



ÉPREUVE COMMUNE - FILIÈRES MP - PC - PSI - TSI - TPC

**LANGUE VIVANTE A
ANGLAIS****Mardi 30 avril : 14 h - 17 h**

N.B. : le candidat attachera la plus grande importance à la clarté, à la précision et à la concision de la rédaction. Si un candidat est amené à repérer ce qui peut lui sembler être une erreur d'énoncé, il le signalera sur sa copie et devra poursuivre sa composition en expliquant les raisons des initiatives qu'il a été amené à prendre.

<p>L'usage d'un dictionnaire et de machines (traductrice, calculatrice, etc.) est strictement interdit.</p>
--

Rédiger en anglais et en 400 mots une synthèse des documents proposés, qui devra obligatoirement comporter un titre.

Indiquer avec précision, à la fin du travail, le nombre de mots utilisés (titre inclus), un écart de 10 % en plus ou en moins sera accepté.

Vous aurez soin d'en faciliter la vérification, en mettant un trait vertical tous les vingt mots.

Toute fraude sera sanctionnée.

Vous indiquerez, en introduction, au minimum, la source et la date de chaque document. Vous pourrez ensuite, dans le corps de la synthèse, faire référence à ces documents par « doc.1 », « doc. 2 », etc.

Ce sujet comporte les 4 documents suivants qui sont d'égale importance :

- **document 1** - Whistleblowers - Heroes or traitors? Robert Hackwill, (extrait et adapté de *euronews.com*, 18/01/2017)
 - **document 2** - UK Government's Plans To Silence Whistleblowers In "Full-Frontal Attack". Ryan Morwood, (extrait et adapté de *anyvoice.co.uk*, 22/04/2017)
 - **document 3** - While the UK attacks whistleblowers, the EU is defending them – that is, until Brexit happens. Jean Lambert, (extrait et adapté de *independent.co.uk*, 20/02/2017)
 - **document 4** - Illustration by Eduardo Fuentes from the article: Life after whistleblowing, (extrait de *timeshighereducation.com*, 31/07/2014)
-

Document 1 - Whistleblowers - Heroes or traitors?

Snowden, Assange, Manning. A piece of art in Berlin representing the three famous whistleblowers is meant to encourage citizens to speak out. For some people these whistleblowers (people who are known for denouncing and revealing illegal practices in government agencies and organisations) are heroes. For others, especially the US administration, they are traitors.

Chelsea Manning is the only one of the three to have served prison time. The 29-year-old transgender US army private was initially sentenced to 35 years for her role in leaking diplomatic cables to Wikileaks. Wikileaks has published sensitive information for 10 years now, but made headlines worldwide in 2010 when it released Manning's classified military documents. Especially shocking was the footage showing US soldiers who shot dead several Iraqi civilians from a helicopter. This caused a public outcry.

Wikileaks founder Julian Assange promoted the video. He remains holed up in the Ecuadorian embassy in London, because by leaving it he may risk extradition to the US. To his critics, Assange is a publicity-seeker, but to his supporters, he informed the public about the hidden damage of US military actions. "We have seen there are approximately 15,000 never previously documented or known cases of civilians who have been killed by violence in Iraq," says Assange.

Like Assange, whistleblower and former intelligence agent Edward Snowden faces a life in exile. After leaking information about the extensive internet and phone surveillance done by the National Security Agency he fled from the United States to Russia. "If we can't understand the policies and programmes of our government, we cannot grant our consent in regulating them," he insists.

Heroes or traitors? Certainly for the media world they are more often than not heroes. From Stanley Adams, who exposed corruption at Swiss drugs giant Hoffman-La Roche, a *cause celebre* in the 1970s and immortalised in song by British rock band The Fall, to Jeffrey Wigand, who exposed the fact that US tobacco companies knew how harmful their products were. He would be played by Russell Crowe in the 1999 Michael Mann movie.

Or there is Dr. David Kelly, a British weapons expert who tried to expose what he called the British government's "sexing up" of reports claiming Saddam Hussein retained a chemical and biological weapons capability, used to justify the US-led invasion of Iraq. Television, not film, has examined his case.

In any case after the Snowden publications took place, the US Congress passed a historic National Security Agency reform law. US President Barack Obama added further changes to NSA practices, and tech companies have been using encryption to better protect millions of people's privacy.

Robert Hackwill, *euronews.com*, 18/01/2017

Document 2 - UK Government's Plans To Silence Whistleblowers In "Full-Frontal Attack"

Theresa May's Conservative Government has come under fire recently due to recommendations from its legal advisers to overhaul the Official Secrets Act to include a raised maximum sentence from two to 14 years for leaking documents and data as well as expanding the definition of espionage to include obtaining or receiving sensitive data.

The proposals, which have been heavily criticised by media organisations and civil rights groups, were part of an ongoing, major overhaul of the existing Official Secrets Act (OSA). The Law Commission, an independent body set up to advise the government on law reform, recently published its draft recommendations for a replacement of the OSA, the Espionage Act, that would include the increased maximum sentences and an expanded definition of espionage.

The recommendations have been described by Jim Killock, chief executive of Open Rights Group, as a "*full-frontal attack, recommending criminalising even examining secret services' material.*" Killock went on to state that "*The intention is to stop the public from ever knowing that any secret agency has ever broken the law.*" Open Rights Group were one of the several organisations that the commission had apparently consulted with about the new recommendations, a consultation they claim they did not take part in.

The draft also contained suggestions to include a “Statutory Commissioner Model” of reporting illegality or impropriety, whereby those who may feel compelled to release sensitive information to the press, the public or outlets such as Wikileaks, can instead bring their concerns to the attention of a statutory commissioner. The commissioner would then have the power to investigate the concerns brought to them but would also, however, report to the Prime Minister so as to prevent the release of sensitive data to the public.

This model appears to try to further cover-up government wrongdoing by adding an extra layer of bureaucracy to the process of holding the government and its officials to account for their actions. What is most concerning, however, is the idea that the UK government seems to be heading towards a one-way street approach when it comes to data, sensitive or not.

With the Investigatory Powers Act making the mass surveillance of every viable internet user in the country legal, one might expect (or at least hope) that, in turn for our data, the government would be more transparent about its own actions and own up to its mistakes when they are recognised. These latest recommendations, however, seem to point to the opposite conclusion. Since the high-profile leaks of Edward Snowden, many western governments, the US and UK in particular, seem to be doing as much as they can in order to ensure that further leaks are prevented and whistleblowers deterred via the use of ever more draconian measures.

Ryan Morwood, *anyvoice.co.uk*, 22/04/2017

Document 3 - While the UK attacks whistleblowers, the EU is defending them – that is, until Brexit happens

In sharp contrast to the UK Government’s new approach to whistleblowing, the European Parliament this week debated and voted for EU provisions to be drafted to protect whistleblowers.

The disparity between what’s happening in the UK and the European Parliament is striking. On one hand we have a Government looking at increasing the punishment of those who would seek to expose wrongdoing to draconian levels, while in the European Parliament there is support across the political groups to protect whistleblowers through the law.

The European Parliament believes that whistleblowing is essential to ensuring the accountability and integrity of the public and private sector. It's the only way in which otherwise secret information can be brought to light, and hence it's often the best way, at least for now, to uncover wrongdoing, corruption, and downright immoral behaviour.

Recent scandals uncovered by whistleblowers include illegal mass surveillance, industrial scale tax avoidance and the sexual abuse of children by peacekeepers. A number of those involved in exposing such cases have then faced disciplinary procedures at work and/or criminal proceedings. The biggest leak in history to date, revealed in the Panama Papers, highlighted just how important whistleblowers are for allowing in-depth journalistic investigations in the public interest.

Some months ago the EU adopted a Trade Secrets Directive that threatens to undermine future disclosures of this kind by treating almost any secretive business information as a trade secret. It was largely in response to this shift in thinking that the Greens/EFA group in the European Parliament set about proposing the text of an EU legal framework that would set out common standards for the protection of whistleblowers throughout the European Union.

On the basis of ongoing demands coming from the European Parliament for such legislation, repeated in this week's debate and vote, the European Commission, which formally proposes all new EU legislation, has indicated it is looking at proposing a law on this issue in the course of the year.

The key issue from the Greens’ proposed Directive is that we need to ensure that there are safe ways for people to provide information and that they should be protected when doing so, not vilified and victimised. From an EU point-of-view, there needs to be a coherent body of law on protection, rather than the patchwork that currently exists. Thus far signs from the Commission are that their initial proposal will reflect these priorities. Far from being unnecessary “red tape”, EU-wide

legislation supporting whistleblowers is long overdue and essential for protecting genuine public interest.

By having at least a minimum standard of protection, the media, public servants and other workers would be more likely to speak up without fear of retaliation. In this way we both prevent wrongdoing from occurring as there is a greater likelihood of getting caught, but we also expose that which has already happened or is currently taking place. These provisions also need a wide scope – to cover environmental crimes, violations of human rights, and corruption – and should apply to both the public and private sectors.

The European Parliament has stressed the important role of investigative journalism and wants the Commission proposals to afford the same protection to such journalists as it does to whistleblowers: for both, the requirement is that their actions are to protect the public interest and that they are acting in good faith.

It is surely in the best interests of the British people that fraud and wrongdoing – in both public and private sectors – be prevented and uncovered. The public interest is not always the same as the interests of government and big business. Good legislation should protect the public interest and those who act to uphold it.

Another fundamental point, brought sharply into focus by the UK Government's proposals, is that we must reverse the current trend of increasingly clamping down on freedom of information and freedom of expression, and of granting ever greater rights to government and corporations to silence dissent. This remains just as relevant for the UK, even as it edges towards Brexit.

Even outside the EU, the UK will still be bound by the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights on issues relating to freedom of expression, which has on a number of occasions ruled in favour of protection of whistleblowers.

However, Brexit – especially a hard Brexit – will create new distance and divergence between the UK and our European neighbours in many different ways. A major concern is how far this will extend to our common fundamental values and freedoms. There will be enough bad legacies arising from Brexit. We must not let this be another one.

Jean Lambert, *independent.co.uk*, 20/02/2017

Document 4 - Illustration by Eduardo Fuentes from the article: **Life after whistleblowing**



timeshighereducation.com, 31/07/2014