



CONCOURS CENTRALE-SUPÉLEC

Anglais

TSI

2023

4 heures

Calculatrice interdite

L'usage de tout système électronique ou informatique est interdit dans cette épreuve.

Rédiger en anglais et en 400 mots une synthèse des documents proposés, qui devra obligatoirement comporter un titre. Indiquer avec précision, à la fin du travail, le nombre de mots utilisés (titre inclus), un écart de 10% en plus ou en moins sera accepté.

Ce sujet comporte les 4 documents suivants :

- une affiche de l'*American League against War and Fascism* (1936) ;
- un article de Keith RATHBONE, paru dans *The Conversation* le 5 février 2018 ;
- un extrait d'un article de Meredith MCCLEARY, publié dans *Northeastern university political review* le 26 février 2019 ;
- un extrait d'un article de George ORWELL, paru dans *Tribune* le 14 décembre 1945.

L'ordre dans lequel se présentent les documents est arbitraire et ne revêt aucune signification particulière.



THE CONVERSATION

Despite good intentions, the Olympics has its limits in promoting peace

Keith RATHBONE, February 5, 2018

The announcement that North and South Korean athletes would march together under one flag at the 2018 Winter Olympics in Pyeongchang and field a joint women's hockey team has been hailed as a sports diplomatic breakthrough.

Diplomatic overtures during sporting events are not unusual. Sports have long been seen as apolitical spaces where athletes from adversarial countries can mingle, become friends and overcome the chauvinism that leads to war.

The promotion of world peace is one of the Olympic movement's stated goals. The Olympic Charter urges leaders:

... to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity.

But despite Olympic organisers' powerful rhetoric, they have only very limited ability to promote peace between warring nations.

Since the refoundation of the Olympic Games, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) has asked countries to respect the historic tradition of the Olympic Truce during the competition.

The Olympic Truce was a crucial component of Ancient Greek Games. Every four years, hundreds of athletes from across Greece met at Olympia under the protection of a sacred truce (*ekecheria*) that brought a halt to the yearly cycle of violent city-state warfare and inaugurated a month-long festival of athleticism.

The truce made the Games possible: it allowed athletes and spectators to travel in complete safety to participate.

The notion of an Olympic Truce re-emerged when the modern Olympics resumed in 1894. The IOC's founder, Pierre de Coubertin, hoped the competition would promote world peace. He said:

Wars break out because nations misunderstand each other. We shall not have peace until the prejudices which now separate the different races shall have been outlived. To attain this end, what better means than to bring the youth of all countries periodically together for amicable trials of muscular strength and agility.

[...]

The Olympic Games have provided several opportunities for international reconciliation, particularly during the global upheaval of the 1990s.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, athletes from 12 of the former Soviet republics competed as members of a unified team at the 1992 Barcelona Olympics. The unified athletes took home more medals than any other team. Their victories were seen as a symbol of "hope, solidarity, and sportsmanship over totalitarianism".

Similarly, during the wars in the Balkans, the IOC co-ordinated to allow athletes from the post-Yugoslavian states to compete. At the 1994 Lillehammer Olympics the Bosnian-Herzegovina Olympic Committee fielded a mixed bobsled team with Russian Orthodox, Catholic and Muslim athletes.

The Olympic Truce continues to be a priority for sport administrators because they see sport as able to promote peace globally and in local communities.

In 1993, the IOC reached out to the United Nations, which passed a resolution calling for a global ceasefire during the Lillehammer Games. The UN has renewed that resolution for every subsequent Olympics.

In 2000, the IOC founded the International Olympic Truce Foundation and adopted the dove as an Olympic symbol. The 2012 London Olympics was the first in which every nation present – 193 countries – signed onto an Olympic Truce.

The IOC's current peace initiatives include preventing youth violence in Colombia, anti-crime projects in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, and community pilot programs for peace in Jamaica.

However, the Olympics did not end either of the two world wars. War actually stopped Olympic Games from taking place: they were not held between 1912 and 1920, and 1936 and 1948.

North and South Korea remain technically at war despite the two countries having competed together or marched under a unified flag nine times since the 2000 Sydney Olympics.

The Olympics can also provoke international confrontations or be a site where international tensions are played out. The Nazi regime used the 1936 Berlin Olympics to promote their fascist and racist agenda. Contemporaries understood these Games as a confrontation between democracy and totalitarianism.

Throughout the Cold War, the US and the Soviet Union channelled their international conflict through the Olympics. When the Cold War warmed up in the 1980s, each side boycotted the Olympics once: the US

stayed home during the 1980 Moscow Olympics and the Russians responded with a boycott of the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics.

Palestinian terrorists targeted Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympics. More recently, Arab athletes from Saudi Arabia, Syria and Egypt routinely forfeit matches or withdraw from competition rather than compete against Israeli athletes.

In 1912, de Coubertin wrote an ode to Olympic peace. The sixth stanza begins:

O Sport, You are Peace! You forge happy bonds between the peoples... Through you the young of the entire world learn to respect one another.

However, sport's ability to overcome war remains limited.

northeastern university political review

Politics and Sports: A Long and Complicated Relationship

by Meredith MCCLEARY, February 26, 2019

In recent years, as the American political sphere has become more polarized, news pundits, online commentators, and politicians have repeatedly declared that professional athletes are “out-of-touch-millionaires” who should “shut up and dribble.” Players such as Colin Kaepernick, LeBron James, Stephen Curry, and Richard Sherman have pushed back against the ‘white-lash’ to become more politicized. But are these assumptions that athletes have only recently grown more political accurate? This question has a long and complicated answer, often overshadowed by personal political beliefs and the debate over the rights of athletes to use their platform to share their opinions.

To understand the relationship between sports and politics, one needs to first understand the relationship between sports and society. Going back millennia, pastimes and sports have symbolized societies' values and provided a glimpse into how people spent their free time. The Mayans used sports to determine who to use for ritual sacrifices. Medieval kings held competitions to show their wealth, allowing the knights to prove their battle prowess and chivalry. Gladiators were often defeated enemies of Rome forced into slavery for entertainment.

Sports, like movies and music, have also been an aspect of imperialism, both historically and culturally. For example, the popularity of cricket in India, brought to the country by British sailors during the British Empire, which has continued to be the most popular sport in India, long after independence from Great Britain. Today, NBA tours of China, plus NFL and MLB visits to London, are cultural exports that create intercultural connections but also establish soft power.

Leaders, autocrats, and powerful individuals have frequently used sports to assert their political dominance. In 1936, Hitler attempted to use the Olympics to show off his regime and its ideologies to the rest of the world, but was undermined by Jesse Owens. Owens, an African-American track and field athlete, made

a political statement when he won four gold medals, beating the athletes representing Hitler's Germany on their home turf. Owens' motivation for victory was never explicitly political, but due to the climate surrounding the Games, he had made a statement nonetheless.

The Olympics, both ancient and modern, have always been political. In ancient Greece, independent city-states came together to discuss politics, form political and military alliances, and celebrate military victories, all while their representatives competed in races and games of strength. Modern Olympics have also seen increased political activity, especially in the past half-century. From the 1968 Mexico City Olympics—where U.S. Olympians Tommie Smith and John Carlos raised their fists in solidarity with the black power movement—to the 1972 Munich Olympics—where 11 Israeli athletes were kidnapped and killed by a Palestinian terrorist group—politics have shone through the veil of non-political competition that is often touted by the International Olympic Committee.

At the national level, American athletes also have a history of taking political stances. One of the most notable examples is Muhammad Ali, who stood against the Vietnam War very early on, and refused to serve in the army. He was banned from boxing by U.S. authorities because of his stance, and soon became a figure of black power and the Civil Rights Movement. More recently, basketball's biggest star, LeBron James, said that NFL team owners have a “slave mentality.” [...]

Recently, more and more professional players are using their platforms to exercise their political views and support wider conversations about civil rights. This has prompted a violent reaction by fans who see their protests as disrespectful. In response to the silent protests, some team owners have also implemented rules restricting player protests on game days, with many interpreting this as suppression of speech and an infringement on players' rights. Originally, to

address the growing controversy, the NFL passed an anthem policy in May 2018, in tandem with the NFL owners. This policy stated that any player on the field was required to stand, but alternatively players could remain in the locker room during the anthem. Under this policy, teams could be fined if players knelt on the field, rather than staying in the locker room as their form of protest. By July, the NFL Players' Association and NFL announced that the policy would be repealed and left it up to individual teams to create their own national anthem policy.

Throughout history, sports have usually been seen as leisure for the majority of the population, separate from serious matters of politics and influence. But sports have always played some role in the distribution and use of power, particularly as a show of national strength on an international stage. Today's athletes are taking more of the political power that comes with their platform and using it to explore and amplify their agendas. This reflects the populist movements of recent years and cannot be discounted. Players are no longer going to "shut up and dribble."

[...]

The Sporting Spirit

By George ORWELL, *Tribune*, December 14, 1945

I am always amazed when I hear people saying that sport creates goodwill between the nations, and that if only the common peoples of the world could meet one another at football or cricket, they would have no inclination to meet on the battlefield. Even if one didn't know from concrete examples (the 1936 Olympic Games, for instance) that international sporting contests lead to orgies of hatred, one could deduce it from general principles.

Nearly all the sports practised nowadays are competitive. You play to win, and the game has little meaning unless you do your utmost to win. On the village green, where you pick up sides and no feeling of local patriotism is involved, it is possible to play simply for the fun and exercise: but as soon as the question of prestige arises, as soon as you feel that you and some larger unit will be disgraced if you lose, the most savage combative instincts are aroused. Anyone who has played even in a school football match knows this. At the international level sport is frankly mimic warfare. But the significant thing is not the behaviour of the players but the attitude of the spectators: and, behind the spectators, of the nations who worked themselves into furies over these absurd contests, and seriously believe — at any rate for short periods — that running, jumping and kicking a ball are tests of national virtue.

Even a leisurely game like cricket, demanding grace rather than strength, can cause much ill-will, as we saw in the controversy over bodyline bowling and over the rough tactics of the Australian team that visited England in 1921. Football, a game in which everyone gets hurt and every nation has its own style of play which seems unfair to foreigners, is far worse. Worst of all is boxing. One of the most horrible sights in the world is a fight between white and coloured boxers before a mixed audience. But a boxing audience is always disgusting, and the behaviour of the women, in particular, is such that the army, I believe, does not allow them to attend their contests. At any rate two or three years ago, when Home Guards and regular troops were holding a boxing tournament, I was placed on guard at the door of the hall, with orders to keep the women out.

[...] As soon as strong feelings of rivalry are aroused, the notion of playing the game according to the rules always vanishes. People want to see one side on top and the other side humiliated, and they forget that victory gained through cheating or through the intervention of the crowd is meaningless. Even when the spectators don't intervene physically they try to influence the game by cheering their own side and "rattling" opposing players with boos and insults. Serious sport has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy, boastfulness, disregard of all rules and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence: in other words it is war minus the shooting.