



Prépa *langues*

EUROSTAGES

ANNALES DES
CONCOURS ÉCONOMIQUES

2025

Conception : BANQUE ELVi

emlyon BS – ESCP BS – ESSEC BS – HEC Paris

LANGUE VIVANTE A

FILIÈRE ÉCONOMIQUE et COMMERCIALE et FILIÈRE LITTÉRAIRE

Mardi 29 avril 2025, de 14 h. à 18 h.

ALLEMAND – ANGLAIS – ESPAGNOL

Durée : 4 heures

N.B. :

Les candidats ne sont pas autorisés à modifier le choix effectué lors de l'inscription de la langue vivante A dans laquelle ils doivent composer.

Aucun document n'est autorisé ; l'utilisation de toute calculatrice ou de tout matériel électronique est interdite.

Si au cours de l'épreuve, un candidat repère ce qui lui semble être une erreur d'énoncé, il la signalera sur sa copie et poursuivra sa composition en expliquant les raisons des initiatives qu'il sera amené à prendre.

Ce sujet comporte les 5 documents suivants :

- **Document 1** – *Oligarchy Comes to America: Could a backlash to the country's megarich ruling class come soon?*, Slate, November 15, 2024
- **Document 2** – *Biden Delivers a Farewell Address and a Warning to the Nation*, The New York Times, January 15, 2025
- **Document 3** – « *Elon Musk, pilier complotiste de la campagne de Donald Trump* », sur *Franceinfo : un précieux allié en désinformation*, Le Monde, November 5, 2024
- **Document 4** – *Table, Trump's victory adds record \$64bn to wealth of richest top 10*
- **Document 5** – *Political editorial cartoon*, Adam Zyglis, 2015

I - RÉSUMÉ ANALYTIQUE COMPARATIF

Répondre dans la langue cible à la question posée en 350 mots (+ ou - 10%) en identifiant et en comparant les informations pertinentes dans les documents 1 et 2, sans commentaire personnel ni paraphrase.

According to Document 1 and Document 2, what role did money play in last year's American presidential election?

II - EXPRESSION PERSONNELLE : ESSAI ARGUMENTÉ

Répondre dans la langue cible à la question posée en 500 mots (+ ou - 10%), en réagissant au contenu du dossier, sans paraphraser celui-ci, tout en développant son opinion personnelle. Vous devez illustrer votre argumentation avec des exemples culturels, civilisationnels et/ou historiques du monde anglophone.

In your opinion, to what extent is democracy at risk within the United States?

III - TRADUCTION DU FRANÇAIS EN ANGLAIS (THÈME)

Traduire uniquement la partie du texte indiquée en français en gras et entre crochets [...]

*Traduire du français en anglais de « **L'homme** » à « **eux** »*

Document 1 :

“Oligarchy Comes to America: Could a backlash to the country’s megarich ruling class come soon?”, Scott Nover, *Slate*, November 15, 2024

On November 8, Elon Musk hopped on a diplomatic call between President-elect Donald Trump and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky. Musk isn’t just a billionaire presidential funder, but a high-powered government contractor whose businesses were promised \$3 billion across nearly 100 different contracts and 17 agencies last year, according to a recent *New York Times* tally. And Musk’s Starlink satellite internet systems have been key to Ukrainian military efforts in its war against Russia—paid for by the Pentagon. More recently, Trump put Musk and billionaire businessman Vivek Ramaswamy in charge of a new effort he says will reduce government bureaucracy.

All of this makes Musk the most visible American oligarch. Yes, oligarch. While oligarchs are typically thought of as Eastern European businessmen with considerable sway over government, Northwestern University political science professor Jeffrey Winters says we need to start applying the label not only to Musk but to many of America’s ultrawealthy.

Trump is supported by billionaires with names you’ve heard of, such as the Winklevoss twins of Facebook fame, and those you might not have, like banking heir Timothy Mellon, who donated \$76.5 million to Trump and aligned groups. Meanwhile, Bill Gates, Michael Bloomberg, and other American oligarchs threw their support behind Kamala Harris.

[The journalist from *Slate*, Scott Nover, spoke with Jeffrey Winters about oligarchy—his area of focus—and how to think about wealth and power in Trump’s America. Here is what Jeffrey Winters said:]

The term *oligarch* is a very ancient word with a stable meaning. So for over 2,000 years, it has referred to a small number of people empowered politically by massive wealth; [...] they have a very flexible instrument to use, and that is money. Money in politics means that you can shape and buy outcomes. For much of history, oligarchs funded their own political positions. But in recent centuries, they have actually used their money to support other political figures and agendas, as they have not necessarily themselves been holding office.

[Oligarchy]’s not a very common word here. Instead, we often hear terms like megadonor, for example, to describe the people who really have a major impact on the direction and the agenda of American politics through the use of their wealth-power. Megadonor is a term that oligarchs themselves are much more comfortable with because the base of the word is “to donate,” as if what you’re doing is altruistic or selfless. But that’s actually not what’s happening. Oligarchs use their wealth-power because they have very important agendas that they want to achieve.

The fundamental principle of democracy is power equally shared. That’s where our commitment to things like “one person, one vote” comes from. And in a democracy, if you have what is essentially the equivalent of “some people, one vote, but other people, 10,000 votes, or 1 million votes,” that clearly is a violation of the most fundamental democratic principles.

And if the kind of power that oligarchs are using were somehow expressed in direct votes, it would be much more obvious what a distortion of democracy and how antidemocratic it is. But

because it's been interpreted as voice instead of voting – meaning you're simply expressing your preferences as if it were campaigning—the distortion is blurred. When it comes to the actual voting booth, every oligarch gets only one vote. But this ignores all the multiple ways in which power is distributed in the democracy unequally. So the question becomes: Why should we fetishize voting and ignore all the extreme distortions of power in the system and then try to call it a strong democracy after that?

Money is always power. It's almost impossible to strip the power component out of wealth and money. It can set things in motion, it can fuel a campaign. *Citizens United* basically opened up the floodgates and took virtually all limits off the use of wealth-power in the American political system. And compared to earlier periods when we had campaign finance reforms in place—McCain-Feingold and other policies—there was an attempt to try to limit the expression of wealth power. We're at a moment of maximum oligarchic power in the United States.

[...]If we look at the robber baron era, there was outrage at the degree to which ultrawealthy people were directly engaging in politics and shaping outcomes and backing particular individuals who were winning and then passing policies that defended the wealth of these oligarchic figures. And the kind of reaction we saw in the New Deal, where, for example, the very first taxes on income in the United States were taxes on the wealthy exclusively. There's a whole series of backlash policies that we saw—they didn't come immediately, but they did come. So the anger starts first and then the opportunities to act on that anger come later. Whatever your political position—Democrat, Republican, independent—Americans should be alarmed and outraged at the role money is playing in their democracy.

We're seeing an unusual alliance between working-class Americans and oligarchs. It's happening not because the MAGA movement is actually going to respond to the pain and the working-class interests of the base. I think they're good at responding to the anger. And the Democrats are not responding at all either to the class interests of the working class or to the anger. But this alliance of the working class with oligarchs, I would predict, is going to work out far to the advantage of oligarchs and produce very little that is concrete in terms of standard of living for the average working-class American.

Document 2 :

“Biden Delivers a Farewell Address and a Warning to the Nation”, Erica L. Green, *The New York Times*, January 15, 2025

President Biden on Wednesday warned that an “oligarchy” of the ultrawealthy was emerging in America, sounding the alarm about unchecked power as he gave a farewell speech to the nation just days before he surrenders office to a man he disdains.

In an address from the Oval Office, Mr. Biden expressed concern about the “dangerous concentration of power” and issued a plea for the preservation of democratic ideals and institutions under the administration of President-elect Donald J. Trump.

“Today, an oligarchy is taking shape in America of extreme wealth, power and influence that literally threatens our entire democracy, our basic rights and freedoms and a fair shot for everyone to get ahead,” Mr. Biden said.

While Mr. Biden did not explicitly name Mr. Trump, his remarks went straight at the tension at the heart of the incoming administration, in which billionaires like Elon Musk are positioned to wield enormous influence over the next four years. Are they really populists intent on shaking up the government to benefit working people who have been left behind by the establishment? Or are they just billionaire disrupters out to enrich themselves?

Mr. Biden's warning of an unelected oligarchy taking shape echoed a similar one by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who spoke about the military-industrial complex in his farewell address. The Biden version referred to the "tech-industrial complex," in which he warned of the erosion of truth itself, brought forth by unchecked social media platforms — a reference to Meta doing away with fact-checkers this week — and artificial intelligence.

"Americans are being buried under an avalanche of misinformation and disinformation enabling the abuse of power," Mr. Biden said. [...]

"The powerful forces want to wield their unchecked influence to eliminate the steps we've taken to tackle the climate crisis, to serve their own interest for power and profit," he said. "We must not be bullied into sacrificing the future, the future of our children and our grandchildren. We must keep pushing forward and push faster." [...]

"Our system of separation of powers, checks and balances — it may not be perfect," he said, "but it's maintained our democracy for nearly 250 years, longer than any other nation in history that's ever tried such a bold experiment."

Mr. Biden called for term limits and ethics reform for the Supreme Court and banning members of Congress from trading stocks.

And he issued a call for changes that would safeguard against a recent Supreme Court decision that gave presidents broad immunity, which Mr. Trump has sought to use to blunt multiple criminal charges and could protect him as he vows retribution and other autocratic acts while in office.

"We need to amend the Constitution to make clear that no president is immune from crimes that he or she commits while in office," Mr. Biden said. [...]

Document 3 :

« Elon Musk, pilier complotiste de la campagne de Donald Trump », sur Franceinfo : un précieux allié en désinformation, Pascal Galinier, *Le Monde*, November 5, 2024

Le patron de Tesla, SpaceX et du réseau social X (ex-Twitter) s'est beaucoup investi dans l'Etat de Pennsylvanie, l'un des sept *swing states* (Etats pivots), qui fut décisif en 2016 pour la victoire du candidat du Parti républicain Donald Trump, qui y avait décroché 45 000 voix de plus que sa rivale Hillary Clinton.

[L'homme le plus riche des Etats-Unis, sinon du monde, n'a pas lésiné sur les moyens, devenant un rouage à part entière de la campagne de Donald Trump – qui lui a promis de le nommer à la tête d'une commission chargée de faire un audit du gouvernement américain, en vue de le « réformer » en profondeur. [...]

Après avoir investi 75 millions de dollars (69 millions d'euros) dans la campagne du candidat républicain, Elon Musk a promis d'offrir 1 million de dollars chaque jour à un électeur choisi « au hasard » sur les listes électorales des *swing states* en échange de la signature d'une pétition déclarant intouchables le premier et le deuxième amendement de la Constitution américaine – ceux qui garantissent la liberté d'expression et le port d'armes –, dont « les médias traditionnels ne veulent pas parler », dit-il.

Les médias, autre cible de la sphère complotiste... Le réseau X lui offre « une puissance de feu sans pareille ». Elon Musk fait siennes les accusations contre les démocrates d'acheminer massivement des migrants « illégaux » dans les Etats-clés afin qu'ils y obtiennent la nationalité américaine et votent pour eux] ; ou celles affirmant que le gouvernement travailliste britannique envisagerait d'ouvrir des camps de rétention pour se débarrasser des émeutiers d'extrême droite descendus dans les rues de Southport le 30 juillet après l'attaque au couteau d'enfants par un adolescent de 17 ans, né à Cardiff de parents rwandais. [...]

Le patron a « lié son destin à celui de Donald Trump », conclut le podcast. Il a offert des habits neufs aux arguments que ne manquera pas de brandir la « trumposphère » au lendemain du 5 novembre, soit pour contester la défaite de son champion, soit pour célébrer sa revanche tant attendue sur « le système » qui l'avait « spolié » en 2020...

Document 4 :

Table from Bloomberg – “Trump’s victory adds record \$64bn to wealth of richest top 10”, *The Guardian*, November 7, 2024

Wealth increases from November 5, 2024 to November 6, 2024

1. Elon Musk \$290bn (+10.1%)	6. Bill Gates \$159.5bn (+1.2%)
2. Jeff Bezos \$228.3bn (+3.2%)	7. Larry Page \$158.3bn (+3.6%)
3. Mark Zuckerberg \$202.5bn (0%)	8. Sergey Brin \$149.1bn (+3.6%)
4. Larry Ellison \$193.5bn (+5.4%)	9. Warren Buffett \$147.8bn (+5.4%)
5. Bernard Arnault \$173.2bn (-1.6%)	10. Steve Ballmer \$145.9bn (+2%)

Document 5: Political editorial cartoon, Adam Zyglis, 2015





prépa

Langues vivantes A

Séries ECG et Technologique

Mercredi 16 avril 2025 de 14h00 à 17h00

Durée : 3 heures

Candidats bénéficiant de la mesure « Tiers-temps » :
14h20 – 18h20

La partie 3 de l'épreuve est au choix du candidat.

Allemand p. 2

Anglais p. 3

Espagnol p. 4

INSTRUCTIONS

Tous les feuillets doivent être identifiables et numérotés par le candidat.

Aucun document n'est permis.

La composition dans une autre langue que celle pour laquelle le candidat s'est inscrit n'est pas autorisée.

Conformément au règlement du concours, l'usage d'appareils communicants ou connectés est formellement interdit durant l'épreuve.

Ce document est la propriété d'ECRICOME, le candidat est autorisé à le conserver à l'issue de l'épreuve.

ANGLAIS

1 - VERSION

Starbucks' CEO commutes to work by private jet

Last week Starbucks made headlines after it was revealed its new CEO, Brian Niccol — who has been described as the “messiah” the coffee company had been searching for — will be commuting to the office via private jet. Niccol is going to abide by the company’s policy of being in the office three days a week. But since he lives in California and the Starbucks HQ is more than a thousand miles away in Seattle, a corporate jet is really the only way to go.

Did anyone at Starbucks sit down with a cup of coffee and ponder the optics of this before sealing the deal? Back in 2018 the company made a lot of noise about how it was getting rid of plastic straws and working towards a recyclable “cup solution”. What is the point of that posturing if you are then going to stick your CEO on a private jet a couple of times a week? As environmental groups and plenty of angry people on the internet have pointed out, this supercommute makes a mockery of Starbucks’ supposed “green agenda”.

While Starbucks is getting backlash for its supercommuting CEO, I imagine the criticism will not bother the board so long as Niccol gets people buying more lattes. Online outrage certainly is not going to prompt Niccol to commute via bicycle.

The Guardian, 27 August 2024

2 - THÈME

Son destin avait changé un soir de l’hiver 1943, lors d’une réception à Washington, où ses parents étaient réunis autour de riches familles américaines sollicitées pour contribuer financièrement à l’effort de guerre. Les Stanfield tentaient de faire bonne figure. Leur fortune avait été dilapidée par le démon du jeu, qui possédait le père de Robert depuis longtemps.

À vingt-deux ans, Robert n’était dupe ni de l’état des finances familiales ni du vice de son père, avec lequel il entretenait des relations distantes. Le jeune homme nourrissait le rêve de rendre à sa famille sa puissance et sa fortune.

À leur table, entre autres convives, était assis un homme discret au crâne dégarni. Edward Wood était l’ambassadeur du Royaume-Uni, et comme Churchill et Roosevelt aimaient communiquer directement, sa charge s’en voyait réduite. Le discours avait été magnifique, et pourtant Wood n’avait d’yeux que pour le jeune Stanfield. Il y avait une raison à la fascination de l’ambassadeur. Un an plus tôt, il avait perdu à la guerre son fils du même âge.

Marc Levy, *La Dernière des Stanfield*, 2017

3 - ESSAI - Les candidats traiteront l’un des deux sujets proposés et indiqueront le nombre de mots employés (de 250 à 350). **Indiquer le nombre de mots utilisés** en portant les mentions suivantes très lisiblement et à l’encre : repère formé d’un double trait // dans le texte écrit après chaque tranche de 50 mots, décompte chiffré cumulatif (50, 100, 150, etc) en regard dans la marge, total exact en fin d’exercice.

1. How could British Prime Minister Keir Starmer rebuild the UK-EU relationship?
2. What would it take to have more women in leadership roles?

Retrouvez les annales
2022, 2023, 2024 et 2025, dans
la bibliothèque Prépa-Langues.

prepa-langues.fr





Prépa *langues*

EUROSTAGES

131 rue de Picpus – 75012 Paris
Tél. : 01 43 07 07 90 – E-mail : info@prepa-langues.fr

prepa-langues.fr