

Copie anonyme - n°anonymat : 469088



A2-00061
469088
ELVI_LVI

Code épreuve : 756B

Nombre de pages : 04

Session : 2023

Épreuve de : LVA Anglais

Consignes

- Remplir soigneusement l'en-tête de chaque feuille avant de commencer à composer
- Rédiger avec un stylo non effaçable bleu ou noir
- Ne rien écrire dans les marges (gauche et droite)
- Numéroté chaque page (cadre en bas à droite)
- Placer les feuilles A3 ouvertes, dans le même sens et dans l'ordre

1) According to the authors of documents 1 and 2, what is the legacy of Queen Elizabeth II?

Last September, the death of the Queen triggered mediatic reactions. Indeed, both documents put forward the legacy she left behind her, as well as the stakes the monarchy and Charles III will have to deal with in the future.

For both authors, it is clear that the Queen embodied unity, gathering all the British in one single kingdom behind a respectful and beloved figure. However, as N. Ascheron seems more melancholic regarding the loss of a strong symbol, M. Jasanoff reminds that her era should not be romanticized.

On the one hand, she highlights the efforts made by the Queen, as historical events ^{had} weakened her popularity. The violent colonial era and the dissolution of the British Empire were difficult moments Elizabeth II had to go through. But on the other hand, Jasanoff take a stronger stance : she feels optimistic by the fresh air King Charles III could bring. Even if Queen Elizabeth has remained a strong link between past and present, his son could bring modernity to the monarchy, by leaving behind him the imperial control over the Commonwealth, or by strengthening the Scottish independence movement.

On the contrary, little will change with Charles III according to document 1. But it clearly emphasizes on the new challenges he will have to face, put in the spotlight by the death of his mother. Indeed, her death jeopardizes the unity of the United Kingdom, and the author feels

less optimistic by the surge of independence movements. Moreover, he puts forward the feelings of the British population: even if royal absolutism was abolished four centuries ago, people seem concerned by the idea of authority, which remains in the country through the Parliament, and does not fit the twenty-one century's way of thinking. British people seems to demand more rights and more control over the Institutions.

All in all, both documents highlight the hurdles the Queen left behind her, especially as Charles III will have to deal with it. Her legacy is a united and peaceful kingdom, while the heir will have to show more modernity to help the monarchy staying as popular as it used to be.

351 words.

2) In your opinion, will the British monarchy survive the current challenges to its existence or not?

As put forward by the YouGov Republic Survey released last December, 60% of Great Britain's population considers that the monarchy should remain (document 4). This proposition seems staggering, as the death of the Queen triggers new debates, on whether the monarchy is still relevant or not today. I would argue that it will manage to survive the current challenges to its existence, especially thanks to the modernity the new king is trying to build.

It is given that the British monarchy faces some issues today. Starting by the unpopularity of Charles III (document 5), who is to reign in the shadow of his mother. He is old and he seems less confident, and ^{less} full. Furthermore, the kingdom feels less

united today, as demonstrated in document 2: the Commonwealth is splitting up, with the leave of Barbados in 2021. But one rampant issue remains the independence movements in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland. Never as the nationalist Sinn Féin party been as strong in recent years: the United Kingdom faces unity challenges, which could question the survival of the British Monarchy. Last but not least, many scandals involving Royal family members have recently hit the headlines. To name but one, the Netflix documentary relating Harry and Meghan's lives, highlights the racism their first child had faced. This was one of the many reasons of the departure of the couple, ~~throwing away~~ their royal duties, in 2020. It all boils down to showing that the British monarchy is going through difficult days, hence the urgent need for the new king to introduce modernity into his reign. I think that it is the only realistic way to keep the Institution alive.

But first and foremost, I believe in the survival of the British monarchy, because it is necessary to support the country's economy, and thus, attractivity. Royal monuments bring in millions of tourists every year. They are lured by the royal pageanties, by the magic the monarchy creates. These travellers back the economy, and bring around 500 million pounds each year. All this goes to show that British people have a certain interest, an economic interest, in the monarchy.

To finish with, I believe that Charles III is trying to introduce modernity into his reign, which is a very good news. First, he got divorced, and then married a divorced woman, which proves his difference with his predecessor. Then, he seems more involved in politics, as never has his mother expressed her opinion. He spent a few days in Northern Ireland after the funeral, to show his involvement in the conflict. Finally, he is more involved in the fight against global warming, as he has published his ecological footprint since 2017, and has been trying to use his private jet the less possible.

As a matter of fact, by continuing to play his

modern card, Charles III might be able to keep the British monarchy as a strong symbol of the country's ^{unity}. And all this without breaking with the values of continuity his mother embodied during her reign. That could help the monarchy to survive, despite the current challenges to its existence. Next week, on May 6, his coronation will take place in Westminster abbey, and he announced on April 30th that it will be a multi-faith ceremony: this shows a real involvement in the well-being of the Institution, one more time.

554 words.

3) Introduction

In 1953, the day of the Queen's coronation, the sociologists Michael Young and Edward Shils had a walk in the swarming streets of London, and outnumbered that event as a "major proof of national communion". It made all its sense, they had written, not as an "individual experience, but as a collective one", which gathered thousands of families in a popular fervor, reminding of the celebration that followed the victory against the nazi Germany. The air was full of human warmth, even the pickpockets had stopped their activity for a while. A fraternity spirit was settled in, and it could have afraid "those who have the nationalist mind of educated people of our days, particularly those who were more politically radical ~~and~~ or liberal".

Today, as inequalities surge increasingly in the United Kingdom, the monarchy seems to remain popular. Nearly two third of the British approve of its existence. Only 22% wish that it disappears, and the Scottish are the more reluctant. Surprising as it could be, the Royal family seems to act as an offshoot or a consolation, when times get difficult. During last ten-year royal weddings, one has always found an issue, to claim that the nation required a bit of happiness.