



Prépa *langues*

EUROSTAGES

ANNALES DES
CONCOURS LITTÉRAIRES

2025

LCU 562
ENS Paris Saclay (langue anglaise)
ENS de Lyon
ENS (Paris)

SESSION 2025

BANQUE D'ÉPREUVES LITTÉRAIRES

COMMENTAIRE D'UN TEXTE EN LANGUE VIVANTE ÉTRANGÈRE
ET TRADUCTION D'UNE PARTIE OU DE LA TOTALITÉ DE CE TEXTE

IMPORTANT

Le commentaire doit être rédigé dans la langue choisie lors de l'inscription.

Durée : 6 heures

L'usage de la calculatrice est interdit

L'usage d'un dictionnaire unilingue est autorisé.

Langue allemande	page 2
Langue anglaise	page 4
Langue arabe	page 6
Langue chinoise	page 8
Langue espagnole.....	page 10
Langue italienne	page 12
Langue japonaise.....	page 14
Langue polonaise.....	page 16
Langue portugaise	page 18
Langue russe	page 20

ANGLAIS

Commenter en anglais le texte suivant et le traduire de [l. 14] « They walked on again... » jusqu'à [l. 30] « ... books you burn. ».

“Do you mind if I walk back with you? I'm Clarisse McClellan.”

“Clarisse. Guy Montag. Come along. What are you doing out so late wandering around? How old are you?”

They walked in the warm-cool blowing night on the silvered pavement and there was the faintest breath of fresh apricots and strawberries in the air, and he looked around and realized this was quite impossible, so late in the year.

There was only the girl walking with him now, her face bright as snow in the moonlight, and he knew she was working his questions around, seeking the best answers she could possibly give.

10 “Well,” she said, “I'm seventeen and I'm crazy. My uncle says the two always go together. When people ask your age, he said, always say seventeen and insane. Isn't this a nice time of night to walk? I like to smell things and look at things, and sometimes stay up all night, walking, and watch the sun rise.”

They walked on again in silence and finally she said, thoughtfully, “You know, I'm not afraid of you at all.”

He was surprised. “Why should you be?”

“So many people are. Afraid of firemen, I mean. But you're just a man, after all ... ”

He saw himself in her eyes, suspended in two shining drops of bright water, himself dark and tiny, in fine detail, the lines about his mouth, everything there, as if her eyes were two miraculous bits of violet amber that might capture and hold him intact. Her face, turned to him now, was fragile milk crystal with a soft and constant light in it. It was not the hysterical light of electricity but—what? But the strangely comfortable and rare and gently flattering light of the candle. One time, when he was a child, in a power failure, his mother had found and lit a last candle and there had been a brief hour of rediscovery, of such illumination that space lost its vast dimensions and drew comfortably around them, and they, mother and son, alone, transformed, hoping that the power might not come on again too soon...

25 And then Clarisse McClellan said:

“Do you mind if I ask? How long have you worked at being a fireman?”

“Since I was twenty, ten years ago.”

30 “Do you ever *read* any of the books you burn?”

He laughed. “That's against the law!”

“Oh. Of course.”

“It's fine work. Monday burn Millay, Wednesday Whitman, Friday Faulkner, burn 'em to ashes, then burn the ashes. That's our official slogan.”

35 They walked still further and the girl said, “Is it true that long ago firemen put fires *out* instead of going to start them?”

“No. Houses have *always* been fireproof, take my word for it.”

“Strange. I heard once that a long time ago houses used to burn by accident and they needed firemen to *stop* the flames.”

40 He laughed.
She glanced quickly over. "Why are you laughing?"
"I don't know." He started to laugh again and stopped. "Why?"
"You laugh when I haven't been funny and you answer right off. You never stop to think
what I've asked you."
45 He stopped walking. "You *are* an odd one," he said, looking at her. "Haven't you any
respect?"
"I don't mean to be insulting. It's just, I love to watch people too much, I guess."
"Well, doesn't this mean *anything* to you?" He tapped the numerals 451 stitched on his char-
coloured sleeve.
50 "Yes," she whispered. She increased her pace. "Have you ever watched the jet cars racing on
the boulevards down that way?"
"You're changing the subject!"
"I sometimes think drivers don't know what grass is, or flowers, because they never see them
slowly," she said. "If you showed a driver a green blur, Oh yes! he'd say, that's grass! A pink
55 blur? That's a rose garden! White blurs are houses. Brown blurs are cows. My uncle drove
slowly on a highway once. He drove forty miles an hour and they jailed him for two days.
Isn't that funny, and sad, too?"
"You think too many things," said Montag, uneasily.
"I rarely watch the 'parlour walls'¹ or go to races or Fun Parks. So I've lots of time for crazy
60 thoughts, I guess. Have you seen the two-hundred-foot-long billboards in the country beyond
town? Did you know that once billboards were only twenty feet long? But cars started
rushing by so quickly they had to stretch the advertising out so it would last."
"I didn't know that!" Montag laughed abruptly.
"Bet I know something else you don't. There's dew on the grass in the morning."
65 He suddenly couldn't remember if he had known this or not, and it made him quite irritable.
"And if you look"—she nodded at the sky—"there's a man in the moon."
He hadn't looked for a long time.

Ray BRADBURY (1920-2012), *Fahrenheit 451*, 1953.

¹ Television screens.

LC 563
ENS Paris Saclay (langue anglaise)
ENS de Lyon

SESSION 2025

BANQUE D'ÉPREUVES LITTÉRAIRES

ÉPREUVE DE SPÉCIALITÉ

L'usage de la calculatrice n'est pas autorisé

Les candidats **doivent** composer dans la langue qu'ils ont choisie au moment de l'inscription (spécialité langues vivantes).

Philosophie	page 3
Version latine	page 4
Version grecque.....	page 5
Etude de texte français	page 6
Explication de documents historiques.....	page 8
Thème allemand	page 10
Thème anglais	page 11
Thème arabe	page 12
Thème chinois	page 13
Thème espagnol.....	page 14
Thème italien.....	page 15
Thème polonais	page 16
Thème russe	page 17

Tournez la page S.V.P.

THÈME ANGLAIS

Durée : 4 heures

L'usage de tout dictionnaire est interdit

On ne voit pas son visage. Il pourrait s'agir de n'importe qui. L'image le montre de dos : formidablement rond, enveloppé dans un manteau épais, son chapeau sur la tête. Une boule immobile. Il est assis sur un rocher : pierre posée sur une autre pierre.

Plongé dans ses pensées, l'homme contemple un paysage de campagne anglaise avec, devant lui, à perte de vue, la pelouse impeccablement tondue et, plus loin, les quelques collines sur lesquelles se dressent plusieurs arbres encore plus vieux que l'individu qui les observe et qui, pourtant, touche maintenant au terme de sa vie. En contrebas, à ses pieds, sous ses yeux, au bout de la pente au sommet de laquelle il se trouve et d'où l'on dirait qu'il va dévaler, roulant sans que rien puisse le retenir, se découpe le disque parfait d'un bassin à l'apparence de miroir circulaire couché sur le sol et dont la surface réfléchirait le ciel.

Peut-être, ce jour-là, n'a-t-il pas pris avec lui sa toile, son chevalet, ses pinceaux, ses couleurs. Peut-être attend-il qu'on les lui apporte afin de pouvoir se mettre à l'ouvrage. En tout cas, on ne les aperçoit pas sur la photographie. Pour l'heure, sans doute l'homme est-il las de peindre. Mais il n'est pas las de regarder. Il prépare mentalement son prochain tableau. Ce petit plan d'eau vers lequel il va et auquel sa pensée s'attache, il l'a déjà représenté plusieurs fois. Tant de fois. Des années que cela dure ! Au point que sa prédilection insensée pour ce pittoresque coin de paysage perdu quelque part au sein de la vaste propriété qu'il possède est devenue un sujet de plaisanterie dans son entourage. On en a fait une fable que l'on raconte et que l'on racontera encore longtemps aux visiteurs venus l'entendre sur ces lieux où ils se rendent en pèlerinage.

Mais, étrangement, l'artiste se dit qu'il n'en a pas encore fini. Ce n'est pas qu'il soit mécontent de ce qu'il a peint jusque-là. En toutes choses, l'homme passe plutôt pour satisfait de lui. La modestie n'est pas son fort. Quelle que soit l'entreprise dans laquelle il s'engage et le succès quelquefois très relatif auquel il parvient, il reconnaît rarement avoir raté son coup. Ses regrets, ses remords, il a pris l'habitude depuis longtemps de les garder pour lui.

Philippe FOREST, *Je reste roi de mes chagrins*, 2019.

SESSION 2025

ÉPREUVE À OPTION**VERSION DE LANGUE VIVANTE ÉTRANGÈRE ET THÈME***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.

Extrait de l'article 6 de l'arrêté du 25 septembre 2017 fixant les conditions d'admission des élèves :

Pour les épreuves des groupes A/L et B/L de la section des lettres, les candidats peuvent se munir des documents et matériels suivants :

I - Épreuves écrites d'admissibilité

(...)

1.2 Pour les épreuves de version en langues vivantes étrangères : pour l'arabe, le chinois, l'hébreu et le russe, un dictionnaire unilingue ; pour le japonais, deux dictionnaires unilingues, dont un en langue japonaise de caractères chinois ; l'usage du dictionnaire est interdit pour toutes les autres langues. (...)

*La liste limitative des dictionnaires prévus pour l'épreuve de tronc commun de la BEL ne s'applique pas à cette épreuve. Les candidates et les candidats sont libres d'utiliser le dictionnaire **unilingue** de leur choix.*

DURÉE : 6 heures

ALLEMAND

ANGLAIS

CHINOIS

ESPAGNOL

ITALIEN

RUSSE

Tournez la page S.V.P.

VERSION ANGLAISE ET THEME

I : VERSION

He talks to no one, goes nowhere. It's the rainy season again, the season that just ended. He falls asleep in a drizzle and wakes to a downpour. The roof comes alive with the assault of water. He's up, listening, and can't let go. No sooner does he fall asleep than he wakes in panic to daylight and the rain's cease-fire.

He goes out back to check the culvert. It's overflowing into an improvised creek through the rented porch. Nick stands in T-shirt and sweats, watching dawn pour down over the mountain. The hour smells moist and loamy, and the soil hums under his bare feet. Two thoughts fight over him. The first, so much older than anyone's childhood, is: *Joy comes in the morning*. The second, brand-new, is: *I'm a murderer*.

There's a tearing in the air. Nicholas looks up, where the mountainside begins to liquefy. Last night's rains have loosened the earth, and, stripped of the covering that held it in place for a hundred thousand years, the mountain slides down with a roar. Trees taller than lighthouses snap like twigs and plunge into one another, slamming down the slope in a swollen wave. Nick turns to run. Above him, a wall of rock and wood twenty feet high heads home. He scrambles down a footpath, wheeling to look back as a river of trees hits the cabin head-on. His living room fills with stump and rock. The building lifts off its foundation and bobs on the flow.

He runs toward the neighbors, screaming, "Get out! Now!" Then his neighbors are running, too, with their two little boys, down the drive to the family truck. But debris reaches the truck first and blocks it in. Trees wash up against the ranch house, bulging like woody lava. "This way," Nick shouts, and the neighbors follow. He leads them down another gully along a shallower slope. And there, the tide of landslide comes to rest behind a thin line of redwoods. Mud and rubble ooze against the final barrier, but the trees hold. The mother breaks down. She sobs and grabs her children. The father and Nick stare upward at the denuded mountainside, a ridge wildly lowered.

Richard Powers, *The Overstory* (2018)

II : THÈME

C'est l'époque où je vivais dans ma voiture. Au début, c'était juste pour rire. Ça me plaisait d'être là, dans la rue, sans rien faire. Je n'avais aucune envie de démarrer. Pour aller où, d'ailleurs ? Je me sentais bien sous les arbres, rue de la Chine. La voiture était garée le long du trottoir, en face du 27. Il y avait des pétales de cerisiers qui tournoyaient dans l'air ; ils s'éparpillaient avec douceur sur le pare-brise, comme des flocons de neige.

C'était un dimanche, vers 20 heures. Je m'en souviens très bien parce que, ce jour-là, on m'avait mis à la porte. Depuis quelques mois, je n'arrivais plus à payer le loyer ; la propriétaire de la chambre m'avait rappelé à l'ordre, et puis ce matin-là elle a frappé à ma porte ; comme je n'ouvrais pas, elle s'est mise à hurler que j'avais la journée pour quitter son *meublé*. Je me suis rendormi, avec une légèreté qui aujourd'hui me paraît extravagante. À l'époque, j'accordais peu d'importance à ce qu'on nomme les relations humaines ; peut-être n'avais-je pas besoin de faire croire aux autres que j'étais vivant.

Bref, j'ai traîné toute la journée au lit, puis vers la fin de l'après-midi, alors que la lumière d'avril entrait dans la chambre avec ses couleurs chaudes, à ce moment où l'on prend plaisir à baigner son visage dans les rayons du soleil, j'ai rassemblé mes affaires ; ça faisait à peine trois cartons : du linge, des livres et une plante verte – un papyrus qui m'accompagne depuis toujours.

Depuis quelques mois, j'avais perdu le fil ; ma vie devenait évasive, presque floue. Je ne sortais plus de chez moi que la nuit, pour acheter à l'épicerie du coin des bières, des biscuits, des cigarettes. Est-ce que je souffrais ? Je ne crois pas : il y avait un coin dans ma chambre, entre le radiateur et le lit, qui me plaisait énormément ; je m'y installais dès le réveil : être assis là, sur le plancher, le dos bien calé dans l'angle du mur, cela me suffisait. Ce coin n'avait rien de particulier, mais une lumière y venait vers 17 heures, une lumière *spéciale* qui me rendait heureux, une sorte de halo rouge, orange, jaune qui avançait au fil des heures le long du mur jusqu'à ma tête, qu'il finissait par couronner.

Yannick Haenel, *Les Renards Pâles* (2013).

UH 556/2

BL

SESSION 2025

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 – CHINOIS
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.

ANALYSE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

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

Document 1

Whether or not the US can be labelled an 'imperialist' power today matters very little, I think. It's mainly a matter of semantics. The word 'imperialism' is used today in a confusing variety of ways, by some of which America clearly does qualify, but not by others. Donald Rumsfeld's claim (in 2003) that 'We don't do empire', for example, is certainly defensible, by one rather
5 narrow definition of the term. (The USA has no desire to annex other countries and rule them directly.) As it happens my own preferred usage, in common with most other imperial historians', is broader than this, and so does include America. (...) What has American 'imperialism' in common with the British kind, and what aspects are different?

The first thing to say is that the USA has certainly been imperialistic – even by Rumsfeld's
10 narrow definition – *in the past*. (...) The myth of US 'anti-imperialism' doesn't go back much further than Woodrow Wilson, and even he was far more 'imperialistic' than he liked to pretend. (He supported the US annexation of the Philippines, for example, and always believed there were some peoples who would never be fit for independence from colonial rule.) The American
15 Revolution is misleading. What the colonists were rebelling against then was not imperialism in general, but the British Empire in particular; and partly in order to give them freedom to imperialise their own continent – and later hemisphere – which Britain was less keen on. (In one sense, the Brits were the anti-imperialists here.) To exclude the colonisation of the American West from the rubric 'imperialism' simply because it didn't involve getting into boats is tendentious, to say the least. (...)

Much of Britain's imperialism in the nineteenth century – in Australia and South Africa, for
20 example – was almost exactly comparable with America's westward expansion. The professed aim of both was to spread 'freedom' (for whites). Both involved dispossessing peoples seen as 'primitive'. Then, of course, there were those blatant overseas annexations of the 1890s: the Philippines, and so on: taken from *another* empire, of course – but then so, in a way, was British
25 India. Thirdly, America's commercial and financial expansion in the twentieth century was closely similar to Britain's *preferred* strategy in the nineteenth, which in the latter's case is now almost universally called 'imperialism'. If you want to exclude the one, you must logically exclude the other too. The early and mid-Victorian British did: were as adamant as Rumsfeld is today that they didn't 'do empire' – in the face, you might think, of all the evidence – on the
30 grounds that they didn't *want* to rule other peoples, only to spread 'free trade', for everyone's benefit, not only their own. Hence all those naval bases they annexed across the world: another form of 'imperialism', by most lights, but not by Britain's. One is reminded here of US War Secretary Stimson's description of the bases America accumulated in the Pacific in the 1940s: 'these are not colonies; they are outposts'. The parallels don't stop there. Many of the disasters
35 of the two 'imperialisms' are uncannily similar: compare Little Big Horn with Isandhlwana, for example; and the atrocities that seem to accompany imperial expansion almost inevitably. (...)

Britain's imperial rulers (...) didn't go in for 'ideal' systems. Around the turn of the twentieth century this came to be called 'Indirect Rule'; but it was also the dominant way of colonial
40 government before then, dictated as much by practicalities – Britain simply didn't have the numbers of personnel to try to *revolutionise* her subjects – as by principle. Besides, she couldn't have functioned without local collaborators. (This is another way in which her real imperial

power was more limited than may appear (...)) So she generally – not always – left local societies alone. Her function was simply to rule. (...)

45 There have always been Americans who have believed that their system is for everyone: from John Winthrop, of ‘City upon a Hill’ fame; through Benjamin Franklin: ‘America’s cause is the cause of all mankind’; to Condoleeza Rice in 2000: ‘America’s values are universal’. (...)

50 At the root of most modern imperialism lay the perceived need for the new dynamic capitalist economies of the West to expand their commercial and financial markets and sources of raw materials beyond their domestic bases. (...) Britain’s nineteenth-century expansion in the world was essentially an early stage of ‘globalisation’: the spread of capitalist markets, *ideally* to be accomplished ‘freely’, that is, without any blatant compulsion; but occasionally provoking local disorder and resistance (Chinese resistance to the ‘free’ import of opium is the most notorious example), which required firmer methods of control. Hence the territorial annexations of the period; which was when our upper class paternalists stepped in, to govern these annexed territories: but, because of their rather more old-fashioned values, often in *counter-capitalist* – i.e. ‘paternalistic’ – ways.

55 Thus was *capitalist* imperialism subverted, in part, by the men who came to manage it. That caused stresses and contradictions (again, this is no place to go into details) which helped bring down the formal British imperialism of the nineteenth century during the third quarter of the twentieth; but leaving the ‘informal’ imperialism of capitalism still intact, this time dominated by the USA, who had by now become the leading capitalist power. (...)

60 **Bernard Porter**¹, “British And American ‘Imperialisms’ Compared”, *History Network*, <<https://www.historynewsnetwork.org/article/british-and-american-imperialisms-compared>> (accessed on December 22, 2024)

Document 2

The institute was founded in 1868 [...], and I confess that I admire the faith of its promoters, who, in a time not altogether favourable to their opinions, sowed the seed of Imperial patriotism. It seems to me that there are three distinct stages in our Imperial history. We began to be, and we ultimately became a great Imperial power in the eighteenth century, but during the greater part of that time, the colonies were regarded, not only by us, but by every European power that possessed them, as possessions valuable in proportion to the pecuniary advantage which they brought to the mother country, which, under that order of ideas, was not truly a mother at all, but appeared rather in the light of a grasping and absentee landlord desiring to take from his tenants the utmost rents he could exact. The colonies were valued and maintained because it was thought they would be a source of profit - of direct profit - to the mother country. That was the first stage, and when we were rudely awakened by the War of Independence in America from this dream that colonies could be held for our profit alone, the second chapter was entered upon, and public opinion seems then to have drifted to the opposite extreme; and because the colonies were no longer a source of revenue, it seems to have been believed and argued by many people that their separation from us was only a matter of time, and that that separation should be desired and encouraged lest haply they might prove an encumbrance and a source of weakness. [...]

¹ He is the author of *Empire and Superempire: Britain, America and the World*, Yale University Press, 2006.

Partly by the efforts of this institute and similar organizations, partly by the writings of such men as Froude and Seeley, but mainly by the instinctive good sense and patriotism of the people at large, we have now reached the third stage in our history, and the true conception of our Empire.

What is that conception? As regards the self-governing colonies we no longer talk of them as dependencies. The sense of possession has given place to the sense of kinship. We think and speak of them as part of ourselves, as part of the British Empire, united to us, although they may be dispersed throughout the world, by ties of kindred, of religion, of history, and of language, and joined to us by the seas that formerly seemed to divide us. But the British Empire is not confined to the self-governing colonies and the United Kingdom. It includes a much greater area, a much more numerous population in tropical climes, where no considerable European settlement is possible, and where the native population must always outnumber the white inhabitants; and in these cases also the same change has come over the Imperial idea. Here also the sense of possession has given place to a different sentiment – the sense of obligation. We feel now that our rule over these territories can only be justified if we can show that it adds to the happiness and prosperity of the people, and I maintain that our rule does, and has, brought security and peace and comparative prosperity to countries that never knew these blessings before. In carrying out this work of civilization we are fulfilling what I believe to be our national mission, and we are finding scope for the exercise of those faculties and qualities which have made of us a great governing race. I do not say that our success has been perfect in every case, I do not say that all our methods have been beyond reproach; but I do say that in almost every instance in which the rule of the Queen has been established and the great Pax Britannica has been enforced, there has come with it greater security to life and property.

Joseph Chamberlain, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, speech delivered at the annual dinner of the Royal Colonial Institute on March 31st, 1897.

Document 3

We now have a Commonwealth divided in structure though still associated in function. It demands study and understanding. Some of the changes have arisen by formula, others by the far-reaching wear and tear of modern circumstances. One of the great psychological factors has been that the word 'Empire' has, in itself, lost its respectability. There is still an Empire, but one must not speak about it. This strange fact represents one of the remarkable paradoxes of our times. For the truth is that the Communist Powers, while practising aggressive Imperialism on the grand scale and with astonishing success, have in non-Communist and free countries succeeded in making peaceful Imperialism disreputable. But the greatest changes that have occurred to produce the new Commonwealth have been in the structural significance of the Crown, which means, in effect, the structural existence of the Commonwealth.

What do I mean by the 'structural' significance of the Crown, a significance of such overwhelming importance between 1926 and the Indian Republic formula of 1948? I will illustrate it by reference to my own country. The Crown was and, I am happy to say, is an essential ingredient in Australian Government and life. Our Acts of Parliament are made by 'The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia'; the Governor-General is the Queen's personal representative; the Queen's writs issue from our Courts; I am Her Majesty's Prime Minister of Australia; Dr Evatt is the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition.

20 Up to 1948, this was true in every member nation of the Commonwealth. It was a Crown
Commonwealth. The Sovereign was the head of the State for all purposes, external and internal;
the great 'common' element of unity. The subjecthood of the individual citizen, whether Indian,
Canadian, or Australian, did not connote subservience or any derogation from liberty, but was,
in fact, a proud guarantee that individual liberties to choose, speak, share in Government, would
25 be sustained by a common membership of a great association of free peoples, all of the 'the
King's men'. True, we were also held together by common interests, in some cases by common
race, in many cases by a common intellectual and spiritual inheritance. But all these things we
had and have in common with some great nations outside the Commonwealth. It was the
Crown, our relation to it, our high feelings about it, its legal significance going so far beyond
30 the mere techniques of the law, which gave its special character to the British Commonwealth
which Balfour and his associates set out to define thirty years ago.

The year 1948 saw a momentous change. India became a republic, but remained a member of
the Commonwealth. The Crown ceased to have significance inside India; for external purposes
India recognized the King as 'the head of the Commonwealth'. Clearly the 'new'
Commonwealth had emerged. Superficially, it may look like the old one, but in reality we no
35 longer have a Commonwealth fully integrated on the basis of the Crown. Indeed, it might be
more accurate to say that we have now a Crown Commonwealth within a total Commonwealth.
The relations between Australia and Great Britain, for example, and between Australians and
Her Majesty the Queen are precisely the same as they ever were.

40 But the relations between India or Pakistan and the United Kingdom are different, for the Crown
has, for local purposes in those countries, disappeared. That the Queen remains the head of the
Commonwealth is no doubt important. But a new name for a new office doesn't assure the
continuance of the significance of the Crown. On the contrary, it draws sharp attention to the
fact that there is a world of difference between Australia's relationship to the Throne and that
of India. [...]

**Robert Menzies, Prime Minister of Australia, "The Ever-Changing Commonwealth", in
The Times, 11-12 June 1956**

Document 4

45 We of this generation do not have to face a task such as that our fathers faced, but we have our
tasks, and woe to us if we fail to perform them! We cannot, if we would, play the part of China,
and be content to rot by inches in ignoble ease within our borders, taking no interest in what
goes on beyond them, sunk in a scrambling commercialism [...]. If we are to be a really great
5 people, we must strive in good faith to play a great part in the world. We cannot avoid meeting
great issues. All that we can determine for ourselves is whether we shall meet them well or ill.
In 1898 we could not help being brought face to face with the problem of war with Spain. All
we could decide was whether we should shrink like cowards from the contest, or enter into it
as beseemed a brave and highspirited people; and, once in, whether failure or success should
10 crown our banners. So it is now. We cannot avoid the responsibilities that confront us in Hawaii,
Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. [...] The timid man, the lazy man, the man who distrusts
his country, the over-civilized man, who has lost the great fighting, masterful virtues, the
ignorant man, and the man of dull mind, whose soul is incapable of feeling the mighty lift that
thrills "stern men with empires in their brains" -- all these, of course, shrink from seeing the
15 nation undertake its new duties; shrink from seeing us build a navy and an army adequate to
our needs; shrink from seeing us do our share of the world's work, by bringing order out of

chaos in the great, fair tropic islands from which the valor of our soldiers and sailors has driven the Spanish flag. . . .

20 [...] The guns that thundered off Manila and Santiago left us echoes of glory, but they also left us a legacy of duty [...]

25 The Philippines offer a yet graver problem. Their population includes halfcaste and native Christians, warlike Moslems, and wild pagans. Many of their people are utterly unfit for self-government, and show no signs of becoming fit. Others may in time become fit but at present can only take part in self-government under a wise supervision, at once firm and beneficent.
30 We have driven Spanish tyranny from the islands. If we now let it be replaced by savage anarchy, our work has been for harm and not for good. I have scant patience with those who fear to undertake the task of governing the Philippines, and who openly avow that they do fear to undertake it, or that they shrink from it because of the expense and trouble; but I have even scater patience with those who make a pretense of humanitarianism to hide and cover their timidity and who cant about "liberty" and the "consent of the governed," in order to excuse themselves for their unwillingness to play the part of men. Their doctrines, if carried out, would make it incumbent upon us to leave the Apaches of Arizona to work out their own salvation, and to decline to interfere in a single Indian reservation. Their doctrines condemn your forefathers and mine for ever having settled in these United States. . . .

35 [...]

I preach to you, then, my countrymen, that our country calls not for the life of ease but for the life of strenuous endeavor. The twentieth century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by, and will win for themselves the domination of the world. Let us therefore boldly face the life of strife, resolute to do our duty well and manfully; resolute to uphold righteousness by deed and by word; resolute to be both honest and brave, to serve high ideals, yet to use practical methods. Above all, let us shrink from no strife, moral or physical, within or without the nation, provided we are certain that the strife is justified, for it is only through strife, through hard and dangerous endeavor, that we shall ultimately win the goal of true national greatness.

Theodore Roosevelt, "The Strenuous Life", speech made to a men's club in Chicago on April 10, 1899.

Document 5

5 The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit, and if we ignore this sobering reality, [...] we will find ourselves organizing "clergy and laymen concerned" committees for the next generation. They will be concerned about Guatemala and Peru. They will be concerned about Thailand and Cambodia. They will be concerned about Mozambique and South Africa. We will be marching for these and a dozen other names and attending rallies without end unless there is a significant and profound change in American life and policy. So such thoughts take us beyond Vietnam, but not beyond our calling as sons of the living God.

10 In 1957, a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past ten years we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which has now justified the presence of U.S. military advisors in

Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investment accounts for the counter-revolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Cambodia and why American napalm and Green Beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru.

It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable." Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken: the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and the pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investments. I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin, we must rapidly begin the shift from a thing-oriented society to a person-oriented society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights, are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of values will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. On the one hand we are called to play the Good Samaritan on life's roadside, but that will be only an initial act. One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on life's highway. True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs restructuring.

A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa, and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say: "This is not just." It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of South America and say: "This is not just." The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just.

A true revolution of values will lay hands on the world order and say of war: "This way of settling differences is not just." This business of burning human beings with napalm, of filling our nation's homes with orphans and widows, of injecting poisonous drugs of hate into the veins of peoples normally humane, of sending men home from dark and bloody battlefields physically handicapped and psychologically deranged, cannot be reconciled with wisdom, justice, and love. A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death. [...]

This kind of positive revolution of values is our best defense against communism. War is not the answer.

"Beyond Vietnam: A Time to Break Silence", speech delivered by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. at Manhattan's Riverside Church, April 4, 1967

ENS Paris-Saclay

**Concours d'admission en 1^{ère} année
Banque Sciences Sociales
Session 2025**

Épreuve de Langue Vivante Étrangère

Durée : 3 heures

Aucun document n'est autorisé

Aucun dictionnaire n'est autorisé

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

Traduire en français le texte ci-dessous.

Why are Remainers so weak in post-Brexit Britain?

Therein lies one of the strangest puzzles of British politics. The pro-European cause is popular; its advocates are ineffective. It has millions of supporters but little hard influence in Westminster. Its power is latent, not manifest. Why?

A mass movement in favour of EU membership was mostly absent for Britain's 47 years in the club; it didn't materialise in the referendum of 2016. But the chaos that followed the vote radicalised a class of diffident, comfortable voters, who turned out for huge marches in odd berets. At its peak, People's Vote, which ran the campaign for a second referendum, raised £100,000 a week, from email donations alone.

Rather than melt away, hostility to Brexit has since risen: voters think it was the wrong decision by a wide margin. For some it has hardened into a resilient new form of political identity. More than a quarter of Remain supporters still say that criticism of their cause "feels like a personal insult", according to the 2023 British Election Study.

Such folk are concentrated in Sir Keir's electoral coalition. Some 78% of Labour voters say they would rejoin the EU, and 69% of them would favour a referendum within five years. Only a third say the matter is definitely settled. It is true the issue has fallen as a priority for Labour voters since the Brexit years, but they still rank Europe alongside immigration and education, and ahead of crime and tax, as a national priority. Sir Keir contends that Britain is tired of hearing about Brexit. For many of his supporters, that is just not the case.

What they lack most is a toehold in Parliament. The Liberal Democrats dialled back their support for Europe as they pursued Tory voters in the election in July. Labour has lined up behind Sir Keir thus far. Many MPs found the Brexit schism traumatic; the Labour Movement for Europe, a caucus, has been marginalised. But that can change. Were they more organised and more ruthless, Remainers would be dangerous.

Adapted from *The Economist*, 4 September 2024 (342 words)

II. Expression écrite

Répondre en anglais à la question suivante en 200 mots (+/-10%).

To what extent did Brexit reveal fractures within the British society?

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