



EAE ANG 2

SESSION 2017

AGREGATION CONCOURS EXTERNE

Section : LANGUES VIVANTES ÉTRANGÈRES
ANGLAIS

COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTE EN ANGLAIS

Durée : 6 heures

L'usage de tout ouvrage de référence, de tout dictionnaire et de tout matériel électronique (y compris la calculatrice) est rigoureusement interdit..

Dans le cas où un(e) candidat(e) repère ce qui lui semble être une erreur d'énoncé, il (elle) le signale très lisiblement sur sa copie, propose la correction et poursuit l'épreuve en conséquence.

De même, si cela vous conduit à formuler une ou plusieurs hypothèses, il vous est demandé de la (ou les) mentionner explicitement.

NB : La copie que vous rendrez ne devra, conformément au principe d'anonymat, comporter aucun signe distinctif, tel que nom, signature, origine, etc. Si le travail qui vous est demandé comporte notamment la rédaction d'un projet ou d'une note, vous devrez impérativement vous abstenir de signer ou de l'identifier.

Tournez la page S.V.P.

INFORMATION AUX CANDIDATS

Vous trouverez ci-après les codes nécessaires vous permettant de compléter les rubriques figurant en en-tête de votre copie.

Ces codes doivent être reportés sur chacune des copies que vous remettrez.

Concours	Section/option	Epreuve	Matière
EAE	0422A	102	2763

[...] George Bush's problem is not what he is, and not what he says, since (as the polls indicate) what he says is what most Americans say they believe. His problem is the Republican Party, which has failed to take advantage of the Reagan years to transform itself into the party of the majority. It is a party, therefore, that is more likely to lose elections than win when there is no special reason (an economic crisis, a foreign-policy crisis) to vote Republican. Precisely (and ironically) because things are going so relatively well for most Americans at this moment, precisely because unemployment is low, real income is up, and we look so good compared with the Soviets—because we are once again “standing tall”—these same Americans are inclined to return to the Democratic fold, their “natural” party, traditional party.

Many Republicans do appreciate this situation, which is why we hear so much talk about the need for the party to “reach out,” to convince voters that it is no longer the party of the business community or the country-club community. But “reaching out” is the wrong metaphor, implying as it does a certain condescension, perhaps even an exercise in political manipulation. The Republican Party shouldn't have to “reach out” to appeal to a majority of Americans. To an occasional minority, of course. But not to the majority—it should already be there.

The Reagan administration must bear a good part of the blame for the fact that it is not there. Like all Republican administrations since World War II, once in office it paid little attention to the mission of forming a majority party and concentrated its efforts on achieving a successful administration. But successful Republican administrations are, and will be, transient affairs so long as the Republican Party fails to overcome its historic disadvantage, the consequence of decades of political mistakes—errors of omission even more than errors of commission.

These errors are identical with those historians discern in the Republican Party's predecessor, the Federalist Party of the early 19th century. They can be summed up as: too narrow a base, too limited an appeal, and above all too exclusive an identity. A party that is more inclined to exclusiveness than inclusiveness is not likely to prosper in a democratic society.

It is very hard for leaders of the Republican Party to understand the problem they face. “What should we do?” they ask. When you tell them, they listen attentively and doubtless in all sincerity. But they proceed to make a purely symbolic gesture in response, and then go on as before, doing what comes naturally to them. Their real problem is that they are who they are and what they are—and who can criticize them for that? They just don't have the appropriate antennae, and so the messages continually being sent out by our ever-changing society are missed or muffled.

Lest there be any misunderstanding: The Republican Party is not the party of racial or ethnic discrimination. It may well have been in the past, but today it is genuinely and sincerely color-blind and ethnic-blind. If you are black or Jewish, or Greek, or Italian, or Hispanic, and are in all other respects just like the traditional Republicans who form the body of party regulars, the party will be happy to count you in. Otherwise—well, it will be grateful for your support. Today, the key to the failure of the Republican Party to develop the requisite absorptive capacity, of a kind a majority party needs, is not so much its ideology or its programs but its social complexion. [...]

Irving Kristol, “The Trouble With Republicans”, *Wall Street Journal*, August 22, 1988, p. 12.

