

# Examen d'accréditation d'interprètes de langue française 2021 – Anglais (SERIE 1)

## Anglais / discours 1

Réunion : Conférence de presse

Date : Novembre 2018

Durée : 10:43

Orateur : Philip Alston

Difficulté : niveau 1

Introduction : Intervention du Rapporteur spécial sur la pauvreté extrême et les droits humains.  
Il sera question de la pauvreté au Royaume-Uni.

Éléments à fournir (vocabulaire) :

Benefits	Prestations
Welfare policy	Politique sociale

Thanks very much...

So, I do want to start, first of all, by thanking the British Government and by thanking all the officials who have made my visit smooth and easy.

The main thrust of my report is to contrast the great prosperity in Britain - the fifth largest economy, one of the leading financial capitals in the world, a thriving industrial and financial center - contrast it with the fact that a fifth of the population, 14 million people, are living in

poverty, four million of those, and more than 50 percent below the poverty line, and one and a half million are destitute. The child poverty rates are staggering and are predicted by the Institute for Fiscal Studies and others to go up significantly over the next couple of years.

The picture, however, is much more complex than just rattling off statistics. What has surprised me is the extent to which there is close to unanimity in terms of the observations by think tanks, by a lot of media commentators, by independent authorities like the National Audit Office, by a whole range of parliamentary committees and others, that poverty is really a major challenge in the United Kingdom, and that not nearly enough is currently being done to address the challenges.

On the other side, what I found in my discussions with Ministers is basically a state of denial. The Ministers with whom I've met told me that things are going well, that they don't see any big problems, and they are happy with the way in which their policies are playing out. But it's of course not the story that I heard in my travels in England. What I saw - food banks, schools, community centers, job centers, libraries and elsewhere - is a lot of misery. A lot of people who feel that the system is failing them, a lot of people who feel that the system is really there just to punish them, people who feel that despite the fact that they are really down and need a little bit of help, that they could always have counted on in yesterday's Britain, they are just not able to get.

And so, what I've tried to do in my report is to ask why? What's the motivation for the main policies that seem to be problematic in the benefits area? And the answer that most people come up with is: "Ah, it's austerity". In other words, the implication is that there was no choice, there was a financial crisis, there was a need to make immense budget savings and benefits was one of the key areas where that could be done. The truth is that, first of all, there haven't been a great many savings from what I can see. A lot of it has involved the transfer over from one set of items to another, a lot of it has been pushed off to the community, to families, to emergency rooms, and to even governmental emergency services, rather than in the benefits system itself.

I don't see that the motivation has been to create a more compassionate, a more caring benefits system, and one that actually produces better life outcomes for people. Instead, the motivation is, very clearly, I believe, an ideological one. I don't say that in a necessarily critical way, because governments have different ideologies, governments think of social welfare in different ways, and this government and its predecessor have both been remarkably successful in bringing about a revolution in British welfare policy.

They have transformed the nature of the system and particularly the underpinnings of it. The problem that I see is not in terms of the worthy objectives. It is true that employment is a key to getting people out of poverty. It is true that the previous system was confused and confusing. It's true that there are efficiencies that have been found. But what's also happened is that the system

epitomized by universal credit - about which I'll talk more in a moment - but not at all limited to that, is in fact driven by the desire to get across a simple set of messages.

The State does not have your back any longer. You are on your own. The Government's place is not to be assisting people who think they can't make it on their own. The Government's place is an absolute last emergency order. And so, what goes along with that is the sense that we should make the system as unwelcoming as possible, that people who need benefits should be reminded constantly that they are lucky to get anything, that nothing will be made easy. And linked to that is what I would think of as the command-and-control approach reflected in universal credit: that sanctions should be harsh, should be immediate, should be painful.

And yet, all of the evidence that I've seen indicate that sanctions are usually counterproductive. That they create fear and loathing among claimants. That they impose immense hardships on people who might have been five minutes late for an appointment, might have **screwed** up in some other way. But instead of trying to work through with people who are already under immense stress, there is this sudden ton-of-bricks approach. And the ton of bricks goes from 3 months to 6 months, and can go into the years, and I think that sort of punitive approach to benefits is utterly inconsistent with the essential underpinnings, not just of what I would see as human rights, but of the whole British sense of community and the values of justice and fairness.

My report also focuses on Brexit, which is an issue that seems to be of current interest. I make the argument, which is not going to be all that unfamiliar, that almost no matter what outcome Brexit achieves, other than the utopian one which is most unlikely to happen, is going to leave Britain worse off economically. There is going to be a fall in GDP. There is going to be a fall in tax revenues.

The problem is that there has been almost no discussion about what impact that's going to have on low-income groups. They will, if present policies are maintained, bear the brunt of the economic fallout from Brexit. And to the extent that most commentators think that the Brexit vote itself had an element of economic alienation, of insecurity underpinning it, in fact Brexit is going to make that worse because those in the lower income levels are really going to suffer.

Thanks very much!

**Anglais / discours 2**

Réunion : TUMuenchen Speakers Series

Date : Février 2020

Durée : 10:26

Orateur : Ban Ki-Moon

Difficulté : niveau 2

Introduction : Intervention d'un ancien Secrétaire-Général qui s'adresse à une assemblée de jeunes en Allemagne.

Éléments à fournir (vocabulaire) :

ICC – International Criminal Court	CPI – Cour pénale internationale
------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Excellencies, dear students,

It is a great honor and privilege for me to be with you here this evening.

True security is not delivered through strength of military power or arms alone. Rather, it requires citizens to feel both protected and free to question their leaders' decisions and by democratic scrutiny, transparency and accountability.

As Secretary General, whenever I was speaking with young leaders, I have been just urging you now, today, to challenge your leaders, challenge your political and (*inaudible*) leaders. Tell them that they should make sure that this world where you are going to lead should be sustainable. I think that is your prerogative as leaders of this world.

Many people around the world are very much concerned about totalitarian or authoritarian regimes still in this 21st century. They create fear and repression among the people and may

even threaten or invade their neighbors under the guise of security concerns. But from the communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe to apartheid South Africa and Colonel Gaddafi's Libya, they ultimately reveal themselves to be brittle and unsustainable against the popular demand for freedom, which cannot be repressed forever.

Again, I have been speaking out against all these dictatorial regimes. Then justice will prevail.

Justice will prevail if not today, tomorrow; if not tomorrow, the day after tomorrow; if not the day after tomorrow, some time in the future. In that regard, I am very relieved at the news that the former President Omar Bashir of Sudan is now going to be handed over to ICC, International Criminal Court.

I have been fighting and struggling to making sure that those people responsible for massacre should be handed over to ICC. Of course, he rejected, after his stepping down as President. The Sudanese Government has announced a few days ago that they are going to hand over to the ICC. *That* is justice.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Again, in preparing for my visit, I was reminded of the words of the writer Thomas Mann. Writing from exile in the United States, on the eve of the Second World War, Thomas Mann appealed to

the German people to reject the false promises of Nazis and return to democratic values. It will be very important for me to repeat and quote what he said: "Democracy is timelessly human, and timelessness always implies a certain amount of potential youthfulness", unquote.

It was a tragedy for Germany, Europe and the whole world that it took 6 years of bloody war for this truth to be understood fully.

Thomas Mann would probably struggle to recognize modern Germany and the way it behaves to his neighbors and the wide world as a strong and vibrant democracy anchored in the European Union and at the United Nations. You should be very proud what your government, your people, and your leadership are doing as a global leader, based on global citizenship, promoting global visions based on sustainable development goals and also implementing a Paris Climate Change Agreement.

As future leaders, I encourage all of you - young people here - to live up to your full potential.

Thomas Mann understood the importance of fighting together for common values. This remains as critical today as it was 75 years ago when the United Nations was founded, after tragic consequences of Second World War.



The world leaders repeatedly confirmed, reaffirmed, that never again, never again. We have heard many times, since then, since 1945: “Never again”. This is still repeating. In 1994, when there was a massacre in Rwanda, they said “Never again”. Then, just one year after, in Srebrenica, they again massacred helpless people, and we repeated again “Never again”. I hope in your generation, there should be no such repetition of “Never again”.

Again, the United Nations remains as critical today as it was 75 years ago.

I am deeply concerned, and even angry - as a former Secretary General of the United Nations - that the multilateralism, symbolized and represented by the United Nations, is under heavy, serious attack.

Multilateralism has been the guiding framework of this 21st century, particularly since the end of Second World War, and many countries claim to be the leaders of this world, promoting multilateralism, respecting within the framework of multilateralism.

Now, those countries, who have been looked to with respect, is now undermining these principles of equality and principles of working together.

It is worth reminding ourselves of the United Nations Charter's opening lines in this regard. What it says:

- to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,
- to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
- to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and lastly
- to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

Cynics might argue that the fact that war, inequality, discrimination and poverty have not been vanquished over the past 75 years means, may mean, that the UN is a positive failure.

I strongly reject and disagree with this, this kind of argument.

Much progress has been made, from the reintegration of post-war Germany into the European Union and global family of nations to the support for due democracies in former colonial states in Africa, in Asia.

### **Anglais / discours 3**

Réunion : #GlobalChallenges debate

Date : Novembre 2017

Durée : 10:24

Oratrice : Louise Arbour

Difficulté : niveau 3

Introduction : Intervention de la Représentante spéciale du Secrétaire général sur les migrations internationales. Il sera question du Pacte mondial pour des migrations sûres, ordonnées et régulières.

Éléments à fournir (vocabulaire) : aucun

Let me just maybe share with you a few observations that I can extract from the process so far. From Pilipino women migrant workers in Gulf countries to regularization exercises in Morocco, there are a multiplicity of both problems and solutions that are easily obscured when a purely Western-centric point of view dominates the analysis. Even within the West, emphasis moves from preoccupations with what are called sometimes “flows” of migrants into Europe to “stocks” of irregular migrants, for instance in the United States.

And I pause here to comment on the use of language through which we perpetuate very unhelpful stereotypes, if not worse. And in this field, it’s quite shocking to see how the use of language, in a very invidious way, has sometimes really poisoned the public debate. Just this expression “stock” and “flow” which is, I understand, it’s a technical expression used by population experts and I really do believe that this one is purely innocent. But I can’t help be aware that it analogizes migrants to merchandise or stocks, livestock actually. There are many other expressions that I believe are less innocent but very deliberately invidious and they do actually aim and sometimes succeed at poisoning public opinion.

“Illegal” rather than “irregular” migrant I think now has really been pushed back but was the dominant expression used until quite recently. Expressions such as “hordes”, “waves”, “swarms” rather than simply “large numbers”, “contract workers” rather than “migrant workers”, which

very conveniently obscures the vulnerabilities that come from being a foreigner. So this is just a side issue but I think, in this field, we need to be very alive of the public discourse being at times entirely hijacked by this kind of vocabulary.

So, approaching the Global Compact as a truly global issue will be one of its many challenges but also one of its key opportunities. The challenge will be to be relevant to all, without drowning in detailed specificities. And the opportunity will be to rise above the exaggerated importance of issues that are time and place sensitive and to put in place a framework that will serve all, all of us well, now and in the future.

So a second observation on my part is how the approach to migration through the Global Compact so far has re-centered the conversation, importantly so, around development issues rather than around almost exclusively security concerns, where it occupied - I believe - a somewhat exaggerated space, at least in many corners of Western public opinion, certainly until recently and maybe still to date. So, development is now I think the proper anchor for moving forward on this issue.

And finally, before I return to some of these development-related considerations and in line with my previous comments about the choice of vocabulary, I believe that the last year or so has contributed to the beginning, the beginning of a change of narrative. In this field, as in many

others, reality is much, much better than perception. And I think this reality has to take hold if we are going to succeed, in the Global Compact, in changing the narrative or at least having a more balanced narrative is going to be very much a part of the exercise. And this reality I think is gaining ground.

Outside informed circles such as this one, knowledge about the impact of remittances, for instance, is often very limited. And yet when I, like I'm sure many of you, have opportunity to discuss this issue with political decision makers for instance, I found that some are not particularly well informed about the importance of many aspects of migrations, particularly this one.

For instance, did they know that 420 billion dollars in remittances, that migrants made to developing countries in 2016, represented some 15% of their earnings and about 3 times the total amount of Official Development Aid? Often, they didn't know that. Well, then surely, they knew that remittances often amount to more than 20% of GDP in some countries? Really? they said. Had they considered that... what this impact would be if we could actually reduce the cost of transfer of these remittances from the current average of about 7.5% to 3%, as we've already committed to do? No idea. And they often had no idea that we actually know how we could do that, that is reduce the cost of transfer of money. And that, actually, there's a lot that they could do themselves, as political decision makers: increase competition amongst money transfer providers and reduce the oversight requirements which, as part of money laundering and

financing of terrorism preoccupations, have actually taken the banks out of a business that is too cumbersome to be lucrative.

This is something that political decision makers, you would have thought, should be right on top of. And did they know, while we are at it, that if we could improve financial awareness on the parts of the recipients of these individually modest sums of money, the impact on developing countries would be even greater? If they didn't know everything I've mentioned up to now, there is a good chance they didn't know that part either. But I believe that this is now starting to be good news because this reality amongst others brings the conversation about migration to a much, much better place. And the more we talk about this issue, this reality, the more I think we have a chance of getting policy choices to be made not on the basis of mythology and perception but reality. And in making sound policy, the foundations have to be facts, not myths, not stereotype, not perception but reality.

So, let me turn briefly to the subject of development more broadly. The relationship between migration and development is at once obvious and deceptive. We have an immensely useful starting point, I believe, as migration is not only explicitly recognized as part of the sustainable development goals, the big United Nations development agenda, but it is actually recognized as a tool to achieve maybe, from my point of view, the most surprisingly universally accepted development objective that is to reduce inequalities within and between countries, that is SDG number 10.

So here is the link between migration and development. We will facilitate safe, orderly and regular migration as a way of reducing inequalities within and between countries. That's the framework and that much is already very clearly stated. What is not always so clearly stated but is often implied in many policy discussions about migration is that development is good because it will reduce migration. So you might ask, well which one is it? I would suggest the following: improved inclusive development may in time change the configuration of migratory patterns.

As people are lifted out of poverty, their life choices will improve, including their choice whether to migrate, either to improve their skills or to seek greater economic opportunities abroad. Their departure then opens work opportunities for others in their country of origin thereby accelerating, alongside with increased financial and other often intangible transfers of benefits, the whole development potential. And as long as their migration takes place in a well-regulated environment, it also benefits countries of destination, thereby contributing to their own development. I should point out that in developed countries, development is usually called prosperity.

Further development progress therefore offers more opportunities at home and may, may, in time, reduce the impetus to leave. It may also serve as an incentive to return for the many who will by then have lived and worked abroad and who may see opportunities to transfer their skills back home. Thank you.



FOR TRAINING PURPOSES ONLY