

# CAPES

# ANGLAIS

session 2026

L3

## *The Great Gatsby* de Francis Scott Fitzgerald

La société des années 1920 aux États-Unis,  
de la mise en œuvre  
du National Prohibition Act  
au krach boursier de 1929

Christine Chollier  
Gérald Préher



# Préambule

En 2026 a lieu un nouveau concours de recrutement des enseignants du second degré. Le ministère de l'Éducation nationale, de la Recherche et de l'Enseignement Supérieur a publié en mai 2025 le format du concours, le programme officiel et les sujets zéro. Ce manuel vise à préparer à la première épreuve d'admissibilité sur programme : *The Great Gatsby*, de Francis Scott Fitzgerald (1925), pour la littérature, et « la société des années 1920 aux États-Unis, de la mise en œuvre du National Prohibition Act au krach boursier de 1929 », pour la civilisation. Voici le format du concours tel qu'il a été dessiné. Il comporte deux épreuves d'admissibilité et deux épreuves d'admission présentées comme suit sur la page du Ministère (nous soulignons les éléments importants) :

## A. Épreuves d'admissibilité (écrits)

### 1. Première épreuve d'admissibilité

L'épreuve consiste en une composition en langue étrangère à partir d'un sujet s'appuyant sur un dossier constitué de documents de nature variée. L'épreuve porte sur une question inscrite au programme.

Elle vise à la vérification des connaissances disciplinaires du candidat. Elle permet d'évaluer la maîtrise de la langue et la connaissance des cultures de l'aire linguistique concernée.

Durée : cinq heures ; coefficient 3 (une note globale égale ou inférieure à 5 est éliminatoire).

### 2. Seconde épreuve d'admissibilité

L'épreuve comporte deux parties. La première partie de l'épreuve est constituée d'un thème et d'une version. La seconde partie porte sur une analyse critique de faits de langue.

L'épreuve se fonde sur un dossier composé de documents de nature variée dans la langue étrangère mais aussi en français.

Elle vise à apprécier la maîtrise des deux systèmes linguistiques et le passage de l'un à l'autre.

Durée : quatre heures ; coefficient 2.

L'épreuve est notée sur 20. Chaque partie compte sur 10 points. Là encore, une note globale égale ou inférieure à 5 est éliminatoire.

## **B. Épreuves d'admission (oraux)**

### **1. Première épreuve d'admission**

L'épreuve prend la forme d'un exposé suivi d'un échange avec le jury qui consiste, à partir d'un dossier constitué de divers documents, à présenter de manière organisée les principaux enjeux d'un sujet.

Le dossier est constitué de quatre documents en langue étrangère (un document audio ou vidéo ne dépassant pas cinq minutes, un ou deux textes, un ou deux documents iconographiques) prenant appui sur le programme du concours.

L'épreuve se compose de deux parties.

- La première partie de l'épreuve est en langue étrangère. Le candidat restitue, analyse et commente le document audio ou vidéo, puis en explicite les liens avec les autres documents du dossier. Cet exposé est suivi d'un échange avec le jury.
- La seconde partie de l'épreuve est en langue française. Le candidat explicite l'intérêt culturel et la portée interculturelle du dossier. Cet exposé est suivi d'un échange permettant au jury de faire préciser ou d'approfondir les points qu'il juge utiles.

L'épreuve vise à apprécier la qualité de la langue employée dans les deux parties de l'épreuve. Elle vise également à évaluer la capacité du candidat, à structurer son propos, à analyser de manière organisée des documents de nature variée, à en présenter les principaux enjeux de sens dans le cadre d'un oral en continu, puis en interaction avec le jury.

Durée de la préparation : trois heures ; durée de l'épreuve : une heure.

Chaque partie dure 30 minutes (exposé : dix minutes ; échange : vingt minutes) ; coefficient 5. L'épreuve est notée sur 20. La note 0 est éliminatoire.

### **2. Seconde épreuve d'admission**

L'épreuve consiste en un entretien avec le jury.

Elle comporte un premier temps d'échange d'une durée de quinze minutes débutant par une présentation, d'une durée de cinq minutes, par le candidat de sa motivation et des éléments de son parcours et des expériences qui l'ont conduit à se présenter au concours en valorisant notamment les enseignements suivis, les stages, l'engagement associatif ou les périodes de formation à l'étranger. Cette présentation donne lieu à un échange avec le jury pendant dix minutes.

L'épreuve se poursuit, pendant vingt minutes, par un entretien avec le jury.

L'échange suivant la présentation du candidat et l'entretien en tant que tel doivent permettre au jury, au travers de questionnements divers (dont une mise en situation), d'apprécier l'aptitude du candidat à :

- se projeter dans le métier d'enseignant ;
- transmettre et incarner les valeurs de la République, dont la laïcité, et les exigences du service public (droits et obligations du fonctionnaire dont la neutralité, lutte contre les discriminations et stéréotypes, promotion de l'égalité, notamment entre les filles et les garçons) ;
- comprendre les grands enjeux liés à la transition écologique ;
- appréhender l'épanouissement de l'élève dans toutes ses dimensions.

Durée totale de l'épreuve : 35 minutes ; coefficient 3.

L'épreuve est notée sur 20. La note 0 est éliminatoire.

Pour l'anglais, le PROGRAMME OFFICIEL du concours de 2026 est le suivant :

### ♦ *Épreuves d'admissibilité*

Programme de la première épreuve d'admissibilité :

*The Great Gatsby*, de Francis Scott Fitzgerald (1925) (Littérature)

et

La société des années 1920 aux États-Unis, de la mise en œuvre du National Prohibition Act au krach boursier de 1929 (Civilisation).

### ♦ *Épreuves d'admission*

Le dossier sur lequel s'appuie la première épreuve d'admission est en lien avec l'un des quatre thèmes ou axes culturels des programmes de collège ou lycées suivants :

- L'amour et l'amitié ;
- Mise en scène de soi ;
- Faire entendre sa voix : représentation et participation ;
- De la protection de la nature à la transition écologique.

Ce manuel vise à préparer la première épreuve d'admissibilité qui dure cinq heures et comporte deux sujets qui sont à traiter tous les deux mais séparément. Un document porte sur le programme de littérature. L'autre, sur le programme de civilisation.

### **Remarque concernant la première épreuve d'admissibilité**

*Le Document A du dossier pourra être, au choix du jury, un extrait de l'œuvre littéraire au programme de l'épreuve ou un texte relevant de la question de civilisation au programme de l'épreuve. La consigne de l'analyse du texte pourra être complétée, au choix du jury, de suggestions d'axes d'études.*

*Quand le Document A portera sur un extrait de l'œuvre littéraire, un ou plusieurs autres documents du dossier évalueront les connaissances du candidat sur la question de civilisation, et inversement.*

En illustration de ce qui précède voici l'exemple proposé :

*Après avoir pris connaissance du dossier composé des documents A et B ci-dessous,*

- 1. vous proposerez, **en anglais**, une analyse littéraire du Document A, qui comprendra une introduction, un développement structuré et une conclusion ;*
- 2. vous répondrez, **en anglais**, à la consigne suivante, portant sur le Document B :*  
Discuss consumer culture and mass consumption in the USA of the 1920s using your analysis of document B to illustrate your remarks.

Les textes officiels ne font pas référence à une édition spécifique du roman de F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, pour le programme de littérature. La bibliographie à la fin du manuel recense la plupart des éditions disponibles en France et intéressantes pour diverses raisons. Dans cet ouvrage, l'édition utilisée est celle publiée par les éditions Norton : ***The Great Gatsby: Authoritative Text, Contexts, Criticism***. Ed. David J. Alworth. New York: Norton Critical Editions, 2022. Elle repose, pour le texte du roman, sur la seconde impression de la première édition chez Scribner's et sur une orthographe américaine. Elle offre, outre le texte du roman, des notes explicatives de bas de page, des lectures qui en ont influencé l'écriture, et un appareil critique incluant des textes

contemporains du roman (carnets de l'auteur, correspondance, nouvelles, un extrait de la version intermédiaire du roman intitulée *Trimalchio*, ainsi que des essais de Fitzgerald) et des articles critiques. Nous recommandons vivement de lire ces documents, ainsi que l'introduction des autres éditions, qui sont des lectures critiques éclairantes.

La bibliographie située à la fin de ce manuel recense également :

- des recueils de lettres écrites ou reçues par F. Scott Fitzgerald. Lire la correspondance s'avère primordial pour comprendre le contexte historique, artistique et personnel car l'écrivain était en relation avec les plus grands intellectuels (journalistes, critiques et auteurs) de son époque et il lisait ce que publiaient les autres romanciers et nouvellistes de son temps. Ces échanges épistoliers livrent des pistes de réflexion précieuses sur la composition du roman et sur son interprétation du texte par l'écrivain lui-même ;
- un recensement des adaptations cinématographiques ;
- des biographies ;
- des monographies ;
- des recueils d'articles ;
- des articles de revues et des chapitres d'ouvrages ;
- des études dont une section traite de l'auteur et/ou du roman au programme ;
- des ouvrages sur les années 1920 aux États-Unis.

## Présentation de l'organisation du volume

Afin de préparer au mieux les étudiants qui doivent travailler le programme pour passer le concours de recrutement 2026, ce volume propose dans une première partie :

- un chapitre sur le contexte historique ;
- un chapitre sur certains aspects de ce contexte en lien avec les domaines artistique, littéraire et personnel dans lesquels a été créé le roman de F. Scott Fitzgerald ;
- un chapitre sur la composition du troisième roman de l'écrivain dans laquelle interagissent lettres, nouvelles, et essais ;
- une chronologie qui met en regard faits historiques et faits littéraires.

Puis une deuxième partie présente trois chapitres généraux sur le roman *The Great Gatsby*, F. Scott Fitzgerald :

- “Plot and Plotting” résume l’histoire principale en la liant à la thématique du complot ;
- “Structuring Outlines” fournit des clés sur la structure et les thèmes structurants ;
- “Characters and Characterization” traite de l’énigme d’une écriture qui doit dire tout en conservant son mystère au personnage éponyme. Il aborde le symbolisme des personnages, des éléments naturels, des lieux, et des objets divers en montrant comment ils participent d’un réseau sémantique.

Une troisième partie, précédée d’un point méthodologique, propose 9 commentaires de texte. Ce ne sont pas des commentaires linéaires mais des commentaires composés. Ils peuvent inclure des titres aux parties principales pour des raisons de pédagogie méthodologique mais en aucun cas ces titres ne devront figurer dans votre copie, les transitions devant remplir cette fonction. Ces titres intermédiaires sont là pour guider la lecture du développement et l’apprentissage de la démonstration.

Cette partie se referme sur glossaire fondé sur des exemples tirés du roman et destiné à éclairer et à faciliter l’utilisation du lexique critique et rhétorique.

Enfin, une quatrième partie s’ouvre sur deux points méthodologiques (sur le commentaire d’image et l’essai) et se saisit ensuite de la question de civilisation sur les années 1920 aux États-Unis pour la traiter à travers 3 « focus » :

- Consumer culture and mass consumption in the U.S. in the 1920s
- Immigration in the U.S. in the 1920s
- Women in the 1920s

## Première partie

# Contextes

- Cultural Background
- “Can’t repeat the past? . . . Why of course you can!” (GG 72): From the Cultural Context to the Literary Context
- *The Great Gatsby*: Composition History and Reception
- A Chronology





# Cultural Background<sup>1</sup>

In the U.S., the 1920s is a decade that is generally associated with prosperity, economic development and growth—better living conditions for the people—but there is also a darker side as the introduction of Prohibition laws gave way to crime and disillusionment. With the 1929 crash, the country had to face a period of recession: unemployment, bankruptcies of banks, companies and factories closing down, poverty increasing . . . Therefore, it is important to look at the two sides of the Roaring Twenties—at the “Jazz Age,” to borrow F. Scott Fitzgerald’s expression, and at the development of organized crime. The latter emerged, as Pierre Lagayette explains, because the lexicon used to define an ideal republic based upon liberty, success, fortune, the promise of happiness and the fulfilment of personal development does not force individuals into pre-defined roles but rather invites them to choose their own, which may lead to just about anything (in Lagayette & Sipière, eds. 7).

## World War I and its Consequences

The war began in July 1914 and everybody in Europe and in the United States thought it would be short. The horrors to come were thus unimaginable.

**August 1914:** President Woodrow Wilson’s position on the war follows what George Washington had advocated in his 1796 farewell address<sup>2</sup>:

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. (Washington)

According to Washington, Americans should not get involved in any European conflict that might lead to internal tension. Following such ideas, in his 1914 Annual Address to Congress, Wilson, a Democrat, issued the routine proclamation

- 
1. We are thankful to Franck Vindevogel for his suggestions on this chapter.
  2. Washington’s speech, written with the help of Alexander Hamilton and James Madison is often regarded as the president’s “political testament to the nation.” The full text can be found, together with a short introduction on the U.S. Senate’s website: [https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/resources/pdf/Washingtons\\_Farewell\\_Address.pdf](https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/resources/pdf/Washingtons_Farewell_Address.pdf)

of neutrality, stating that it was “a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us.” Such a viewpoint also calls to mind another important Presidential Address to Congress: President James Monroe’s, which came to be known as “The Monroe Doctrine.” In his speech, Monroe made it clear that:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. (Monroe)

The apparent lack of concern shown by Wilson for European issues is therefore not surprising—it is in keeping with earlier presidential positions—yet, at the time, most Americans sympathized with the Allies (Great Britain, France and Belgium, but not Russia, which was a rather unpopular country). In the next part of his speech, Wilson was already hinting at future involvement when referring to the war “whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble. This is assuredly the opportunity for which a people and a government like ours were raised up, the opportunity not only to speak but actually to embody and exemplify the counsels of peace and amity and the lasting concord which is based on justice and fair and generous dealing.”

**April 6, 1917:** Still, it took a few more years before the U.S. declared war on Germany, not only because American interests were threatened (merchant ships being torpedoed, German State Secretary for Foreign Affairs Arthur Zimmermann’s telegram to Mexican authorities proposing a military agreement...) but because American sentiment was outraged by the Germans and, as Jean Rivière explains, because Wilson believed that “an American intervention would enable his country to participate in the peace conference and protect the freedom of the seas” (in Rougé, ed. 17, our translation). He made it clear in his “War Message” delivered to Congress on April 2, 1917:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest to our hearts for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes,

everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. (Monroe)

***A few facts:***

- 2,8 million men were drafted and another 2 million volunteered (National Archives Foundation).
- American losses during the war: 117,465 (Clodfelter 481).

**January 8, 1918:** Wilson addressed Congress a list of 14 points—actually based upon the collaborative work of various scholars and intellectuals who had gathered at the New York Public Library<sup>3</sup>—in a kind of a statement of principles for peace in which he presents guidelines to help rebuild the postwar world (see Rivière, in Rougé 18).

Also important, Wilson introduced the idea of a League of Nations which he outlined as the final point XIV: “A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.” To the American President, World War I turned into a crusade for democracy (another form of Manifest Destiny) and “a war to end all wars”—a famous phrase that derives from H. G. Wells’s *The War That Will End War*. Ironically, none of the other “Big Four” (Lloyd George of Britain, Vittorio Emanuele Orlando of Italy, and Georges Clémenceau of France) was totally thrilled by Wilson’s proposed plan of action during the Paris Peace Conference that led to the Treaty of Versailles. In the U.S., public opinion was in favor of ratifying the treaty (and the Covenant of the League of Nations) but there was a strong opposition to it within the U.S. Senate and, ultimately the Treaty of Versailles was not ratified in 1920 (Kaspi, *Les Américains* 272-73).<sup>4</sup>

---

3. The group was known as “The Inquiry” and later developed into a public policy institute, the Council on Foreign Relations (1921).

4. Instead, the U.S. Government signed a separate treaty with Germany, the Treaty of Berlin, on August 25, 1921. It announces that the United States will enjoy all “rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations or advantages” conferred to it by the Treaty of Versailles, but there is no mention of the League of Nations which the U.S. never joined.

## **From November 11, 1918...: Armistice and its Aftermath**

The War Department canceled all war contracts (worth about 4 billion dollars). The War Industries Board, established in 1917 and designed to provide coordination and control of war supplies, put an end to its activities in December. This resulted in a decrease in the industrial production and in a series of strikes. Still, thanks to the war, unemployment almost disappeared, the average annual wage in manufacturing almost doubled (from \$580 in 1914 to about \$950 in 1918).

Preoccupied with his crusade to promote the League of Nations (he even completed a three-week speaking tour to push it), upset with the Republicans' lack of support, and incapacitated by a stroke, Wilson proposed no further reform measures during his last two years in office (see Rivière in Rougé 19-20).

## **1919-1920: The Red Scare, an early example of “the complete and full necessity of 100% Americanism” (Coolidge)**

Because of the 1917 Russian Revolution, many Americans were afraid of communist or subversive parties—of any far-left or radicalist movement, to make it simpler—and the Espionage Act of the same year empowered the government in its actions to silence potential dissenters. There was a growing fear of revolution as homemade bombs were posted to prominent politicians and industrialists considered hostile to labor interests or immigrants, explosions occurring simultaneously in various cities. As Sylvie Le Bars puts it: “Post WWI labor unrest, rioting in major industrial cities, and bombing incidents ... compounded the fear” (53). The BOI (formed in 1908 and later to become the FBI), in charge of security threats, arrested and sometimes even shipped off hundreds of “supposedly radical aliens” (Le Bars 53).

Some Supreme Court decisions (*Schenck v. U.S.*<sup>5</sup>; and *Abrams v. U.S.*; *Gitlow v. New York*)<sup>6</sup> restraining both freedom of speech and of the press introduced distinctions between speech they called “protected” as opposed to speech they deemed “not protected.” Announcing modern understandings of the First Amendment, they established tests to “weigh the guarantee of individual freedom against the preservation of peace and order” (Le Bars 55) and evaluate, as Justice Holmes has it, “whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about

5. This decision was overturned in 1969 by *Brandenburg v. Ohio*. The latter limits the scope of speech the government may ban to that inciting lawless action.

6. There are three other examples: *Debs v. United States* (1919); *Whitney v. California* (1927); *Fiske v. Kansas* (1927).

the substantive evils that the United States Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree” (see Le Bars 55). In the first case, the concerns had to do with Schenck promoting insubordination—he felt that the Conscription Act constituted a violation of the 13th amendment because it implied future forms of “servitude.” Abrams had circulated anti-war pamphlets which did not pass the “bad tendency test” while Gitlow was charged for “criminal anarchy” because he had brought out a “left-wing manifesto.” In the end, “the Red Scare led the courts to indict Socialists and agitators for their views and political stands.” It also forced “the States to prove they had a ‘compelling interest’ in passing laws infringing personal freedoms” (Le Bars 57).

One last emblematic illustration of the Red Scare is the Sacco and Vanzetti case (1920-27). Two Italian immigrants, who had allegedly met during a strike and fled to Mexico not to be drafted in 1917, were arrested for the murder of a guard and a paymaster during an armed robbery in 1920. Yet, as Ronald Creagh observes, “the trial seem[ed] to be more about challenging anarchism and immigration than bringing the working class into line” (in Royot, ed. 128, our translation). In fact, it is possibly because they were well-known anarchists that they were convicted. The crime had happened during the wave of robberies mentioned earlier. In addition, class struggles as well as frictions between the Italian and Irish communities played important roles. “Their social condition, their intimate convictions, everything persuade[d] the two defendants that their trial [was] an episode in the class war, at the end of which they [would] irrevocably be sacrificed” (129, our translation). Throughout the trial, Sacco and Vanzetti kept claiming they were innocent, but all their appeals were denied, and eventually they were electrocuted in August 1927. “Their unorthodox political views helped to condemn them. The fact that they were Italians also sealed their fate, or so they believed. ... As anarchists they were outside the mainstream of American thought. They were tried primarily for their political views and their ethnic associations and secondly for their alleged crime” (Veronesi 136). The story of the trial traveled the world thanks to international media coverage, and they gained support from socialists and intellectuals that included John Dos Passos, Dorothy Parker, Albert Einstein, H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw (see Creagh in Rougé).

It took some time but, in the end, it became evident that fears of revolution were unfounded, and the Red Scare somehow subsided. In a 1920 essay published in *Forum*, U.S. Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer tried to account for the fear and paranoia that define those two years:

Like a prairie-fire, the blaze of revolution was sweeping over every American institution of law and order a year ago. It was eating its way into the homes of the American workmen, its sharp tongues of revolutionary heat were licking the altars of the churches, leaping into the belfry of the school bell, crawling into the sacred corners of American homes, seeking to replace marriage vows with libertine laws, burning up the foundations of society.

Robbery, not war, is the ideal of communism. This has been demonstrated in Russia, Germany, and in America. As a foe, the anarchist is fearless of his own life, for his creed is a fanaticism that admits no respect of any other creed. Obviously, it is the creed of any criminal mind, which reasons always from motives impossible to clean thought. Crime is the degenerate factor in society.

Upon these two basic certainties, first that the “Reds” were criminal aliens and secondly that the American Government must prevent crime, it was decided that there could be no nice distinctions drawn between the theoretical ideals of the radicals and their actual violations of our national laws. An assassin may have brilliant intellectuality, he may be able to excuse his murder or robbery with fine oratory, but any theory which excuses crime is not wanted in America. This is no place for the criminal to flourish, nor will he do so so long as the rights of common citizenship can be exerted to prevent him. (“The Case Against the Reds”—the whole essay is available on the Digital History website)

The war influenced not only attitudes to the outside world but also many aspects of social, cultural, and political life. For instance, when soldiers returned home, things had drastically changed, women had taken the jobs of those who were fighting abroad, and they had to adapt. For African Americans, the return illuminated a paradox that had defined their lives since the Reconstruction Amendments: they had fought for democracy but in their own country they were still considered as second-class citizens and discriminated against. It may be that the “changes” of the 1920s—the revival of nativism, a second industrial revolution, the challenges to the existing social and moral order—would have happened anyway. Some were already on the way before 1914, but the war certainly accelerated everything. And the best consequence was for women who were granted the right to vote.

In January 1918, the long fight led by suffrage groups and women’s valuable contribution to the war effort (see Hage in Garbaye, ed.) made President Wilson, who had so far been opposed to the vote of women in America, declare that it was necessary. The House of Representatives approved of the Amendment in May 1919 quickly followed by the Senate a month later. The 19th Amendment was ratified on August 26, 1920. It states “[t]he right of citizens of the United

States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.” As Armand Hage explains, “the victory was all the more complete and sweet as the Amendment was worded exactly like the 1878 proposed amendment” (in Garbaye 99).

Wilson died in 1924, desperate not to have been able to make the Americans approve of his new international order: the United States would not take part in the League of Nations but he had made the country greater inside and out.

## Prosperity and Illusions

### *The Republican Era*

There were three presidents during the period, all Republicans:

- Warren G. Harding (1921-1923)
- Calvin Coolidge (1923-1929)
- Herbert Hoover (1929-1933)

### *Warren G. Harding*

There was an atmosphere of social unrest (numerous strikes) and race riots during the campaign for the 1920 presidential election. People were worried, they had doubts and fears but there remained room for hope and the Republican party managed to address all three in order to convince electors that they could be trusted (see Marx, in Royot, ed.). Harding’s propositions were rather vague—he wanted things “back to normalcy” and for America to come first—but he was nonetheless elected with 60.4% of votes, by a greater margin than any previous presidential candidate.

It was the first modern presidential campaign: the press covered it widely and even Hollywood stars supported Harding’s candidacy (some traveled to Marion, Ohio for photo shootings with him and his wife to provide favorable publicity). Harding’s idea of a “return to normalcy” was formulated in response to the Progressive Era (a period of reform during the previous thirty years). It implies three political trends: Isolationism<sup>7</sup> (in reaction to World War I), Nativism (a doctrine that aims to protect the interests of native-born or established citizens against those of immigrants), and a move away from the government activism of the reform era.

7. Foreign policy that combines both a non-interventionist military policy and economic protectionism, thus restraining trade between countries.