



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by evidence and references drawn from Documents 1-5 and at least two other pertinent cultural, civilisational or historical references from the English-speaking world.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.



Annexe

Notes for teachers and candidates

Methodology

It is recommended to begin by reading the questions, then to read the dossier thoroughly, noting and highlighting relevant points (Question 1) and potential arguments (Question 2) in the light of the questions. One or more sections of each article may not be relevant to the question(s) and this content can be put aside.

The text in French should be read in its entirety before beginning the translation. Relevant points and arguments from this document may also be included in the essays or used as context.

The information contained in the images can be referred to and developed in the answer to Question 1 and/or used as a stimulus/inspiration for answering Question 2.

1. Question 1 (Compréhension - résumé analytique comparatif)

FORM:

- The candidate should display a wide range of grammatical structures, including some complex sentences and idiomatic vocabulary in the appropriate style and register, as well as rich lexis and sophisticated phrasing.
- Candidates are asked to answer the question “in their own words”; the candidates must avoid “copy and paste” at all costs.
- In the answer to this question, the candidate must avoid judging or adding to the points made in the texts.
- Examples from the dossier can be discussed in some detail
- In the answer to this question, the candidate should make no reference to facts or viewpoints not found in the dossier.
- This question focalizes on the importance of comprehension; misinterpretation and mischaracterization of the viewpoints of the authors must be avoided.

CONTENT:

Principally, documents 1 and 2 should be referenced and compared (at least one clear reference to each article).

Points may be made document by document, or grouped according to theme

Reference to one of the images is required. The Black Panther movement and Civil Rights in 1960s US can be discussed, for example (doc.4).

Reference to the text in French and the other image is also possible.

The list below is not exhaustive (examples only)

- Doc. 1 illustrates nuanced and conflictual relationships due to opposing positions on immigration in particular, and the issue of the legitimacy of players of immigrant descent to represent the nation.
- Doc. 2 illustrates more mutually supportive relationships due to alignment on social and cultural issues, which however alienate others who do not share these views.
- National teams and players are often instrumentalized by their governments (docs 1-3; doc.5)
- Priti Patel's criticism of England players' kneeling during the national anthem and her stance on immigration contrast with Joe Biden's inclusiveness, his praise for WNBA players' involvement in BLM, pro-vaccination, etc... (docs 1-2)
- Politicians seek to benefit from the positive image of successful national teams among the public/voters (doc.1; doc.5)
- High-profile sports players have access to the national and/or international stage to highlight causes that may cause either pride or shame to their governments (doc.2, doc 4).
- National sport is connected with national identity and pride in the popular imagination and is therefore of great interest to politicians seeking popular approval (doc.3)
- The comments made by Roselyne Bachelot (doc.3) conflate the national football team with the Nation itself ("treason" is a term reserved for political betrayal of one's country or government or a military coup d'état) and question who is worthy to represent it (the authors' thesis implies social/racial discrimination against certain players)

2. Question 2 (Expression Personnelle - rédaction argumentée)

FORM:

- The candidate should display a wide range of grammatical structures, including some complex sentences and idiomatic vocabulary in the appropriate style and register, as well as rich lexis and sophisticated phrasing.
- Candidates are expected to provide a personal viewpoint and defend that viewpoint using evidence and references drawn from the documents, as well as at least two other relevant examples from the English-speaking world.
- Candidates are expected to follow the structure outlined in the question (i.e., to write a formal speech, not an essay). It is apt to use one or more rhetorical devices appropriate to giving a speech (anaphora, analogy, metaphor, antithesis, alliteration, litotes, etc...), or to address the reader with a rhetorical question, for example. More repetition of words or phrases than would be acceptable in an essay is allowable in this exercise.

CONTENT:

Should athletes speak out on social and political issues? Do they have a responsibility to use their platform and influence to raise awareness or should they stick to sports? Should politicians exploit the popularity of sports stars? Is the sports field a political space?

Argumentation should clearly develop a position on one side only of the issue.

Support for either position can be found in the dossier.

Relevant references from the English-speaking world (including examples from the dossier) should be used.

The list below is not exhaustive (examples only)

a) to propose the motion:

- opinions/arguments to be found in Documents 1-3: sports players are not qualified to speak out on political issues; ‘inappropriate’ actions by national players reflect directly on their government and on the country as a whole
 - example to support this argument from outside the dossier: Fox News host Laura Ingraham who told LeBron James “Shut up and dribble”
- from Document 1: Political gestures by England footballers fuel and polarize divisions in society around the complex issue of immigration
- athletes should just play sports and stay out of politics - document 2: athletes’ endorsement of presidential candidates influences the votes of their supporters
 - Michael Jordan has defended his refusal to speak out on politics during his NBA career, saying he viewed himself as an athlete not an activist. Speaking on the latest episode of the ESPN and Netflix documentary *The Last Dance*, Jordan addressed his infamous quote "Republicans buy sneakers too", his supposed reason for why he was reluctant to take political sides during his playing days.
- International Olympic Committee: At the centre of the debate is Rule 50 of the Olympic Charter, which purports to “protect the neutrality of sport and the Olympic Games”, stating no kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in the Olympic areas.
- Olympic boycotts (e.g., US and other nations’ withdrawal from Moscow Olympics 1980, Soviet Union and its allies’ withdrawal from Los Angeles 1984) deprived many athletes of competing after years of preparation and training.
- International sport can be considered a ‘career’ and as such, athletes are entitled to change and represent different nationalities as other professionals move from one employer to another. It is a business or strategic transaction for mutual benefit - Olympic medals/International titles for the nation in question, access to training, resources, etc... for the athlete - and does not engage either party on a political level.

b) to oppose the motion: Examples of effective political and social action by athletes

- Marcus Rashford (indirectly referenced in document 1) forced the UK government to make a U-turn on social policy with regard to child poverty (funding and access to free school meals during the Covid pandemic)
- from Document 2: Stephen Curry refused the customary White House invitation from Trump

- Document 4: Tommie Smith and John Carlos, gold and bronze medalists in the 200-meter race at the 1968 Olympic Games, engaged in a victory stand protest against unfair treatment of African-Americans in the United States. Their Black Power salute raised international awareness of the situation.
- Muhammad Ali was stripped of his title and temporarily barred from boxing due to his activism against the Vietnam draft, in defiance of the policies put in place by Presidents L.B. Johnson and R. Nixon
- Jesse Owens and other black athletes' performances in the 1936 Munich Olympics defeated Hitler's aim to demonstrate Aryan racial superiority
- Colin Kaepernick's Nike ad: "Believe in something. Even if it means sacrificing everything."; Kaepernick was blacklisted by the NFL resulting in loss of income for standing up for his principles
- Simone Biles used her platform to speak out against Larry Nassar; she was awarded the Arthur Ashe Courage Award for speaking out for sexual abuse survivors
- Alex Morgan/Megan Rapinoe: Tweet "to use our platform to speak for gender equality"

3. Translation (Thème)

Many correct variants are possible and acceptable. It is important to note that full marks can be awarded for a less-than-perfect translation if the candidate has made intelligent attempts to render difficult items coherently. Grading is conducted positively rather than by a detrimental points-faute system.

Expectations:

- a correct and fluid text in English that reads easily
- respect of tenses, verb forms and tense sequences - no particular difficulties occur in this extract, with the exception of the inversion '*S'est alors immédiatement instruit*' and the expression '*Je ne peux que constater*'
- nuances and variations in vocabulary - differentiation between the translations of '*désastre*' and '*débâcle*', for example
- strategies to deal with unknown vocabulary should be deployed - intelligent guesses from context, paraphrases, etc... are to be encouraged, rather than substituting the nearest homophone/homonym or false cognate
- longer sentences can be broken down into shorter sentences to avoid the clumsiness of multiple subordinate clauses and to maintain fluidity and style
- formal register should be maintained - no auxiliary verb contractions, lack of colloquial lexis...