Banque commune d'épreuves des écoles de management (BCE), France

Session 2026, filière ECG

Langue vivante A : anglais (ELVi)

Durée : 4 heures

Ce que traite le sujet

- I. Compréhension : résumé analytique comparatif
- II. Expression personnelle : essai argumenté
- III. Traduction du français en anglais (thème)

Sujet reproduit sans retouche à partir de la page suivante.

Résumé des parties, chapitres de cours liés et autres années :
prepahelp.com/annales/bce/ecg/2026/lva-anglais

Prepa Help ne revendique aucun droit sur le sujet, propriété de l'organisateur du concours.

Code sujet : 75 GB

BANQUE COMMUNE D'ÉPREUVES

Conception : BANQUE ELVi

emlyon BS – ESCP BS – ESSEC BS – HEC Paris

_____

LANGUE VIVANTE A

FILIÈRE ÉCONOMIQUE et COMMERCIALE & FILIÈRE LITTÉRAIRE

Mardi 28 avril 2026 de 14h à 18h

_____

ALLEMAND – ANGLAIS – ESPAGNOL

Durée : 4 heures

N.B. :
Les candidats ne sont pas autorisés à modifier le choix effectué lors de l'inscription de la langue vivante A dans laquelle ils doivent composer.
Aucun document n'est autorisé.
L'utilisation de toute calculatrice et de tout matériel électronique est interdite.
Si au cours de l'épreuve, un candidat repère ce qui lui semble être une erreur d'énoncé, il la signalera sur sa copie et poursuivra sa composition en expliquant les raisons des initiatives qu'il sera amené à prendre.

Tournez la page SVP

LVA ANGLAIS

****

Ce sujet comporte les 5 documents suivants :

- **Document 1** - *Can ICE Stop People Solely Based on Their Race?*, The New York Times, October 24, 2025
- **Document 2 -** *Starmer urges Europe's leaders to curb ECHR to halt rise of far right,* The Guardian, December 9, 2025
- **Document 3 -** *Face au vent xénophobe, il faut considérer l'immigration comme une question non pas morale, mais économique et sociale*, Le Monde, 21 septembre 2025
- **Document 4 - Image –** Instagram, January 23, 2026
- **Document 5 - Image –** The Guardian, December 2, 2025

I – COMPRÉHENSION : RÉSUMÉ ANALYTIQUE COMPARATIF

Répondre dans la langue cible à la question posée en 350 mots (+ ou - 10%) en identifiant et en comparant les informations pertinentes dans les documents 1 et 2 du dossier, sans commentaire personnel ni paraphrase.

How do the legal and political debates about immigration reflect the tensions between national security and human rights in the US and UK today?

II - EXPRESSION PERSONNELLE : ESSAI ARGUMENTÉ

Répondre dans la langue cible à la question posée en 500 mots (+ ou - 10%), en réagissant au contenu du dossier, sans paraphraser celui-ci, tout en développant son opinion personnelle. Vous devez illustrer votre argumentation avec des exemples culturels, civilisationnels et/ou historiques du monde anglophone.

In your opinion, to what extent do the current policies and rhetoric about immigration reflect political and economic challenges faced by the US and the UK?

III - TRADUCTION DU FRANÇAIS EN ANGLAIS (THÈME)

Traduire uniquement les parties du texte indiquées en français en gras et entre crochets.

de [Les excités nationalistes**… à …**sur l'immigration.]

Document 1

"Can ICE Stop People Solely Based on Their Race?", Jazmine Ulloa, *The New York Times*, October 24, 2025

For decades, federal officers have had to rely on more than race or ethnicity to stop and question someone over citizenship. That is now being tested.

Again and again in Chicago and elsewhere in recent weeks, masked federal agents have accosted people who appear to be Latino, and have confronted them with questions about their immigration status.

Targeting people for immigration enforcement based on race or ethnicity alone was forbidden by the U.S. Supreme Court in a unanimous decision 50 years ago. After all, it's impossible to determine the immigration statuses of people simply by looking at them. So for decades, agents seeking to question people about their citizenship were supposed to rely on more than just appearance.

But as President Trump has intensified his mass deportation campaign, roving patrols that have targeted predominantly Latino communities have become a key part of the administration's playbook. And whether the tactics are legal appears to be an open question, one likely to be decided by the Supreme Court.

Lawsuits challenging the administration's sweeps in Los Angeles and elsewhere are making their way through the courts. The outcomes could redefine the limits on the discretion officers have to stop, question and detain people over their immigration statuses and how much race and ethnicity can play into those decisions.

"We are in nebulous land," said Mark Fleming, a lawyer at the National Immigrant Justice Center, which is representing plaintiffs in Chicago. "We have never seen this type of enforcement on the streets ever."

Last month, in an emergency ruling in the Los Angeles suit, the Supreme Court said federal agents there could question people about their immigration statuses based solely on factors such as race or ethnicity or another spoken language or accented English.

The decision isn't final, as it overturned the temporary prohibition imposed by a federal judge on officers while she hears arguments on the case. But like many of the justices' emergency decisions since the start of the new administration, the ruling appeared to signal substantial deference to the executive branch under President Trump and the possibility that the court would ultimately side with him should it ultimately issue an opinion on the case.

It is one of four legal challenges nationwide aiming to curb the warrantless arrests and traffic stops that have become a defining element of the Trump administration's mass deportation campaign.

But even as the lawyers mounting the challenges are hoping to affirm constitutional limits on such immigration stops and apprehensions, experts warn that the lawsuits could end up further emboldening officers to use race or ethnicity in immigration enforcement.

Thomas Coffin was part of the government legal team in the case that led to the 1975 Supreme Court ruling that race could not be the sole factor in immigration stops. Though he and his colleagues lost the case, Mr. Coffin, now 80, said the decision and others had established crucial rights to privacy. But whether they govern the federal agents conducting sweeps on American streets today is, he said, "the $64,000 question."

During the mass deportation campaign, Latinos have been stopped while driving gardening and landscaping trucks. They have been questioned and detained at bus stops and street corners where laborers gather to wait for work. They have been rounded up at farms, carwashes and construction sites. […]

In Chicago, where ICE tactics have escalated in recent weeks, lawyers say they have identified dozens of arrests that have violated a 2022 consent decree that covered six Midwestern states. The order — stemming from a 2018 class-action lawsuit that immigrant and civil rights groups filed against the first Trump administration on behalf of five immigrants — restricted federal immigration agents from apprehending and holding people without a warrant.

In court filings, government lawyers have asserted that federal agents are trained in the Fourth Amendment, which prohibits "unreasonable searches and seizures," and that they should not be hobbled in their efforts to target unauthorized immigrants.

Civil and immigrant rights groups have said the dragnets in different cities have violated the Constitution: Federal agents routinely approach people with brown skin or whom they perceive to be Latinos or immigrants. The agents ask who the people are and where they are from. If people refuse to answer or attempt to leave, they are held or handcuffed and sometimes subdued. […]

In a dissent, Justice Sonia Sotomayor said that the court's decision eroded freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. "We should not have to live in a country where the Government can seize anyone who looks Latino, speaks Spanish, and appears to work a low wage job," she said. […]

Document 2

"Starmer urges Europe's leaders to curb ECHR to halt rise of far right", Pippa Crerar and Rajeev Syal, *The Guardian*, December 9, 2025

PM calls for members of European convention on human rights to allow tougher action to protect borders

Keir Starmer has called on European leaders to urgently curb joint human rights laws so that member states can take tougher action to protect their borders and see off the rise of the populist right across the continent.

Before a crucial European summit on Wednesday, the prime minister urged fellow members to "go further" in modernising the interpretation of the European convention on human rights (ECHR) to prevent asylum seekers using it to avoid deportation.

But Labour has been condemned for calling for changes, with human rights campaigners, Labour peers and some MPs arguing they could open the door to countries abandoning some of the world's most vulnerable people.

Critics of the government's asylum changes also argue that the prime minister should not be diluting protections that pander to the right, amid deepening concerns from charities that its rhetoric could demonise refugees.

On the eve of the Council of Europe summit in Strasbourg, the actors Michael Palin, Stephen Fry and Joanna Lumley were among 21 well-known figures calling on Starmer to drop plans to weaken human rights law and instead "take a principled stand" for torture victims.

Under sweeping changes announced last month, the government said it wanted to introduce measures to stop asylum seekers using their rights in the ECHR to a family life to avoid deportation. The Conservatives and Reform UK have called for withdrawal from the convention altogether.

But writing for the Guardian, the prime minister said that updating the interpretation of the convention was urgently required to confront the challenges posed by mass migration – and far-right forces that sought to divide mainstream opinion across Europe.

“The best way of fighting against the forces of hate and division, is to show that mainstream, progressive politics can fix this problem,” he wrote in a joint article with the Danish leader, Mette Frederiksen.

“Listening to legitimate concerns and acting on them is what our politics is about. That’s not empty populism, it’s democracy. We are determined to show that our societies can act with compassion while upholding law and order, and fairness.”

The two leaders called on European allies to go further in tackling the shared challenge of migration by modernising the ECHR to reflect the challenges of the 21st century.

“Europe has faced big tests before and we have overcome them by acting together. Now we must do so again. Otherwise, the forces that seek to divide us will grow stronger.” […]

The government has already said it will legislate to clarify how article 8, the right to a private life, is interpreted in the domestic courts in regard to immigration rules.

Lammy is expected to argue on Wednesday that the ECHR could also be reinterpreted to limit the scope of rights under article 3, which prohibits torture and “degrading treatment”.

This could, for example, include higher thresholds for prison conditions or access to healthcare abroad where it currently prevents extradition or deportation from the UK.

The deputy prime minister will reassert the UK’s commitment to the ECHR, saying that pulling out would be a “fake solution” that would undermine every international agreement on national and border security.

At the summit, he is expected to say: “We must strike a careful balance between individual rights and the public’s interest, otherwise we risk a loss of confidence in the convention, and in human rights themselves.

“The definition of ‘family life’ can’t be stretched to prevent the removal of people with no right to remain in the country … The threshold of ‘inhuman and degrading treatment’ must be constrained to the most serious issues. […]

The sweeping changes to the UK asylum system came against the backdrop of Nigel Farage’s Reform UK attracting support because of the failure of successive governments to stop unauthorised small boat crossings in the Channel and unease about the use of hotels to house asylum seekers. […]

Some Labour MPs, charities and legal experts have warned that if a country such as the UK waters down the application of article 3, then less scrupulous nations could follow suit, with horrific implications.

Veronika Fikfak, a professor of international law at University College London, said a change to the anti-torture provisions within the ECHR “touches the very core” of the convention.

“Prohibition of torture and inhuman and degrading treatment is an absolute right. It allows for no balancing. There is no margin of appreciation for states, nor any deference to them,” she said. […]

Document 3

« Face au vent xénophobe, il faut considérer l'immigration comme une question non pas morale, mais économique et sociale », Philippe Bernard, *Le Monde*, 21 septembre 2025

Prétendre (...) que l'ampleur de ce sujet résulte d'abord d'une instrumentalisation politicienne reflète une forme de cécité.

Les signaux d'alarme sur l'état des démocraties ne manquent pas en ces temps de déstabilisation générale. Mais les slogans xénophobes scandés par plus de 110 000 manifestants, le 13 septembre, en plein Westminster, cœur du pouvoir britannique, résonnent comme un tocsin. Au Royaume-Uni, pays du monde où la démocratie parlementaire paraît le plus enracinée, et où la population, fière de sa résistance au nazisme, se considère comme immuablement « modérée » et imperméable à l'extrémisme, voilà que l'extrême droite tient la rue tout en menaçant dans les urnes.

[Les excités nationalistes qui ont affronté la police au cri de « Renvoyez-les !» se conjuguent désormais avec les bataillons d'électeurs qui grossissent les rangs du parti anti-immigrés Reform UK.

Avec 31 % des intentions de vote, la formation de Nigel Farage, inspirateur du Brexit, domine aujourd'hui, loin devant le Labour au pouvoir (20 %) et les tories (16 %). Du jamais-vu depuis un siècle rythmé par l'alternance ininterrompue au pouvoir entre ces deux grands partis.

Déjà, en 2014, la xénophobie avait été l'un des principaux moteurs du divorce avec l'Union européenne (UE), accusée de faciliter l'entrée incontrôlée de travailleurs d'Europe de l'Est. Depuis la sortie de l'UE, les Polonais ont cessé de pouvoir s'installer librement au Royaume-Uni, mais ils ont été remplacés par un nombre record, bien plus élevé, de ressortissants de l'ex-empire britannique.

Non seulement le Brexit – dont seuls 32 % des Britanniques pensent aujourd'hui que c'était une bonne décision – n'a pas tenu sa promesse de « reprendre le contrôle » des frontières, mais il a exacerbé la controverse sur l'immigration, encore envenimée par la politique de Donald Trump. Au point que Vernon Bogdanor, sommité britannique du droit constitutionnel, mette en garde, dans le *Guardian*, contre la « panique morale » que peut engendrer une « rhétorique incendiaire » sur l'immigration.]

Document 4

Cartoon: Instagram @goldenboyftw, retrieved January 23, 2026



Document 5

Cartoon: Ben Jennings, *The Guardian*, December 2, 2025



**Paddington Bear is a character from a children's book; in the story, he arrives in London as a stowaway on a boat from Peru*

Tournez la page SVP

Travailler les chapitres de ce sujet

Prepa Help suit le programme d'ECG chapitre par chapitre : cours détaillé, méthodes, pièges, exercices et problèmes corrigés pas à pas, tirés des concours. L'essai gratuit donne accès aux chapitres offerts de ta filière, sans carte bancaire.

Chapitres liés à ce sujet

- Méthode : la synthèse de textes

Ouvrir l'essai gratuit

Scanne le code ou clique sur le bouton.

prepahelp.com/#essai

Une question sur le concours ou sur ta filière : **écrire sur WhatsApp**

Les autres années et épreuves : prepahelp.com/annales/bce/ecg