**Résumé analytique comparatif - Proposition de corrigé**

**According to documents 1 and 2, why is the “rule of law” increasingly threatened in the US?**

 The American political system, based on “checks and balances,” ensures that no citizen is above the law. However, throughout American history, breaches of this rule have occurred, and the question is even more pressing with the upcoming elections. The two articles under study, published in The Guardian and The Economist, show that authoritarian-minded political leaders have the power to jeopardize democracy.

Both articles denounce political interference with the law. The Guardian sets this in historical context, citing past abuses by Presidents Adams and Nixon, who criminalized and silenced their opponents. This article also highlights how the American Constitution, as seen with Trump, may enable the rise of an authoritarian figure, as the president holds far-reaching powers. At the state level, The Economist focuses on the pardon granted by Texas Governor to the murderer of a Black Lives Matter demonstrator, deliberately overlooking decisive elements, including the fact that this murder had been tried and the man condemned by a jury of peers, as the law requires. In both cases, the overlap of judicial and executive powers undermines the rule of law.

Yet today’s America faces unprecedented threats. While the Guardian points out how newspapers countered past assaults, people’s choices on election day may be the only hope left in 2024. Trump has been immune to impeachment so far and is clinging to power by becoming more extreme, contrary to his predecessors who backed down after facing opposition. Justice is now being held in a chokehold: Trump has tipped the balance of the Supreme Court in his favor and can appoint an attorney general who will condone his actions. The Economist confirms these are not hopeful times, as most citizens have lost faith in justice. (280 words)

REMINDER : A conclusion is optional in this exercise

**Thème - Proposition de corrigé**

**Président de 2016 à 2020, l’homme à la casquette rouge supportait mal la nécessité du compromis démocratique. Il était allergique au jeu des pouvoirs et contre-pouvoirs imposé par la Constitution américaine. Avec l’appui de la Fondation Heritage, les trumpistes ont cette fois préparé un « Projet 2025 » destiné à établir, au moins dans la pratique, la prépondérance absolue du président – en lieu et place du dialogue permanent avec le Congrès voulu par les Pères fondateurs. L’équipe Trump sélectionne d’ores et déjà des milliers de collaborateurs, qui doivent, au préalable, signer un contrat de loyauté à son égard.**

As the president from 2016 to 2020, the man in the red cap struggled to accept/ had little patience for the need for democratic compromise. He could not stand/ He loathed/ He was averse to the play/ functioning of checks and balances imposed by/ enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. Now, with the support of the Heritage Foundation, Trump supporters have prepared a “Project 2025” designed to establish, at least in practice, the absolute supremacy/ predominance of the president instead of the permanent dialogue with Congress sought by the Founding Fathers. The Trump team / Trump’s team is already choosing / picking/ selecting thousands of collaborators, who must first sign a loyalty contract with him. […]

**Passivité, complicité volontaire ou pas, elles sont responsables d’une étonnante anomalie politico-juridique : l’homme qui, le 6 janvier 2021, alors qu’il est encore à la Maison Blanche, a appelé ses partisans à *« marcher »* sur le Congrès pour empêcher la certification du scrutin de novembre 2020, gagné par Joe Biden, cet homme-là peut guigner à nouveau la présidence.**

 Out of passivity, out of complicity whether it was wilful or not, they are responsible FOR a surprising/ astonishing political and legal anomaly: the very man who, on January 6, 2021, while [he was] still in the White House, called on his supporters to “march” on Congress to prevent the certification of the November 2020 ballot, won by Joe Biden, can once again run for president / stake his claim to the presidency/ covet the presidency/ be after the presidency.

**Fill in the blanks with the correct preposition:**

1. She is very **interested** \_\_\_\_ learning new languages.
2. I’m really **worried** \_\_\_\_ my upcoming exams.
3. The book was **similar** \_\_\_\_ the one I read last year.
4. His behavior is **different** \_\_\_\_ his usual calm self.
5. We are **delighted** \_\_\_\_ the progress you've made.
6. The movie was **different** \_\_\_\_ what I expected.
7. She is always **good** \_\_\_\_ solving difficult problems.
8. I’m **tired** \_\_\_\_ hearing the same excuse every day.
9. My parents are **proud** \_\_\_\_ my achievements.
10. They were **familiar** \_\_\_\_ the area and knew all the best places to visit.
11. He is **fond** \_\_\_\_ / **keen** \_\_\_\_ playing the guitar in his free time.
12. We were **surprised** \_\_\_\_ the news of her promotion.
13. Are you **responsible** \_\_\_\_ taking care of their pets during their vacation?
14. The children were **excited** \_\_\_\_ the upcoming holiday.
15. She seems **bored** \_\_\_\_ the lecture and was distracted all the time.
16. The manager is **satisfied** \_\_\_\_ your work performance.
17. They are **angry** \_\_\_\_ the delay in their flight.
18. He was **ashamed** \_\_\_\_ his actions during the wedding.

 **Expression personnelle- Proposition de corrigé**

**Is it inevitable for politics to seep into American institutions or should it be prevented at all costs to preserve democracy?**

 The question of whether politics should inevitably permeate institutions or whether it must be kept separate touches upon a fundamental tension in all democracies between competing values such as public accountability, influence and representation.

 When power is concentrated without oversight, it is prone to being misused, as document 4 depicts, in tune with document 1 pinpointing that unchecked power can lead to abuse and an erosion of democratic principles. In many instances, politicians, who have a democratic mandate to reform the country and to bring about social progress, have no choice but to step in, as evidenced by the student debt crisis. A social injustice and a serious threat to the American economy, the debt now balloons at 1.73 trillion dollars. It clearly underscores the need for transparency and accountability of higher education institutions and banks but for want of those, political interference is required. The Biden administration has been struggling to redress the situation and is now poised to partly cancel student debt, thus relieving over 30 million Americans. [If dubious institutional practices challenge the principle of equality in education, I believe it is only normal and beneficial that politicians should have a say, which is reminiscent of Johnson’s stance on the need for affirmative action policies in the sixties. Likewise, when the health care system appeared to be flawed, presidents rightly stepped up: Obama pushed the Affordable Care Act in 2010; Trump and Biden, regardless of their ideological divide, both acknowledged the need for intervention in the deadly opioid crisis.]

 Thereby, the principle that no institution holding power should go unchecked is foundational to democratic governance and social justice. The challenge is to ensure that accountability mechanisms remain robust and adapt to new threats, like social media or political polarisation. Yet, when faith in these mechanisms is eroded - Americans’ trust in institutions has fallen by 15% (document 5) - democracy is jeopardized as there is no common ground for sound discussion and societal progress. This is why measures should be implemented to guarantee institutions’ neutrality. Appointing Supreme Court Justices for a limited amount of years (18, the number proposed by President Biden, is already significant). **Gerrymandering** also needs to be done away with, for the sake of equal representation and a restored faith in the voting system. [While the Supreme Court has frowned upon gerrymandering, it has failed to intervene to ban it and surely reinforced it in 2013 by scrapping the preclearance requirement in **Shelby County v. Holder**. Such under-enforcement of the judiciary is symptomatic of a weakening of the “checks and balances” system, as document 3 underlines.]

 At the end of the day, Trump merely used the vulnerabilities of the system intended by the Founding Fathers. Interestingly enough, **Samuel Adams wrote: “Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide.”** Is this original diffidence in democracy part of the explanation for today’s weaknesses of American institutions and has it always foreshadowed a dark future? 505 words – 82 – 52 = 371 words for an LVB format

**ADVICE**:

* Look up the underlined words in a dictionary
* Do a quick research on the words in bold and try to remember that Samuel Adams quote by heart (the question of democracy is a key issue this year!)
* METHODO = don’t forget to mention all the documents in your Q2 (this pre-requirement has been clarified in a recent meeting chaired by jury members)