

Copie anonyme - n°anonymat : 940894



A8-00449
940894
ELVI_LVI

Code épreuve : 7560

Nombre de pages : 4

Session : 2023

Épreuve de : langue vivante A ELVi : 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

I - Compréhension - Résumé analytique comparatif.

The death of Queen Elizabeth II triggered a debate on her legacy: the Queen, who was loved by most, left a positive opinion of her, but she may also have weakened the monarchy and its perception.

First and foremost, the Queen's personal legacy is to be acknowledged. According to both documents, the devotion she had for both her country, by appointing her eighteenth prime minister two days before dying (documents 1 and 2), and for the monarchy, for instance after deposing Prince Andrew, who was unpopular, of his roles, will be missed. Moreover, it is what the Queen embodied that must be mourned: she was a link to World War II and to a powerful United Kingdom (doc 2) that allowed her people to gather under a patriotic feeling that the United Kingdom is a good country (doc 1). For these reasons, the Queen's personal legacy is positive.

However, she also leaves behind her a fragile institution. Her reign symbolized the nosedive of the United Kingdom as a power, and the massive violence that came with it (doc. 2), and she could not address the divisions her country suffered from: while the British people agreed to her vision of a "family" throughout the world, many others (in Scotland, Ireland or Wales) perceived the United Kingdom more like a state rather than a nation (doc 1). Furthermore, even her personal legacy threatened the monarchy: because of what she did, the people loved Elizabeth more than the Queen. Thus, it is the unity of the kingdom that is jeopardized.

In consequence, she transmitted to her son a threatened monarchy that must be reformed. The first document underlines that independantisms, like in Ireland, and the fragile and dangerous unwritten Constitution, and with them the claims of the people, are among the challenges the Crown must face. But according to the second document, the death of the Queen could become an opportunity to reform it. It has already begun

with the decolonization of the curriculum and the excuses for colonial crimes in Cyprus or Kenya let it must go further. The main legacy of the Queen could then be the reforms her death will foster.

368 words.

III - Thème

~~Sociologists Michael Young and Edward Shils, who walked in the streets of London which were full of cheering crowd~~

Sociologists Michael Young and Edward Shils, who had walked with the cheering crowd London's streets were full of*, said the event was a "great act of national unity". The event was to be understood, they wrote, "not as an individual but as a collective experience" which gathered thousands of families in a popular euphoria that reminded of the victory over Nazi Germany. The air was impregnated with human warmth; even pickpockets had stopped their job, and we could feel a spirit of brotherhood that would have horrified "those who carry in them the rationalist bias that today's educated people have, especially those who are prone to vote radical or liberal".

Nowadays, while inequalities keep increasing in the United Kingdom, the monarchy seems to have kept its popularity. Almost two Brits out of three approve its existence. Only 22% of them wish it would disappear, the most hostile to it being the Scots. Surprising paradox: when the times are harsh, the royal family seems to serve as a distraction or to cheer up. Over the last ten years, at royal weddings, there was always someone to chant that the moral of the nation needed a boost.

* The day the Queen was crowned in 1953,

"Inoxydable British monarchy", le monde diplomatique, December

2020

II - Expression personnelle.

In the wake of the death of Queen Elizabeth II, many were those who voiced their opinion against the monarchy and against the new king, Charles III. For instance, the #NotMyKing was displayed on social media. But the popularity of Charles III is only one of the several challenges the Crown must adapt to in order to survive.

On the one hand, it is crystal clear that the Crown faces challenges that could threaten its existence. ^(1 and 2) Those threats were revealed by the death of the Queen: with the loss of a figure of unity and peace, many states may want to reconsider their membership to the Commonwealth, like Barbados did in 2021. However the death of the Queen is more a trigger than the real danger for the monarchy. There were already many challenges the Crown had to face: for instance, the place of Lady Diana in the royal family had endangered the image of the Queen, and the recent interview of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle with Oprah Winfrey started a wave of denunciation against the racism Meghan Markle had suffered from. Thus, the challenges the monarchy has to face today are deep-rooted, since it is sometimes no longer adapted to our society: is 200 million ^{pounds a year} a normal amount to pay for one family, while the country keeps getting poorer?

On the other hand, I for one think that the royal family remains essential for the United Kingdom, and thus that it will survive the challenges it faces. Firstly, the monarchy remains highly popular: 60% of the Brits consider we should keep the monarchy (according to a YouGov poll, doc. 4). A case in point is the wedding of Kate Middleton and the heir to the throne^{Swiss} that had been followed live by a vast majority of British people (two thirds). Moreover, the royal family is useful to the country, thanks to tourism, and because of the Soft Power it conveys for the United Kingdom, as shown by the presence of many State Leaders at the funeral of the Queen. But more importantly, the monarchy will survive because they must survive in the interest of the unity of the United Kingdom: without the monarchy, the United Kingdom becomes a state among others, where nations (Scotland, Ireland) will gain the upper hand.

Therefore, although its existence is not threatened, the monarchy must adapt to society. This adaptation has already begun, for example when the Queen decided to pay her taxes in 1993. But this is not enough. In my opinion, the monarchy will have to modify its political role, which was justified by Walter Bagehot in The British Constitution. As mentioned in the article of The Atlantic, the effective power the monarchy has is too strong, and the notion of "dignified branch" does not mean anything anymore. Finally, I consider that the actions of Charles III will determine whether the monarchy will survive or not: if he keeps fighting for noble causes such as the environment (his speech during ^{the} COP 26 in Glasgow, when he said that "the cost of inaction is greater than the cost of transition", was one of the achievements of the conference), and uses his title to make headways, then the monarchy will

survive the challenges it faces.

546 words