supporting the removal of their leaders. They both valued prosecuting government whistleblowers and conducting massive surveillance against its own people. They both valued bailing out and subsidizing banks and corporations over citizens.

Many of the candidates for the Democratic nominee also share these values, from Pete "Definitely Not CIA" Buttigieg to Amy "We Can't Have Nice Things" Klobuchar to Elizabeth "Good Capitalist" Warren. Of course he'd be maneuvering against the one candidate who values different things, like economic justice and fewer deaths from people who can't afford their medically necessary insulin.

Or maybe the Obamas just saw on Wikipedia that their net worth is somewhere around \$70m, and they're trying to avoid paying Sanders's wealth tax. Either way, Bernie Sanders is the only candidate who consistently scares the political establishment, and the Obamas can't stop themselves from showing whose side they're on.

**Répondre en anglais aux questions suivantes (250 mots par question, + ou – 10%)**

1. How are the Obamas re-entering politics?
2. Do you agree with the statement that women are better leaders than men?

--- Fin du sujet d'anglais ---