RÉUSSIR L'ÉPREUVE DE RÉDACTION EN ANGLAIS

AUX CONCOURS D'ENTRÉE AUX ÉCOLES DE COMMERCE

BCE, ECRICOME, IENA

- *Méthodologie type concours*
- *Annales et corrigés pas à pas*
- *Civilisation, vocabulaire, grammaire*

70 SUJETS CORRIGÉS

Samantha Lemeunier

ellipses

Corrigés commentés des épreuves BCE LV1 et LV2 de 2021

Sujet de l'épreuve de rédaction LV1

Donald Trump is exiting political life much the same way he entered it, pushing conspiracy theories for personal gain. Now, as then, these aren't just any old conspiracy theories, but ones that hinge on the fundamental illegitimacy of a whole class of Americans. Trump made his first serious foray into national politics with "birtherism," the conspiracy theory that Barack Obama was born outside the United States, making him an illegal president. It was a public expression of Trump's belief that citizenship is tied to blood and ethnicity – that some Americans are Americans, some are less so and some just aren't.

The voter fraud conspiracy to which Trump hitched his attempt to hold onto power falls under the same umbrella, an attempt to write millions of Americans out of the electorate on the basis of race and heritage, instead of just one person out of the office of the presidency.

The essence of the campaign's legal and political argument, after all, is that Trump won the election, or would have, if not for mass electoral fraud, all in swing states and only then in those cities with sizable Black populations, specifically Atlanta, Detroit, Milwaukee and

Philadelphia. To right the ship, his campaign asked various courts to toss out votes in these cities, invalidating hundreds of thousands of Black votes to hand the president a second term.

Here is Rudy Giuliani saying exactly this without shame or embarrassment at a news conference last week: "The margin in Michigan is 146,121 and these ballots were all cast basically in Detroit that Biden won 80-20. So you see it changes the result of the election in Michigan if you take out Wayne County. So it's a very significant case."

The Trump movement has never been about "populism" or "nationalism" or the interests of working Americans. It has always and only been about the contours of our national community: who belongs and who doesn't; who counts and who shouldn't; who can wield power and who must be subject to it.

And the answers, no matter how much the president's defenders and apologists pretend otherwise, have race at their core. Yes, Trump will take support from anyone who wants to give it to him, but the Americans that matter – whose votes must be counted, whose wishes must be heard, respected and fulfilled – are the white ones, and of them, only a subset.

I call this "Trumpism," but none of this began with the president. Trump did not force the Republican Party in Michigan and Wisconsin to create districts so slanted as to make a mockery of representative government in their states; he did not tell the North Carolina Republican Party to devise and pass a voter identification bill targeting the state's Black voters for disenfranchisement with "surgical precision"; he didn't push Republican election officials in Georgia to indiscriminately purge their voter rolls or pressure Florida Republicans into practically nullifying a state constitutional amendment – passed by ballot measure – to give voting rights to former felons.

The Republican Party's contempt for democracy and embrace of minoritarian rules and institutions predate Trump and will continue after he leaves the scene. It does not seem to matter that Republicans can clearly compete and win in high turnout elections since hostility to democratic participation has become as much a part of the party's identity as its commitment to low taxes and so-called small government.

What does this mean for the future of our politics? In the near-term, the president's haphazard attempt to nullify the election is probably the start of a new normal, in which it is standard procedure for Republican politicians to allege fraud and challenge the results,

tying the outcome up in federal court until it's either untenable – or somehow successful. And even if it doesn't work, the attempt still stands as a ritual affirming the belief that some Americans count more than others, and that our democracy is legitimate only insofar as it empowers the people, narrowly defined, over the mere majority.

In "Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship Since *Brown v. Board of Education*," the political theorist Danielle S. Allen observes that "An honest account of collective democratic action must begin by acknowledging that communal decisions inevitably benefit some citizens at the expense of others, even when the whole community generally benefits."

She continues: "The hard truth of democracy is that some citizens are always giving things up for others. Only vigorous forms of citizenship can give a polity the resources to deal with the inevitable problem of sacrifice."

What if the thing we need some citizens to give up is a sense of superiority, a sense that they are – or ought to be – first among equals? And what if they refuse? What do we do about our democracy when one group of citizens, or at least its chosen representatives, rejects the egalitarian ideal at the heart of democratic practice?

These aren't new questions in American history. But unless we plan to recapitulate the worst parts of our past, we will have to come up with new answers.

<div align="right">Jamelle Bouie, The New York Times, November 24, 2020.</div>

Répondez en ANGLAIS aux questions suivantes (250 mots environ pour chaque réponse).
1. **According to the author of the text, what effects have Republicans and "Trumpism" had on the American electoral process? Answer the question in your own words.**
2. **In your opinion, is political polarization, or the divergence of political attitudes to ideological extremes, as we have seen in the United States, inevitable? Do you believe it is the responsibility of politicians, or others, to address this?**
Illustrate your answer with relevant examples from the English-speaking world.

a. Lecture de l'article

Une première lecture du texte permet de repérer les grandes lignes de l'article : la journaliste commence par rappeler les **méthodes politiques** utilisées par Donald Trump, notamment la théorie de la **conspiration** ; ensuite, l'article précise que cela **divise** la population (les structures binaires renforcent d'ailleurs cette scission : « who belongs and who doesn't ; who counts and who shouldn't ; who can wield power and who must be subject to it ») ; puis, il est expliqué que ces méthodes sont **antérieures à la présidence de Donald Trump**. La fin de l'article se concentre sur les propos de Danielle S. Allen qui revient sur **l'ontologie de la démocratie** et explique que la démocratie ne consiste pas à pas contenter tout le peuple mais seulement la majorité du peuple, ce qui suppose qu'une partie doit accepter d'être mécontente, et donc faire des sacrifices. Dans le cas des partisans de Donald Trump, il s'agirait d'abandonner l'idée de suprématie blanche.

b. Brouillon de la question 1

L'article esquisse certains arguments avant de les reprendre. Un résumé linéaire de l'article est donc à proscrire car il serait redondant. En outre, la question est de résumer les effets du Trumpisme et des Républicains sur le processus électoral américain, certaines parties de l'article sont donc à privilégier, notamment celles qui répondent à la question « What does this mean for the future of our politics? ».

La réponse s'organisera donc de manière **typologique** et **progressive** comme suit :

I.   Political strategies challenging democracy
II. Political strategies dividing the population
III. Political strategies normalizing undemocratic processes
Conclusion on the necessity of a relegitimization of democracy

Il convient ensuite de spécifier ce que chaque partie contiendra, en notant les **références** textuelles justifiant ces idées pour ne pas se perdre lors de la composition.

I.   Political strategies challenging democracy
  ‣ Republicans tried to roll back progress on voting rights
  ‣ Trump resorted to similar techniques
II. Political strategies dividing the population
  ‣ Creating a hierarchy of citizens
  ‣ Claiming white superiority

III. Political strategies normalizing undemocratic processes
- ▸ Standardization of undemocratic processes
- ▸ Ritualization of undemocratic processes

Conclusion on the necessity of a relegitimization of democracy

Une fois cette structure en tête, il est nécessaire d'expliciter dès le brouillon les **liens** entre les parties, ce qui sera utile lors de la rédaction des transitions :

I. Political strategies challenging democracy
- ▸ Republicans tried to roll back progress on voting rights
  SIMILITUDE (Similarly)
- ▸ Trump resorted to similar techniques
  CONSEQUENCE (Therefore)

II. Political strategies dividing the population
- ▸ Creating a hierarchy of citizens
  IMPLICATION (Owing to)
- ▸ Claiming white superiority
  CONSEQUENCE (Hence)

III. Political strategies normalizing undemocratic processes
- ▸ Standardization of undemocratic processes
  ADDITION (Moreover)
- ▸ Ritualization of undemocratic processes
  RESTRICTION (Yet)

Conclusion on the necessity of a relegitimization of democracy

Enfin, il est important de noter le **ton** et la **modalité** de l'article. Ici, la journaliste utilise une modalité épistémique, exprimant la probabilité (« probably »), il serait intéressant de rendre cette subtilité dans la réponse à la question.

Il peut enfin être intéressant, en fonction du temps dont le candidat dispose, de dresser une liste rapide de **synonymes** des termes souvent répétés dans le plan ou dans l'article, ce qui lui servira d'appui lors de la rédaction tout en permettant de préciser sa pensée et d'éviter le copier/coller de l'article :

- _Democracy:_ *a representative government, a government in which people participate...*
- _Political strategies:_ *methods, techniques, approach...*
- _Division:_ *scission, polarization...*
- _Normalization:_ *banalization, standardization, making it ordinary...*
- _Sacrifice:_ *renunciation, abandonment...*

c. Rédaction de la question 1

If President Trump resorted to political strategies challenging democracy, his Republican predecessors had already tried to roll back progress on voting rights with the introduction of voter ID laws targeting black citizens in North

Carolina. Similarly, Donald Trump capitalized on the judicial system hoping that courts would confirm an electoral fraud during the 2020 election. He furthermore initiated conspiracy theories, which notably led to the birther movement in order to exclude allegedly "unamerican" people from politics. These strategies therefore transformed the electoral process by dividing the population and standardizing undemocratic electoral methods according to the article.

Such strategies first rely on a hierarchic classification of the population: swing-state cities with a measurable number of African-American citizens were pointed, conversely, to Michigan or Wisconsin districts in which biased voters are considered to be respectable by the Republicans. This bias is due to the long history of racism in the United States, which contributed to the emergence of the concept of White superiority now influencing the electoral process. Republican policies are no longer about the population's preferences on the whole, but favor the wishes of a minority of people, hence political strategies normalizing undemocratic processes.

Republican politicians are now apt to ignore the results of an election, showing how undemocratic methods are standardized, leading to the ritualization of conspiracy theories. Yet, the article evokes the necessity of a relegitimization of democracy, thus showing that the effects of the Republicans and Trumpism on electoral processes are not irreversible provided that the population reaches equality, which begins by renouncing to White superiority.

256 words

d. Analyse du sujet de la question 2

In your opinion, is political polarization, or the divergence of political attitudes to ideological extremes, as we have seen in the United States, inevitable? Do you believe it is the responsibility of politicians, or others, to address this?

La question 2 comporte en réalité **deux questions imbriquées**. Il faut donc prendre soin de répondre aux deux questions et de ne pas en omettre une. Il convient également de noter que c'est une expression **personnelle** qui est demandée (« In your opinion »), d'où la nécessité d'éviter le placage de cours ainsi que la répétition des arguments de l'article.

Il s'agira d'argumenter sur l'éventuelle **inévitabilité** de la polarisation politique, puis de proposer des pistes de réflexion possibles quant aux éventuelles **solutions** à ce problème.

La tension, ou le paradoxe du sujet est assez explicite : la question sous-tend une dichotomie entre **l'évitable et l'inévitable**, qui peut constituer la problématique de la rédaction. Il peut dès lors être intéressant de penser à des **synonymes** pour le terme *inevitable* (*inexorable, fatality, inescapable, unavoidable, necessary...*)

e. Brouillon de la question 2

Rappels sur la polarisation partisane et politique (1960-2000)

Dans les années 1960, le Parti démocrate connaît un **réalignement partisan**. Depuis le New Deal de Roosevelt des années 1930, il était divisé en une partie conservatrice et en une partie progressiste. Néanmoins, la *Great Society* progressiste de Johnson, composée des Civil Rights Act (1964), des Voting Rights Act (1965), de Medicare et de Medicaid (1965) crée une **division**, les progressistes allant du côté des Démocrates et les conservateurs du côté des Républicains, d'où la réaction conservatrice sous Nixon qui déclare vouloir un retour à l'ordre et au droit des États. Cette polarisation a plusieurs conséquences, notamment la **baisse des compromis et du bipartisme** selon Uslaner dans *The Decline of Comity in Congress* (1993) et **l'augmentation de l'obstruction** selon Mann et Ornstein dans *The Broken Branch* (2006). Il est intéressant de noter que cette polarisation est **asymétrique** : les Républicains seraient devenus un ensemble uni très conservateur tandis que les Démocrates ne seraient pas tous aussi progressistes selon Grossmann et Hopkins dans *Asymmetric Politics* (2016).

Ces connaissances permettent d'établir une première remarque : la polarisation serait **plus forte du côté Républicain**. Elles nous amènent également à explorer la baisse du bipartisme : **à quel point a-t-il diminué ? Existe-t-il encore aujourd'hui, ou bien l'obstruction est-elle la stratégie dominante** ? Ces interrogations permettront d'établir une démonstration argumentée et nuancée riche en exemples.

A ce stade, il y a deux stratégies possibles : établir son plan et trouver ses exemples subséquemment, ou bien partir de ses exemples pour ensuite établir son plan. Les deux méthodes valent la peine d'être essayées lors de la préparation au concours afin que le candidat trouve la stratégie qui lui convient le mieux.

Voici quelques **exemples** issus de la culture américaine qui peuvent être exploités pour répondre à la question :

- Obama was in favour of bipartisanship: "Occasionally, I would partner up with even my most conservative colleagues to work on a piece of legislation, and [...] we might conclude that we had more in common than we publicly cared to admit" Barack Obama, *The Audacity of Hope* (2006).
- Yet, he faced obstructionism (his Affordable Care Act was delayed by Congress; and the Tea Party developed in the United States).

Il peut également être judicieux de faire référence à la **culture britannique** :

- UKIP and the British National Party gained in popularity.

Il convient également de préparer une **banque d'exemples pour répondre à la deuxième partie** de la question :

- Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Microsoft are currently fighting against extremism as they plan to create a watchdog aiming at preventing hate crimes and extremists' attacks. Companies thus also play a part in the fight against polarization and extremism.

A la lumière de ces exemples, il est possible de structurer un **plan** :

Introduction: the case of Barack Obama's Affordable Care Act shows the complexity of the matter

I. A tension between evitability and inevitability

II. The rise of extremist parties suggests that polarization is inexorable

III. Yet, private entities are still fighting against extremism, showing that one must see beyond political spheres

Conclusion: citizens might also have a role to play.

Comme pour la question 1, il peut être utile de préciser les **exemples** qui seront utilisés et le **lien** qui sera établi entre les parties.

f. Rédaction de la question 2

"Occasionally, I would partner up with even my most conservative colleagues to work on a piece of legislation, and [...] we might conclude that we had more in common than we publicly cared to admit" Barack Obama declared in *The Audacity of Hope* (2006), showing his desire for bipartisanship and conversational politics in the United States. However, despite his attempts at collaborating with the Republicans, he failed to achieve a real dialogue between the two parties, revealing a tension between an idealization of bipartisanship and the use of pragmatic policies.

Barack Obama first faced obstructionism regarding his Affordable Care Act project, which the Congress delayed. In addition, he witnessed the rise of the Tea Party, which notably reacted to his American Recovery and Reinvestment Act since the Tea Party is a libertarian grassroots movement opposed to interventionism which particularly supported Donald Trump during the 2016 electoral campaign. Donald Trump's 2016 victory therefore seems to point towards the inevitability of polarization in politics. This idea is furthermore reinforced by the rise of polarizing parties such as UKIP and the British National Party in the United Kingdom.

The answer to polarization and extremism might therefore not be in politics but in the private sector as illustrated by Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Microsoft's recent attempt at creating a watchdog aiming at preventing hate crimes and attacks caused by extremists. Issues of polarization may therefore be solved by going beyond political spheres, and citizens also have their parts