



Concours BCE

Nouvelle épreuve de langues ELVI
(à partir de 2023)

Sujet 0

Anglais LV A

Durée de l'épreuve - **4 heures**

Contenu du dossier thématique - 2 à 3 articles d'un total de 1.500 mots en anglais, 1 texte de 400 mots en français et 2 à 4 documents iconographiques.

1. Compréhension : Résumé analytique comparatif

Le candidat répond en anglais à la question posée en 350 mots, + ou – 10%, en identifiant et en comparant les informations pertinentes dans les documents du dossier, sans commentaire personnel ni paraphrase.

1 - According to documents 1 and 2 in the dossier, what are the relationships between mainstream politics and sports activism? Reference to any other documents may be included if relevant. Answer the question in your own words (350 words).

2. Expression personnelle : Rédaction argumentée

Le candidat répond en anglais à la question posée en 600 mots, + ou – 10%, dans la forme demandée, en réagissant au contenu du dossier, sans paraphraser celui-ci, tout en développant son opinion personnelle. Le candidat doit illustrer son argumentation avec des exemples culturels, civilisationnels et/ou historiques du monde anglophone.

2 - You are scripting a formal speech to debate the motion “*This house believes that sport should be apolitical.*” Write an opening speech of 600 words to either a) propose or b) oppose the motion. Elaborate your personal opinions on this issue in your own words, supported by evidence and references drawn from Documents 1-5 and at least two other pertinent cultural, civilisational or historical references from the English-speaking world.

3. Traduction du français en anglais (Thème)

Traduction d'une partie d'un texte en français. Le candidat traduit uniquement la partie du texte indiquée (200 mots, + ou – 10%)

3 - Document 3. Translate into English « *Désastre national....des gamins apeurés.* »

Contents

Document 1 - “The England squad is built on immigration – yet our xenophobic government dares to cheer it on”, Jonathan Liew, *New Statesman*, July 7, 2021

Document 2 - “Biden praises WNBA champs for social justice activism”, Aamer Madhani, *The Associated Press*, August 24, 2021

Document 3 - Extrait de Traîtres à la Nation? Un autre regard sur la grève des Bleus en Afrique du Sud, Stéphane Beaud et Philippe Guimard, éd. *Cahiers Libres*, 2011

Document 4 - Gold medallist Tommie Smith (center) and Bronze medallist John Carlos (right) showing the raised fist on the podium after the 200m race at the 1968 Summer Olympics, Wikipedia, 1968 Olympics Black Power Salute, *Public domain*, created 15 October, 1968

Document 5 - Boris Johnson holds a flag as he walks outside Downing Street ahead of the Euro 2020 final, *Reuters*, 10 July 2021

Document 1.

“The England squad is built on immigration – yet our xenophobic government dares to cheer it on”

JONATHAN LIEW, *New Statesman*, July 7, 2021

Minutes after the full-time whistle blew in Rome on 3 July, concluding England’s 4-0 victory over Ukraine in the quarter-finals of the European Championships, the Home Secretary Priti Patel tweeted her congratulations. “What a performance. What a team. It’s coming home!” she wrote. The irony of the sentiment was not lost on many.

For one thing, Patel had been curiously forthright in her criticism of the England team ahead of the tournament. In an interview with (...) GB News, Patel refused to criticise fans who booed England for taking the knee before games to protest against racial injustice. Instead, she derided the players for engaging in “gesture politics”. Bizarrely, she went on to conflate the entirely peaceable act of taking the knee with the toppling of the statue of the slave trader Edward Colston in Bristol last summer. “I just don’t subscribe to this view that we should be rewriting our history,” she said, deploying a tactic used by many politicians on the far right to cast even the mildest progressive tendencies as essentially indistinguishable from violent extremism.

But the wider irony is that the England team of 2021 is one that simply would not exist if Patel had been in charge of the Home Office a generation ago. After England’s historic 2-0 win over Germany at Wembley in the last-16 on 29 June, a viral social media post from the Migration Museum in London, accompanied by a poster campaign, sought to underline the impact of immigration on English football. It depicted England’s starting XI from the game, but with the names of all the players of foreign ancestry – with either a parent or grandparent born abroad – crossed out. Just three remained: the defenders Luke Shaw and John Stones, and the goalkeeper Jordan Pickford. All have had superb tournaments. Still, you suspect the three of them might have struggled to keep Germany at bay on their own.

Like many of this country’s most cherished institutions, this is an England team built on migrant labour. Harry Kane, who scored the clinching second goal against Germany and added two more against Ukraine, was born to an Irish father who moved to London from Galway. Bukayo Saka’s parents are Nigerian. Raheem Sterling was born in Jamaica. Ben Chilwell’s father emigrated to Britain from New Zealand. In total, 13 of England’s 26-man squad could have chosen to represent another nation.

Quite apart from this, English football has benefited immensely over the past 30 years from what you might describe as its “open borders” policy. The influx of foreign footballers from the 1990s onwards has often been blamed for stifling opportunities for young English players, but few dispassionate observers would deny that the Premier League – from which 24 of England’s 26 players have emerged – is among the best in the world.

Moreover, many of the team’s key players have developed their games under the tutelage of migrant coaches. Sterling and Phil Foden would not be the players they are today without the influence of Pep Guardiola at Manchester City. Kane, Shaw and Kieran Trippier all owe their rise

to the opportunities granted to them by Mauricio Pochettino at Tottenham and Southampton. Without his intensive football education at the hands of Marcelo Bielsa at Leeds, Calvin Phillips would be another jobbing Championship midfielder playing for his next contract.

You could argue that all this is, or should be, entirely irrelevant. Indeed, there is a persuasive case to be made that using the accomplishments of prominent, high-achieving individuals to underline the benefits of immigration is a counterproductive tactic, feeding into a narrative in which migrants have to “prove their worth” to gain acceptance in a host society. It goes without saying that Robert and Melanie Rashford should not need to have produced a superstar footballer called Marcus to be treated with dignity and humanity.

And yet at this juncture, with the country uniting around the success of Gareth Southgate’s side, with immigration returning to the political agenda, with the Windrush scandal still fresh in the mind, it feels right to expose the noxious double standard of populist demagogues like Patel as the shameless opportunism it is. On 6 July, the day before England’s semi-final against Denmark, the Home Secretary unveiled the Nationality and Borders Bill in parliament – the latest front in the government’s attempt to correlate migration with criminality, even as it embraces this immigrant England team with its polyvalent identity and abhorrence of racist dog-whistling.

Unfortunately for Patel and her colleagues in government, this is not a team that can easily be co-opted into their brand of un-nuanced flag-waving. There is, after all, an alternative story to be told here. For all the passion and fervour generated by international tournaments, modern football is a resounding refutation of narrow-minded ethno-nationalism. This is a sport that has always thrived on the easy interchange of expertise and talent across borders, on mixing and kicking ideas around. England’s possession-based football is inspired by Spain’s (itself based on the 1970s Dutch school); its emphasis on pace and pressing borrowed from Germany; its centralised academy system modelled on France’s.

Above all, its outlook has been shaped by the diversity of its influences, by a complex world in which we are not simply one thing or another, but fluid and plural. At a moment of surging ethno-nationalism, rampant nativism and widening cultural division, it feels more vital than ever to get across that message: to point out the incongruity of wrapping yourself in England team colours while spurning the values they represent.

Document 2.

“Biden praises WNBA champs for social justice activism”
AAMER MADHANI, *The Associated Press*, August 24, 2021

President Joe Biden honored the 2020 WNBA champions Seattle Storm on Monday, celebrating their success on the court and hailing the four-time title holders for changing lives with their activism.

The visit marked the first time that an NBA or WNBA team has visited the White House since the Cleveland Cavaliers were feted by Barack Obama in 2016.

Presidents typically host college and major league sports champions for a White House ceremony. But the two big basketball leagues skipped such celebrations during Donald Trump’s administration as several prominent players and coaches were outspoken about their opposition to Trump’s rhetoric and policies.

Biden marveled at the team and its feats on the court. The team includes three players who won gold medals as part of Team USA’s women’s basketball team at this summer’s Olympic games—Sue Bird, Jewell Lloyd and Breanna Stewart. The three presented Biden with a souvenir Storm jersey.

Biden also took a moment to note team members’ efforts to spotlight the issue of police brutality in Black communities, promote voter registration, speak out about violence against transgendered people and encourage Americans to get vaccinated.

“What makes this team remarkable is they don’t just win games, they change lives,” Biden said. “That’s what winners do. They shine the light and lift people up. They’re a force for change. That’s the Seattle Storm, that’s the WNBA.”

Storm co-owner Ginny Gilder also praised the team’s activism and noted WNBA players’ efforts last year on behalf of Democrats Raphael Warnock and Jon Ossoff in their winning Senate campaigns in Georgia.

Warnock defeated Republican Sen. Kelly Loeffler, co-owner of the Atlanta Dream. Loeffler, an ally of Trump, came under criticism from WNBA players for attacks on the Black Lives Matter movement. Loeffler and her fellow owners sold the team this year.

“It feels good to be back in this place and have our achievements celebrated in this way,” Stewart said in brief remarks at the ceremony.

Before the visit, Bird said that with Trump out of office, she was happy to visit the White House “now that it’s back in a place where it’s considered an honor.”

Many WNBA players, including Bird, have been outspoken in their embrace of social justice movements such as Black Lives Matter, which Trump characterized as a violent, radical ideology. Trump was also critical of Bird's fiancée, U.S. soccer star Megan Rapinoe.

"I think for a very long time, up until 2016, going to the White House was an honor — it wasn't necessarily political," Bird said before the visit. "It was to meet the president of the United States. The person who holds that office acknowledging your team's success."

During his campaigns and presidency, Trump got in several public spats with prominent athletes and coaches who have sought to use their celebrity to spotlight social justice and other issues.

Trump lashed out at Stephen Curry and his Golden State Warrior teammates in 2017 after they declined the customary White House invitation. The Republican also has repeatedly feuded with Lakers' star LeBron James, who was an outspoken critic of Trump and endorsed Hillary Clinton and Biden's White House runs.

Document 3.

[“Désastre national”, “affaire d’État”, “défaite sportive et morale”, “débâcle”, “épisode grotesque”, etc., les grands journaux n’ont pas lésiné pour exprimer le sentiment d’effroi national qui a saisi les observateurs (et nos concitoyens?) dans les jours qui ont suivi le refus de s’entraîner des joueurs de l’équipe de France, le dimanche 20 juin 2010 lors de la Coupe du monde en Afrique du Sud, pour protester contre l’exclusion par la Fédération française de football (FFF) de Nicolas Anelka. Cette grève, inédite dans les annales de l’équipe nationale, a entraîné d’innombrables réactions indignées dans l’espace public.

S’est alors immédiatement instruit un procès en accusation qui a certes visé l’encadrement de l’équipe de France - {...} - mais qui a surtout dénoncé, en des termes très violents, le “comportement inadmissible” des joueurs eux-mêmes. {...}

Une atmosphère d’union nationale a donc régné lors des jours qui ont suivi la mutinerie des joueurs: il convenait de condamner sans faiblir ces “irresponsables”, “immatures”, considérés bien vite comme des “traîtres à la nation”. La ministre des Sports, Roselyne Bachelot, s’est distinguée dans cette exercice en déclarant, devant l’Assemblée nationale, le 25 juin: “Je ne peux que constater comme vous le désastre avec une équipe de France où des caïds immatures commandent à des gamins apeurés.”]

Les événements de Knysna ont été très vite interprétés par les entrepreneurs de morale républicaine comme directement imputables, une fois de plus, à la jeunesse populaire des cités – à son inculture, son inconséquence morale et à sa dangérosité sociale et politique. {...}

Comme le dit l’historien Pap Ndiaye, “le sport est culturellement et politiquement important du point de vue de la représentation des personnes et des collectifs. Les équipes représentent les sociétés, locales et nationales. Dès lors, la composition des équipes est commentée dans une double perspective : l’efficacité tactique et l’adéquation entre l’équipe et la nation imaginée. L’efficacité fait l’objet de débats entre amateurs et spécialistes, {...} alors que la symbolique de l’équipe suscite aussi des débats articulés aux représentations différentes de la nation, au delà des amateurs de sport. Ces identifications sont plurielles et peuvent entrer en tension. C’est particulièrement vrai dans les sports à fort investissement nationaliste, comme le football ou le sport olympique de premier plan, où le public attend de s’identifier à l’équipe nationale. Le sport propose un discours sur la nation, sur ce que signifie être français (ou britannique ou allemand)”. En ce sens, la grève des Bleus de juin 2010 est bel et bien une “affaire nationale” qui met en cause les fondements de la nation et interroge l’attachement des individus à celle-ci.

Extrait de Traîtres à la Nation? Un autre regard sur la grève des Bleus en Afrique du Sud,
Stéphane Beaud et Philippe Guimard, *éd. Cahiers Libres, 2011*

Document 4.



Document 5.

