

ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

Durée : 6 heures

Analysez et commentez, **en anglais**, les documents suivants :

Document n°1: Extract from the statement by the Right Honourable David Lloyd George, "British War Aims", House of Commons, 5th January, 1918 (Authorised Version as published by the British Government, New York: George H. Doran Company).

We are told that it is not the intention of the Central Powers to appropriate forcibly any occupied territories or to rob of its independence any nation which has lost its political independence during the war. It is obvious that almost any scheme of conquest and annexation could be perpetrated within the literal interpretation of such a
5 pledge. Does it mean that Belgium, and Serbia, Montenegro and Romania will be as independent and as free to direct their own destinies as the German or any other nation? Or does it mean that all manner of interference and restrictions, political and economic, incompatible with the status and dignity of a free and self-respecting people, are to be imposed? If this is the intention then there will be one kind of independence for a great
10 nation and an inferior kind of independence for a small nation. We must know what is meant for equality of right among nations, small as well as great, is one of the fundamental issues this country and her Allies are fighting to establish in this war. (...)

The rest of the so-called 'offer' of the Central Powers is almost entirely a refusal of all concessions. All suggestions about the autonomy of subject nationalities are ruled
15 out of the peace terms altogether. The question whether any form of self-government is to be given to Arabs, Armenians or Syrians is declared to be entirely a matter for the Sublime Porte. A pious wish for the protection of minorities "in so far as it is practically realisable" is the nearest approach to liberty which the Central statesmen venture to make. On one point only are they perfectly clear and definite. Under no circumstances
20 will the "German demand" for the restoration of the whole of Germany's colonies be departed from. All principles of self-determination or, as our earlier phrase goes, government by consent of the governed, here vanish into thin air.

It is impossible to believe that any edifice of permanent peace could be erected on such a foundation as this. Mere lip-service to the formula of no annexations and no
25 indemnities or the right of self-determination is useless. Before any negotiations can even be begun, the Central Powers must realise the essential facts of the situation. The days of the Treaty of Vienna are long past. We can no longer submit the future of European civilisation to the arbitrary decisions of a few negotiators striving to secure by chicanery or persuasion the interests of this or that dynasty or nation. The settlement of
30 the new Europe must be based on such grounds of reason and justice as will give some promise of stability. Therefore, it is that we feel that government with the consent of the governed must be the basis of any territorial settlement in this war. (...)

The first requirement, therefore, always put forward by the British Government and their Allies, has been the complete restoration, political, territorial and economic, of
35 the independence of Belgium. (...) Before there can be any hope for a stable peace, this great breach of the public law of Europe must be repudiated and, so far as possible,

repaired. Reparation means recognition. Unless international right is recognised by insistence on payment for injury done in defiance of its canons it can never be a reality.

40 Next comes the restoration of Serbia, Montenegro and the occupied parts of France, Italy and Romania. The complete withdrawal of the alien armies and the reparation for injustice done is a fundamental condition of permanent peace. (...) The democracy of this country means to stand to the last by the democracies of France and Italy and all our other Allies. We shall be proud to fight to the end side by side with the new democracy of Russia, so will America and so will France and Italy. But if the
45 present rulers of Russia take action which is independent of their Allies we have no means of intervening to arrest the catastrophe which is assuredly befalling their country. Russia can only be saved by her own people. We believe, however, that an independent Poland comprising all those genuinely Polish elements who desire to form part of it, is an urgent necessity for the stability of Western Europe. Similarly, though we agree with
50 President Wilson that the break-up of Austria-Hungary is no part of our war aims, we feel that unless genuine self-government on true democratic principles is granted to those Austro-Hungarian nationalities who have long desired it, it is impossible to hope for the removal of those causes of unrest in that part of Europe which have so long threatened its general peace. On the same grounds we regard as vital the satisfaction of
55 the legitimate claims of the Italians for union with those of their own race and tongue. We also mean to press that justice be done to men of Romanian blood and speech in their legitimate aspirations. If these conditions are fulfilled Austria-Hungary would become a power whose strength would conduce to the permanent peace and freedom of Europe, instead of being merely an instrument to the pernicious military autocracy of
60 Prussia, which uses the resources of its allies for the furtherance of its own sinister purposes.

Outside Europe, we believe that the same principles should be applied. While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean
65 and the Black Sea being internationalised and neutralised, Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine are in our judgment entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions. What the exact form of that recognition in each particular case should be need not here be discussed, beyond stating that it would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred. (...) With regard to the German colonies, I have repeatedly declared that they are held at the
70 disposal of a conference whose decision must have primary regard to the wishes and interests of the native inhabitants of such colonies. None of those territories are inhabited by Europeans. The governing consideration, therefore, in all these cases must be that the inhabitants should be placed under the control of an administration, acceptable to themselves, one of whose main purposes will be to prevent their
75 exploitation for the benefit of European capitalists or governments. The natives live in their various tribal organisations under chiefs and councils who are competent to consult and speak for their tribes and members and thus to represent their wishes and interests in regard to their disposal. The general principle of national self-determination is, therefore, as applicable in their cases as in those of occupied European territories.
80 (...) The German treatment of their native populations in their colonies has been such as amply to justify their fear of submitting the future of those colonies to the wishes of the natives themselves.

Finally, there must be reparation for injuries done in violation of international
85 law. The Peace Conference must not forget our seamen and the services they have rendered to, and the outrages they have suffered for the common cause of freedom. (...)

The crushing weight of modern armaments, the increasing evil of compulsory military service, the vast waste of wealth and effort involved in warlike preparation, these are blots on our civilisation of which every thinking individual must be ashamed. For these
90 and other similar reasons, we are confident that a great attempt must be made to establish by some international organisation an alternative to war as a means of settling international disputes. After all, war is a relic of barbarism and, just as law has succeeded violence as the means of settling disputes between individuals, so we believe
95 that it is destined ultimately to take the place of war in the settlement of controversies between nations.

Document n°2: Winston S. Churchill, *The Second World War*, Volume Three, *The Grand Alliance*, Chapter XXIV, "The Atlantic Charter", London: Cassell, 1950, pp. 385-388.

President Roosevelt told me at one of our first conversations that he thought it would be well if we could draw up a joint declaration laying down certain broad principles which should guide our policies along the same road. Wishing to follow up this most helpful suggestion, I gave him the next day, August 10, a tentative outline of such a declaration.
5 My text was as follows:

JOINT ANGLO-AMERICAN DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr.
10 Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together to resolve and concert the means of providing for the safety of their respective countries in the face of Nazi and German aggression and of the dangers to all peoples arising therefrom, deem it right to make known certain principles which they both accept for guidance in the framing of their policy and on which they base their hopes
15 for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government
20 under which they will live. They are only concerned to defend the rights of freedom of speech and thought, without which such choice must be illusory.

Fourth, they will strive to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of essential produce, not only within their territorial boundaries, but between the nations of the world.

25 Fifth, they seek a peace which will not only cast down for ever the Nazi tyranny, but by effective international organisation will afford to all States and peoples the means of dwelling in security within their own bounds and of traversing the seas and oceans without fear of lawless assault or the need of maintaining burdensome armaments.

Considering all the tales of my reactionary, Old World outlook, and the pain this is said to have caused the President, I am glad it should be on record that the substance and spirit of what came to be called the "Atlantic Charter" was in its first draft a British production cast in my own words.

35 August 11 promised to be a day of intense business.

40 [*Prime Minister to Admiralty*, 11 Aug 41: Utmost strength to be put on deciphering telegrams from here during next twenty-four hours.]

45 At our meeting in the morning the President gave me a revised draft, which we took as a basis for discussion. The only serious difference from what I had written was

about the fourth point (access to raw materials). The President wished to insert the words "without discrimination and on equal terms". The President also proposed two extra paragraphs:

50 Sixth, they desire such a peace to establish for all safety on the high seas and oceans.

Seventh, they believe that all the nations of the world must be guided in spirit to the abandonment of the use of force. Because no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, to use force outside of their frontiers, they believe that the disarmament of
55 such nations is essential. They will further the adoption of all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

(...) There followed a detailed discussion of the revised text of the declaration. Several
60 minor alterations were easily agreed. The chief difficulties were presented by points 4 and 7, especially the former. With regard to this, I pointed out at once that the words "without discrimination" might be held to call in question the Ottawa agreements, and I was in no position to accept them. This text would certainly have to be referred to the Government at home, and, if it was desired to maintain the present wording, to the
65 Governments in the Dominions. I should have little hope that it would be accepted. Mr. Sumner Welles indicated that this was the core of the matter, and that this paragraph embodied the ideal for which the State Department had striven for the past nine years. I could not help mentioning the British experience in adhering to Free Trade for eighty years in the face of ever-mounting American tariffs. We had allowed the fullest
70 importations into all our colonies. Even our coastwise traffic around Great Britain was open to the competition of the world. All we had got in reciprocation was successive doses of American protection. Mr. Welles seemed to be a little taken aback. I then said that if the words "with due respect for their existing obligations" could be inserted, and if the words "without discrimination" could disappear, and "trade" be substituted for
75 "markets", I should be able to refer the text to His Majesty's Government with some hope that they would be able to accept it. The President was obviously impressed. He never pressed the point again.

80 As regards the generalities of Point 7, I pointed out that while I accepted this text, opinion in England would be disappointed at the absence of any intention to establish an international organisation for keeping peace after the war. I promised to try to find a suitable modification, and later in the day I suggested to the President the addition to the second sentence of the words "pending the establishment of a wider and more permanent system of general security".

Document n°3: Students for a Democratic Society, “A Call to all Students to March on Washington to End the War in Vietnam”, April 17, 1965 (SDS Archives, State Historical Society of Wisconsin in Madison).

The current war in Vietnam is being waged on behalf of a succession of unpopular South Vietnamese dictatorships, not on behalf of freedom. No American-supported South Vietnamese regime in the past few years has gained the support of its people, for the simple reason that the people overwhelmingly want peace, self-determination, and the opportunity for development. American prosecution of the war has deprived all

5 them of all three.

- The war is fundamentally a *civil* war, waged by South Vietnamese against their government; it is not ‘a war of aggression’. Military assistance from North Vietnam and China has been minimal; most guerrilla weapons are home-made or are captured

10 American arms. The areas of strongest guerrilla control are the areas adjacent to North Vietnam. And the people could not and cannot be isolated from the guerrillas by forced settlement in ‘strategic hamlets’; again and again the Government military attacks fail because the people tip off the guerrillas; the people and the guerrillas are inseparable. Each repressive Government policy, each napalm bomb, each instance of torture,

15 creates more guerrillas. Further, what foreign weapons the guerrillas have obtained are small arms, and are no match for the bombers and helicopters operated by the Americans. The US government is the only foreign government that has sent major weapons to Vietnam. (...)

- It is a *self-defeating* war. If the US objective is to guarantee self-determination in

20 South Vietnam, that objective is far better served by allowing the South Vietnamese to choose their own government—something provided for by the 1954 Geneva Agreement but sabotaged in 1956 by the American-supported dictator Ngo Dinh Diem and never allowed since. The Diem government that invited US intervention was thus illegitimate, having violated the agreement that established it. The Vietnamese, North and South,

25 have no taste for Chinese domination—these two countries have fought one another for over a thousand years. Moreover, South Vietnam is not a ‘domino’—the ‘threat’ to it is internal, not Chinese, and the greater threat to stability in other Southeast Asian countries is US-inspired provocation of China, not China’s own plans. (...)

- It is a war never declared by Congress, although it costs almost two million dollars a day and has cost billions of dollars since the US began its involvement. The facts of the war have been systematically concealed by the US government for years, making it appear as if those expenditures have been helping the Vietnamese people. These factors erode the honesty and decency of American political life, and make democracy at home impossible. We are outraged that two million dollars a day is expended for a war on the

30 poor in Vietnam, while government financing is so desperately needed to abolish poverty at home. *What kind of America is it whose response to poverty and oppression in South Vietnam is napalm and defoliation, whose response to poverty and oppression in Mississippi is... silence?*

- It is a hideously *immoral* war. America is committing pointless murder.

40 But the signs are plain that Americans are increasingly disaffected by this state of affairs. To draw together, express, and enlarge the number of these voices of protest, and to make this sentiment visible, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) is calling for a MARCH ON WASHINGTON TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM.

We urge the participation of all students who agree with us that the war in Vietnam

45 injures both Vietnamese and Americans, and should be stopped.

The March, to be held on Saturday, April 17, 1965, will include a picketing of the White House, a march down the Mall to the Capitol Building to present a statement to Congress, and a meeting with both student and adult speakers.

Document n°4: President George W. Bush, Address at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, New York—For Immediate Release—Office of the Press Secretary, September 21, 2004.
(<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/09/print/20040921-3.html>)

PRESIDENT BUSH: Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen: (...)

5 The United Nations and my country share the deepest commitments. Both the American Declaration of Independence and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaim the equal value and dignity of every human life. That dignity is honored by the rule of law, limits on the power of the state, respect for women, protection of private property, free speech, equal justice, and religious tolerance. That dignity is dishonored by oppression, corruption, tyranny, bigotry, terrorism and all violence against the innocent.
10 And both of our founding documents affirm that this bright line between justice and injustice—between right and wrong—is the same in every age, and every culture, and every nation.

15 Wise governments also stand for these principles for very practical and realistic reasons. We know that dictators are quick to choose aggression, while free nations strive to resolve differences in peace. We know that oppressive governments support terror, while free governments fight the terrorists in their midst. We know that free peoples embrace progress and life, instead of becoming the recruits for murderous ideologies.
20

Every nation that wants peace will share the benefits of a freer world. And every nation that seeks peace has an obligation to help build that world. Eventually, there is no safe isolation from terror networks, or failed states that shelter them, or outlaw regimes, or weapons of mass destruction. Eventually, there is no safety in looking away, seeking
25 the quiet life by ignoring the struggles and oppression of others.

In this young century, our world needs a new definition of security. Our security is not merely found in spheres of influence, or some balance of power. The security of our world is found in the advancing rights of mankind. (...)
30

Because we believe in human dignity, peaceful nations must stand for the advance of democracy. No other system of government has done more to protect minorities, to secure the rights of labor, to raise the status of women, or to channel human energy to the pursuits of peace. We've witnessed the rise of democratic governments in
35 predominantly Hindu and Muslim, Buddhist, Jewish and Christian cultures. Democratic institutions have taken root in modern societies, and in traditional societies. When it comes to the desire for liberty and justice, there is no clash of civilizations. People everywhere are capable of freedom, and worthy of freedom.

40 Finding the full promise of representative government takes time, as America has found
in two centuries of debate and struggle. Nor is there any—only one form of
representative government—because democracies, by definition, take on the unique
character of the peoples that create them. Yet this much we know with certainty: the
desire for freedom resides in every human heart. And that desire cannot be contained

45 forever by prison walls, or martial laws, or secret police. Over time, and across the
Earth, freedom will find a way.

Freedom is finding a way in Iraq and Afghanistan—and we must continue to show our
commitment to democracies in those nations. The liberty that many have won at a cost
50 must be secured. As members of the United Nations, we all have a stake in the success
of the world's newest democracies. (...)

The Afghan people are showing extraordinary courage under difficult conditions.
They're fighting to defend their nation from Taliban holdouts, and helping to strike
55 against the terrorist killers. They're reviving their economy. They've adopted a
constitution that protects the rights of all, while honoring their nation's most cherished
traditions. More than 10 million Afghan citizens—over 4 million of them women—are
now registered to vote in next month's presidential election. To any who still would
question whether Muslim societies can be democratic societies, the Afghan people are
60 giving their answer.

Since the last meeting of this General Assembly, the people of Iraq have regained
sovereignty. Today, in this hall, the Prime Minister of Iraq and his delegation represent
a country that has rejoined the community of nations. The government of Prime
65 Minister Allawi has earned the support of every nation that believes in self-
determination and desires peace. And under Security Council resolutions 1511 and
1546, the world is providing that support. The U.N., and its member nations, must
respond to Prime Minister Allawi's request, and do more to help build an Iraq that is
secure, democratic, federal, and free. (...)

70 History will honor the high ideals of this organization. The charter states them with
clarity: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", "to reaffirm faith in
fundamental human rights", "to promote social progress and better standards of life in
larger freedom".

75 Let history also record that our generation of leaders followed through on these ideals,
even in adversity. Let history show that in a decisive decade, members of the United
Nations did not grow weary in our duties, or waver in meeting them. I'm confident that
this young century will be liberty's century. I believe we will rise to this moment,
80 because I know the character of so many nations and leaders represented here today.
And I have faith in the transforming power of freedom.

May God bless you. (Applause.)