

Ministère de la culture et de la communication

Concours réservé « loi Sauvadet » pour l'accès au corps de conservateur du patrimoine, spécialités « archéologie », « monuments historiques et inventaire » et « musées », organisé au titre de l'année 2015

SESSION 2015

Épreuve orale d'admission n°2 : épreuve d'anglais

3 octobre 2016

La seconde épreuve d'admission consiste en une conversation dans une langue vivante étrangère à partir d'un texte.

La langue vivante étrangère faisant l'objet de cette épreuve est choisie par le candidat lors de l'inscription parmi les langues suivantes: allemand, anglais, arabe, chinois, espagnol, italien, japonais, russe, portugais, polonais.

(Préparation de l'épreuve : 30 minutes ; durée de l'épreuve : 30 minutes ; coefficient 1).

Avertissement :

- avant de commencer, vérifiez que le sujet qui vous a été remis comporte toutes les questions ; signalez aux surveillants tout de suite les anomalies éventuelles (page manquante, page illisible...).

Ce document comporte 2 pages au total.

SUJET n°8

Lexington | In Trump they trust

Why the Republican nominee does not need to concern himself with policy details



SHERIFF JOE ARPAIO of Maricopa County, Arizona—a law-and-order populist who styles himself “America’s toughest sheriff”—sets much store by his gut. His gut tells him that his county, a sun-frazzled expanse of retirement villages and shopping centres around Phoenix, is safer when foreigners with no legal right to be in America are tracked down and locked up. That same instinct made the sheriff an early supporter of Donald Trump, lauding the New York businessman as he promised to build a border wall and deport an estimated 11m migrants in the country without the right papers. The ferocity of “Sheriff Joe”, a gruff, bearlike 84-year-old, could yet send him to jail: a federal judge recently recommended that he be prosecuted for defying court orders to cease patrols that target people by race.

So it was striking, this week, to find Mr Arpaio rather relaxed after several days in which Mr Trump seemed to hint that his immigration policies might be about to soften—even to the point of giving interviews saying that he will focus deportation efforts on “bad guys” and other foreigners with criminal records, while pondering a more leisurely approach for those who have lived blameless working lives for many years.

Lexington caught up with Mr Arpaio at the headquarters of the Arizona Republican Party in Phoenix, a day before Mr Trump came to the city to spell out details of his policies on immigration, after a swift detour south of the border to meet President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico. Asked how he would feel if, after sorting through 11m migrants, a President Trump allowed several million to remain, Mr Arpaio replied: “I would live with it, he’s my guy,” adding, “Everybody has the right to change a little.” In Mr Arpaio’s telling, he will follow Mr Trump “to the end” because, unlike the cast of career politicians who also sought the Republican presidential nomination, the property tycoon is not seeking the presidency “for his own advantage”.

Motives matter a lot in Trump-world. A volunteer making telephone calls for Mr Trump at Republican headquarters in Phoenix, Diana Brest, says that Mr Trump can change any policy and have her vote. “I’ll forgive him, no matter what,” she says. She offered no such absolution to the Republican politicians who, during the presidential primary contest, called it unrealistic to say that 11m people can be thrown out. Politicians are “phony people”

who say things to look good, she asserts: they betray themselves with their “swifty eyes”.

Though more people have moved from America to Mexico this decade than have gone in the opposite direction, it is instructive to ask Trump supporters why they think that Congress and successive presidents, of both parties, have not sealed America’s borders. They have no truck with talk of complex problems that defy quick fixes. Instead they see a conspiracy to leave the law unenforced, born of ill-faith and corruption. When a politician changes his line on immigration it is a betrayal. When Mr Trump does it, it is further proof that he’s not a politician, which is good.

As it happens, Mr Trump’s big speech in Phoenix contained more to comfort his hardline base than to worry them. It followed a rather awkward performance in Mexico City, involving a press conference in which Mr Trump said that he had not discussed with Mr Peña Nieto his long-standing assertion that he will force Mexico to pay for his border wall. His Mexican host took to Twitter hours later to assert that he had begun their talks by making clear Mexico would not pay for a wall. Had Mr Peña Nieto said that to Mr Trump in front of the cameras, the day could have turned disastrous for the American. Those wondering what the trip was for received a part-answer a little later when Mr Trump contrasted himself with his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton. She had been invited to Mexico but not gone, Mr Trump told his Arizona audience, taking the chance to feed conspiracy theories that she is deathly ill by commenting: “She doesn’t have the strength or the stamina to make America great again.”

Mr Trump’s Phoenix rally began with testimony from a succession of speakers whose loved-ones were killed by illegal immigrants. “Countless Americans [...] would be alive today if not for the open-border policies of this administration,” Mr Trump said, with special emphasis on the case of a 64-year-old woman “sexually assaulted and beaten to death with a hammer”.

A tall, powerful, beautiful wall

The Republican vowed to triple the number of deportation officers in the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, with orders to move fast to remove criminals who have evaded justice, joking that on that basis they might deport Mrs Clinton (“lock her up” roared the crowd in Phoenix with delight). On Day One of his presidency, he would begin expelling what he called 2m “criminal aliens”, naming gang members, visa over-stayers and those on welfare as special targets. He pledged to start work on an “impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful” wall.

Dig a bit, and there were small nods to realism: he talked of setting “priorities” when enforcing immigration (as the Obama administration does), but added that no one who entered the country illegally would be “immune” from deportation. In plain English, he is ditching his promise to swiftly deport 11m, and instead proposing to leave perhaps 9m or more in the shadows, unless they are arrested or come to police attention for any reason.

His most chilling lines seemed to divide would-be immigrants along cultural and religious lines, saying America had to be honest that not every group can successfully assimilate. It has a sovereign right to choose “immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish,” he declared, which either means nothing or something rather frightening. It is also, at a practical level, impossible to implement. Mr Trump’s supporters do not care, leaving him free to say what he wants on immigration or anything else. His actual policies do not have much to do with it. ■