



Epreuve de Langue Vivante A

Durée 3 h

Si, au cours de l'épreuve, un candidat repère ce qui lui semble être une erreur d'énoncé, d'une part il le signale au chef de salle, d'autre part il le signale sur sa copie et poursuit sa composition en indiquant les raisons des initiatives qu'il est amené à prendre.

Pour cette épreuve, l'usage des machines (calculatrices, traductrices,...) et de dictionnaires est interdit.

Les candidats doivent obligatoirement traiter le sujet correspondant à la langue qu'ils ont choisie au moment de l'inscription.

Les candidats qui ne composeraient pas dans la langue choisie au moment de leur inscription se verront attribuer la note zéro.

Les différents sujets sous forme d'un fascicule sont présentés de la manière suivante :

Pages 2 à 7	Allemand
Pages 8 à 12	Anglais
Pages 13 à 18	Arabe
Pages 19 à 23	Espagnol
Pages 24 à 29	Italien

Tournez la page S.V.P.

Il est interdit aux candidats de signer leur composition ou d'y mettre un signe quelconque pouvant indiquer sa provenance.

ANGLAIS LVA

En vous appuyant *uniquement* sur les documents du dossier thématique qui vous est proposé, vous rédigerez une synthèse répondant à la question suivante :

To what extent does the British Royal family have a difficult relationship with the media?

Votre synthèse comportera entre 450 et 500 mots et sera précédée d'un titre. Le nombre de mots rédigés devra être indiqué à la fin de votre copie.

Liste des documents :

1. "Who controls whom? The monarchy v the media", *The Guardian*
2. "The Media Column: If the Royal Family continues to push out the press, it will put its own future at risk", *The Independent*
3. "On *The Crown* and our fascination with the Royal family", *Vogue*
4. "Kate and William expecting 2nd", davegranlund.com
5. "Hollywood royalty", *The Daily Mail*

Document 1

Who controls whom? The monarchy v the media

Adapted from Esther Addley and Robert Booth, *The Guardian*, 8 November 2016

Rarely, in the long and dramatic history of the royal family's relationship with the press, has a palace spokesman used such direct language. "The past week has seen a line crossed," Kensington Palace said of the coverage of Prince Harry's relationship with the US TV actor Meghan Markle¹. Saying the prince fears for Markle's safety, the spokesman added: "This is not a game. It is her life and his."

The decision to issue such a bold statement is evidence of the increasingly proactive approach that Kensington Palace² is taking with the media, particularly in response to coverage of Harry and the family of Prince William.

The royals have also appealed to the Independent Press Standards Organisation (Ipso) for protection. Earlier this year, Prince Harry forced the *Daily Star* to retract a claim he had an affair with the Duchess of Cambridge's sister, Pippa Middleton, after complaining to Ipso. Ipso also ruled that a front-page headline in the *Sun* claiming the Queen "backs Brexit" was "significantly misleading".

But some media observers have expressed unease at the royals' attempts to control their own image. Writing last year, Joan Smith, the executive director of *Hacked Off*, argued that no other institution in the UK would be allowed to "intimidate the media".

The royals and the tabloid newspapers have been rebuilding bridges ever since matters reached an all-time low after the death of Princess Diana. Earl Spencer, Diana's brother, said the press had "a direct hand" in her death. The shock of the princess's death led to the famous temporary truce³, with newspaper editors agreeing not to use paparazzi pictures and agreeing to end "deplorable practices" in their coverage of the royals.

Indeed Princes William and Harry were allowed substantial privacy while growing up, but remained uncomfortable in their dealings with the media. In 2002, Harry was exposed for drinking underage and using cannabis; two years later, he was involved in a fight with reporters as he left a nightclub, reportedly shouting: "Why don't you leave me alone?"

William and Kate Middleton were largely left alone on honeymoon after their marriage in 2011, but when topless photographs of the duchess emerged the following year the palace was furious, calling them a "grotesque and totally unjustifiable" invasion of privacy. The photographs did not appear in a mainstream UK publication, but were published in the French magazine *Closer* and widely available online.

That incident illustrated the scale of the difficulty the family faced in controlling their image in a global media market where they were of huge international interest.

In 2008, it was not a British newspaper, but a US website which revealed Prince Harry was serving in Afghanistan, forcing him to be urgently pulled out of the country. On that occasion, the British media had been aware of the deployment but agreed to observe a strict media blackout.

¹ In November 2016, Prince Harry issued a rare statement criticizing the media for harassing his girlfriend and intruding into her private life.

² The official residence of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge (Prince William and Kate Middleton), Prince Harry, and other members of the Royal family.

³ A truce = a short interruption in a war or argument, an agreement to stop fighting or arguing for a period of time

Document 2

The Media Column: If the Royal Family continues to push out the press, it will put its own future at risk

Adapted from Ian Burrell, *The Independent*, Sunday 13 March 2016

The Royal Family and the media that follows it are involved in an existential struggle. Relations between Buckingham Palace and the press deteriorated yet further last week when *The Sun* outed Her Majesty as an “outer” in the European referendum debate. “Queen Backs Brexit”, splashed the paper. The palace swiftly complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation, claiming the interpretation of a 2011 lunch conversation was inaccurate and misleading.

“The idea that there is some kind of Ruritanian¹ anonymity for the Queen is for the birds,” *Sun* editor Tony Gallagher said. “We’re journalists. We just have to put these things in the public domain.”

Gallagher was firing a shot in a much bigger war between the Royals and the press, regarding not only their relations with each other but their respective roles in society. The younger Royals are making a concerted effort to redefine the rules on the media’s access to their lives.

That explains why the royals seek to take control of their own media narrative by embracing Twitter. Kate’s choice of the *Huffington Post*, mostly a platform for amateur bloggers, as media partner was interpreted as another attempt to sideline the press.

Most of all, William and Harry have a deep antipathy for the media. When the Cambridges excluded press photographers from their family skiing trip to Courchevel this month, Piers Morgan, *Mail Online* editor-at-large, explained: “Prince William hates the press and this is a very deliberate and unacceptable attempt to control them.” William apparently sees little distinction between the paparazzi who pursued his mother to her last in the Paris car crash of 1997 and the photographers who once gathered as a matter of protocol to take family portraits on the first days of royal skiing holidays.

But the pattern of press blackout goes much further. Since becoming a mother, the Duchess has largely preferred to release photos of Prince George and Princess Charlotte that she has taken herself. The Cambridges have stepped up their efforts to block publication of pictures which they claim are invasive, even when taken in public places. “They have tried to create a new law of privacy around Kate and squashed pictures of her that have been taken quite legitimately,” one senior Fleet Street² figure told me.

While it’s perfectly understandable that William wants to protect his wife from the fate suffered by his mother, it’s something else to expect to live by different laws from the rest of society.

It’s not just the press fighting for survival here. The Cambridges represent the future of the monarchy. Without the support of such once-fervently royalist titles such as *The Sun*, *the Mail* and the *Express*, that’s a future which is less certain. “The public are turning on these two,” said one Henley-on-Thames commentator to *Mail Online*’s coverage of the ski blackout. “Once the Queen goes, the Royal Family will fall apart.”

¹ Ruritanian: relating to or having the characteristics of an imaginary place of high romance.

² Fleet Street is a street in central London where many newspaper offices used to be located. The term is often used figuratively to mean the entire British newspaper world.

Document 3

On The Crown And Our Fascination With The Royal Family

Adapted from Juliet Nicolson, *Vogue* magazine, 2nd November 2016

Interest in the royal family is as British as an addiction to tea and complaining about the weather. And *The Crown*, a new 10-part show commissioned by Netflix, will only increase our infatuation. The show offers us an invitation to spy on royalty and watch, fascinated by the very ordinariness of this extraordinary family.

Before Eileen Atkins – who plays Queen Elizabeth's grandmother – went to a reception at Buckingham Palace, she had a “take-it-or-leave-it approach to the monarchy”, she confesses. And then she met the actual Queen. “Something hit me as I walked through that door,” she says, explaining how she experienced first-hand what the series conveys so powerfully. “I was suddenly aware that being royal is no privilege. They are constantly on display. Celebrities choose fame. Royals have it thrown on them.”

Much of what we feel for the royal family is linked to our admiration for the Queen and the way in which she has devoted her life to a role that she did not ask for. On her 21st birthday she made a moving speech committing herself to her country, the Commonwealth and her subjects. Now she is this country's longest-serving monarch and the opinion polls have delivered a steady approval score of not less than 70 per cent throughout her reign.

The future of the royal family has not always looked so sunny and the family has sometimes suffered from a shaky relationship with the media. Recently, images of Prince Harry “cavorting¹” in a Las Vegas swimming pool did a roaring trade for the press. And yet, as the late Princess of Wales² realised, if the popularity of the royal family was to survive, it was important to step out from behind their palace walls and become more available to us, more human.

The dual demands for privacy and exposure present a precarious tightrope on which the royal family must walk. Public enjoyment versus public expectation can pull in conflicting directions. Royal scandals sell papers, they spark national debate, and they provide a subject on which everyone has a view. But we also look to the monarchy to represent us as a nation, to reflect who we are and what we stand for on the international stage, to fly the flag for our Britishness. We beam with pride at Prince Harry's enterprise; we celebrate the chicness of the Duchess of Cambridge, a real-life Cinderella who started life as “one of us” and was transformed into a princess before our eyes; and we marvel at the work ethic of the Queen.

However, too much reality, while tempting, is also unsettling. As the historian Vernon Bogdanor explains, “we project ideal values on to the royal family that we would like to have ourselves. We need someone to look up to in a secular age.”

¹ to cavort = to engage in extravagant behaviour

² Diana, Princess of Wales (the mother of Princes William and Harry).

Document 4



"Kate and William expecting 2nd", Dave Granlund, davegranlund.com, 8th September 2014

Document 5



The Daily Mail, July 2011. The caption reads, "Hollywood royalty: Wearing a classic tuxedo, Prince William escorts Kate down the red carpet and into the Belasco Theatre in Los Angeles"