

ANGLAIS

TRADUCTION D' ANGLAIS EN FRANÇAIS

His eyes rested for a moment on Hercule Poirot, but they passed on indifferently. Poirot, reading the English mind correctly, knew that he had said to himself: "Only some damned foreigner."

True to their nationality, the two English people were not chatty. They exchanged a few brief remarks and presently the girl rose and went back to her compartment.

At lunch time the other two again shared a table and again they both completely ignored the third passenger. Their conversation was more animated than at breakfast. Colonel Arbuthnot talked of the Punjab and occasionally asked the girl a few questions about Baghdad where, it became clear, she had been in a post as governess. In the course of conversation they discovered some mutual friends, which had the medium effect of making them more friendly and less stiff. They discovered old Tommy Somebody and old Reggie Someone else. The Colonel inquired whether she was going straight through England or whether she was stopping in Stamboul.

"No, I'm going straight on."

"Isn't that rather a pity?"

"I came out this way three years ago and spent three days in Stamboul then."

"Oh! I see. Well, I may say I'm very glad you are going right through, because I am."

He made a clumsy kind of little bow, flushing a little as he did so.

"He is susceptible, our Colonel," thought Hercule Poirot to himself with some amusement. "The train, it is as dangerous as a sea voyage!"

ANGLAIS

TRADUCTION DE FRANÇAIS EN ANGLAIS

Arrivé sur l'île fin novembre, il écrivit à Hada une première lettre pour lui dire qu'elle lui manquait, qu'il en souffrait à chaque instant, qu'il ne pourrait pas vivre longtemps si éloigné d'elle, et qu'il était tenté de tout laisser tomber. Dans une deuxième lettre, postée en février 1914, il se plaignait d'être continuellement malade ; à coup sûr, il ne passerait pas sa vie entière dans cette île ! que son épouse ne soit pas surprise si, un jour, elle le voyait revenir ! Mais dans une troisième lettre, écrite en mai, il lui apprenait que le travail, finalement, ne lui déplaisait pas, qu'il s'entendait bien avec Gebrayel, et que celui-ci envisageait de lui confier des responsabilités, en lui doublant son salaire initial. Dans la quatrième, il lui annonça sur un ton euphorique qu'il était devenu le bras droit de son beau-frère, lequel ne pouvait plus se passer de lui ; à présent, son choix était fait, il vivrait à Cuba pour toujours, et il était sur le point de louer un grand appartement au centre de la capitale, tout près des magasins La Verdad – installés à présent dans l'ancienne demeure du général Gómez.

Amin Maalouf, *Origines*, Editions Grasset et Fasquelle, 2004

ANGLAIS

Lire soigneusement le texte ci-dessous :

The United Nations headquarters in New York has a problem: the toilets leak. This 50-year-old vision of the future also has faulty air-conditioning, asbestos in the walls and no sprinkler system. In short, the place needs a thorough overhaul. But it's not just the building that is in trouble. Many people believe the organisation itself is in dire need of reform.

Reform is not a new word to the UN. In the 1990s, it underwent a series of restructuring programmes. In 1998, the UN secretary general, Kofi Annan, spoke of creating "a revitalised United Nations" by the year 2001. In 2003, he proposed yet more reforms. There is also pressure for change from outside. The current occupants of the White House are no fans of the UN in its current form. Richard Perle, a former chief foreign policy adviser to George W Bush, has said that the Security Council "is simply not up to the task" and that the UN should be relaunched with a different charter. The British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, in a speech in Sedgefield earlier this year, called for a new agenda that included "reforming the UN, so its Security Council represents 21st-century reality; and giving the UN the capability to act effectively, as well as debate".

Many of the UN's critics believe that the organisation is overstaffed and wasteful. Even Annan has admitted that its management could be improved, saying: "Where we should have been flexible and adaptable, we have, all too often, been bureaucratic." However, spending on this bureaucracy has grown little in the past decade, from \$1bn in 1991 to \$1.07bn in 2001. Spending on peacekeeping operations has also remained remarkably low: the total in the past year — funding 13 separate operations and almost 50,000 peacekeepers — is around \$2.5bn, roughly the same figure spent to police London each year. The total cost of all UN peacekeeping operations since 1948 equates to roughly a third of the cost of the recent war in Iraq. [...]

The UN is dominated by the US, UK, France, Russia and China — whose military victory in 1945 was transformed into control of the Security Council — as well as countries, such as Japan and Germany, that have significant economic muscle. Of these, the US and the European Union states place the most demands on the UN.

While these two may agree broadly on the threats that the UN should be concerned with — such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, state failure and organised crime — they differ in their strategy. The EU's foreign policy strategy focuses on "effective multilateralism". Its security document states: "We are committed to upholding and developing international law. The fundamental framework for international relations is the UN Charter [...] Strengthening the UN [...] is a European priority." But the US under Bush has an instinctive dislike of international law and multilateralism, clearly demonstrated by his administration's rejection of the International Criminal Court and the Kyoto treaty.

These contrasting strategies suggest two different futures for the UN. With continued US unilateralism, the UN will either be abolished or simply wither away, and instead "coalitions of the willing" will be rounded up to support American actions. A second term for Bush may appear to guarantee this rather gloomy future, but the EU's preferred way may still win out.

Philip Bobbitt, a former adviser to Bill Clinton, believes that multilateral and legalistic strategies will become increasingly effective, and necessary, in the 21st century. There will be "no successful international security policy that does not have an active and engaged role for law", he argues. "None of the central problems Bush faces — terrorism, WMDs, precarious financial systems, intellectual property rights, escalating trade barriers — can be solved without law."

The UN stands to be reinvigorated if the US is convinced that it is necessary to achieve its goals. Other countries are already certain of the UN's value to them. To developing countries, for example, it is one of the only institutions through which they can interact with industrialised nations on a near-equal footing. However, these countries often question the dominance of the wealthy states within the organisation. Just like its headquarters, the structures of the UN seem outdated. When it was first founded, the organisation had 51 members; it now has 191. Reform is needed to cater for them, yet any reform is hindered because it requires complex bargaining with each state. Ten years after a working group first looked into changing the membership of the Security Council, there have still been no recommendations. [...]

The UN is likely to survive long into the 21st century, broken toilets or not. As Blair has said, if the UN didn't exist, then it would have to be invented. If it were created again, its structures would probably suit today's purposes a little better, but its main problems — such as political divisions and inequality — would no doubt remain. Despite its weaknesses, for an annual cost of what the Pentagon spends every couple of days, supporting the UN is one of the best investments we can make to tackle the challenges of the 21st century.

Tom Freke

New Statesman, Sept 13, 2004

Répondre en **ANGLAIS** aux questions ci-dessous :

(environ 250 mots pour chaque réponse) :

1. According to the author, what are the main problems currently facing the United Nations?
Answer the question in your own words
2. How do you see the future of the United Nations?