

INGLÊS

Culture War

- 1 *In December 2007, the Italian government opened an exhibition in Rome of 69 artifacts that four major U.S. museums had agreed to return to Italy on the grounds [base legal] that they had been illegally excavated and exported from the country. Leading nearly 200 journalists through the exhibition, Francesco Rutelli, Italy's then cultural minister, proclaimed, "The odyssey of these objects, which started with their brutal removal from the bowels [entranhas] of the earth, didn't end on the shelf of some American museum. With nostalgia, they have returned. These beautiful pieces have reconquered their souls." Rutelli was not just anthropomorphizing ancient artifacts by giving them souls. By insisting that they were the property of Italy and important to its national identity, he was also giving them citizenship.*
- 2 *Rutelli has hardly been the only government official to insist that artifacts belong to the places from which they originally came. In 2011, the German government agreed to return to Turkey a 3,000-year-old sphinx that German archaeologists had excavated from central Anatolia in the early twentieth century. Afterward, the Turkish minister of culture, Ertugrul Gunay, declared that "each and every antiquity in any part of the world should eventually go back to its homeland."*
- 3 *Such claims on the national identity of antiquities are at the root of many states' cultural property laws, which in the last few decades have been used by governments to reclaim objects from museums and other collections abroad. Despite UNESCO's declaration that "no culture is a hermetically sealed entity," governments are increasingly making claims of ownership of cultural property on the basis of self-proclaimed and fixed state-based identities. Many use ancient cultural objects to affirm continuity with a glorious and powerful past as a way of burnishing [lustrar, polir] their modern political image – Egypt with the Pharaonic era, Iran with ancient Persia, Italy with the Roman Empire. These arguments amount to protectionist claims on culture. Rather than acknowledge that culture is in a state of constant flux, modern governments present it as standing still, in order to use cultural objects to promote their own states' national identities.*
- 4 *In the battle over cultural heritage, repatriation claims based strictly on national origin are more than just denials of cultural exchange: they are also arguments against the promise of encyclopedic museums – a category that includes the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York; the British Museum, in London; and the Louvre, in Paris. By presenting the artifacts of one time and one culture next to those of other times and cultures, encyclopedic museums encourage curiosity about the world and its many peoples. They also promote a cosmopolitan worldview, as opposed to a nationalist concept of cultural identity. In an era of globalization that is nonetheless marked by resurgent nationalism and sectarianism, antiquities and their history should not be used to stoke [fortalecer] such narrow identities. Instead, they should express the guiding principles of the world's great museums: pluralism, diversity, and the idea that culture shouldn't stop at borders – and nor, for that matter, should the cosmopolitan ideals represented by encyclopedic museums. Rather than acquiesce to frivolous, if stubborn, calls for repatriation, often accompanied by threats of cultural embargoes, encyclopedic museums should encourage the development of mutually beneficial relationships with museums everywhere in the world that share their cosmopolitan vision. Cultural property should be recognized for what it is: the legacy of humankind and not of the modern nation-state, subject to the political agenda of its current ruling elite.*

By James Cuno
Adapted from *Foreign Affairs* November/December 2014.

31. With respect to the December 2007 exhibition of 69 artifacts in Rome, the information in the article most supports which of the following?

- The Italian government had to negotiate for many years in order to convince the four U.S. museums to repatriate the 69 artifacts.
- During a period of many years, the 69 artifacts were stolen from Italian museums and sold to four U.S. museums.
- Italy's cultural minister publicly questioned whether the 69 artifacts had in fact gone directly to the four U.S. museums after they left Italy.
- Before repatriating the 69 artifacts, the four U.S. museums recognized that it had been a mistake to accept those artifacts in the first place.
- Before the December 2007 exhibition opened in Rome, most Italians were unaware that the 69 artifacts had been illegally taken from the country.

Resolução:

Pode-se ler a resposta no trecho que segue:

In December 2007, the Italian government opened an exhibition in Rome of 69 artifacts that four major U.S. museums had agreed to return to Italy on the grounds [base legal] that they had been illegally excavated and exported from the country.

Alternativa D

32. According to Francesco Rutelli, the 69 artifacts that were returned to Italy

- can be understood only within the context of Italian history.
- will never leave Rome again.
- were all prominent items in the collections of the four U.S. museums.
- lost something important when they left Italy for the U.S.
- deserve the rights and protections that any Italian citizen has.

Resolução:

Encontra-se a resposta no seguinte trecho:

With nostalgia, they have returned. These beautiful pieces have reconquered their souls.

Alternativa D

33. Which of the following is most supported by the information in the article?

- Germany was the first European country to return an illegally excavated artifact to its land of origin.
- The 3,000-year-old sphinx was the first in a series of artifacts that the German government has agreed to send back to Turkey.
- When the 3,000-year-old sphinx was created, Anatolia was the center of Turkish culture.
- According to Francesco Rutelli, every ancient artifact must, without exception, be returned to its land of origin.
- If Turkish museums take Ertugrul Gunay seriously, it's possible they could lose some of their artifacts.

Resolução:

A resposta pode ser lida no trecho que segue:

Afterward, the Turkish minister of culture, Ertugrul Gunay, declared that "each and every antiquity in any part of the world should eventually go back to its homeland."

Alternativa E

34. In paragraph 3, the phrase "no culture is a hermetically sealed entity" most likely supports the idea that

- as declared by Ertugrul Gunay, "each and every antiquity in any part of the world should eventually go back to its homeland."
- there is nothing inherently wrong with artifacts from one country remaining in another country.
- if an artifact was illegally taken from a country, then it must be returned.
- as an impartial, international organization, UNESCO should be the judge of which antiquities should be returned to their homelands.
- national cultural property laws are by their nature invalid.

Resolução:

A frase "nenhuma cultura é uma entidade hermeticamente lacrada" sustenta a ideia de que *não há nada inerentemente errado se artefatos de um país permanecerem em outro.*

Alternativa B

35. With respect to certain governments that demand the repatriation of ancient artifacts, the information in the article supports all of the following **except**

- a) they use the conflict over such artifacts as a way to distract people's attention from more serious problems.
- b) they try to present themselves as the continuation of an illustrious past.
- c) they are not completely satisfied with their current political image.
- d) motivated by self-interest, they present a nationalistic idea of culture.
- e) they treat their countries' ancient artifacts as a kind of exclusive national property.

Resolução:

Em relação a certos governos que exigem a repatriação de artefatos antigos, a informação no artigo não sustenta que *eles usam o conflito sobre tais artefatos como uma maneira de distrair a atenção das pessoas em relação a um problema mais sério.*

Alternativa A

36. According to the information in the article, encyclopedic museums

- a) have been seriously affected by the demand that they return valuable artifacts to their countries of origin.
- b) are the world's greatest repositories of learning and culture.
- c) are designed so that visitors can compare and contrast various cultures, peoples, and periods.
- d) give attention to all cultures in order to stimulate curiosity about the world and its peoples.
- e) reject the idea that nations should promote their own cultural identity.

Resolução:

A resposta pode ser lida no trecho:

By presenting the artifacts of one time and one culture next to those of other times and cultures, encyclopedic museums encourage curiosity about the world and its many peoples. They also promote a cosmopolitan worldview, as opposed to a nationalist concept of cultural identity.

Alternativa C

37. Which of the following is most supported by the information in the article?

- a) Nationalism and sectarianism can be the enemies of encyclopedic museums.
- b) It is the duty of encyclopedic museums to facilitate the unrestricted cross-border movement of antiquities and cultural artifacts.
- c) Encyclopedic museums should be allowed to set up offices in as many countries as possible.
- d) The existence of encyclopedic museums is proof that international cultural exchange cannot be stopped.
- e) When an important antiquity or cultural artifact is in an encyclopedic museum's collection, it should remain there forever.

Resolução:

Pode-se ler a resposta no trecho:

They also promote a cosmopolitan worldview, as opposed to a nationalist concept of cultural identity. In an era of globalization that is nonetheless marked by resurgent nationalism and sectarianism, antiquities and their history should not be used to stoke such narrow identities.

Alternativa A

38. According to the information in the article, the demand that an artifact be repatriated is most likely all of the following **except**

- a) politically motivated.
- b) foolish and poorly reasoned.
- c) a rejection of plurality and diversity.
- d) a reaction against cosmopolitan ideals.
- e) an example of a cultural embargo.

Resolução:

De acordo com a informação no artigo, a exigência de que um artefato seja repatriado *não é um exemplo de embargo cultural.*

Alternativa E

German Submarines (U-Boats) (2)

- 1 *Warships are built for war, but not only for war. They have always had an eloquent symbolic value as expressions of power, wealth and resolve [determinação], as instruments of threat or reassurance. They speak this language in peacetime just as much as in war. But 'language' should really be in the plural. Different kinds of warship convey different meanings, in different languages, and the languages are not easy to translate. This applies to all warships, but especially to submarines. The range of ideas and associations linked with German submarines, for example, in the period of the two world wars and since, were not the same inside Germany as outside. For many episodes of Anglo-German submarine history there are at least three versions of the narrative: the British, the German and what actually happened.*
- 2 *During the Second World War, the British officially described all enemy submarines as 'U-boats', regardless of nationality, so that they would all be tainted [manchados, tachados] by the sinister connotations of the German word, and so that the public would not confuse their activities with the heroic campaigns of British and allied submariners. Today, most books in English on the First World War still describe Germany's adoption of 'unrestricted submarine warfare' as the critical point of the naval war, but what they imagine to have taken place bears only a slight resemblance [semelhança] to the reality. 'Unrestricted submarine war' implies the rejection of legal restraints [restrições] that did not exist, for international law as yet had taken almost no note of the existence of submarines. The German submarine force was divided into different commands that followed different policies and operated different types of boat, but most of them were occupied with stopping cargo ships on the surface in daylight in coastal waters, then allowing the crews to escape in their boats before sinking the ships by shellfire or scuttling charges. This was a highly efficient form of attack involving minimal loss of life. In August 1916 Lieutenant Lothar von Arnauld de la Perière, the captain of U-35, returned to his base having sunk 54 ships, still the record for the single most destructive submarine patrol in history. The quayside [cais] was black with cheering crowds, 'and yet,' he commented, 'so far we had scarcely had any adventures. It was all rather humdrum. We would stop the ship, order the crew into the boats, check the ship's papers, give the crew a course to the nearest land and sink the prize.'*
- 3 *This practice was economical and brilliantly successful, but German senior officers were not cheering. It was hateful to German admirals, and even more to generals, because to them it looked like a concession to civilian values that would ruin Germany's reputation for Abschreckung ('frightfulness' or terror). They wanted the U-boats to torpedo passenger liners, which was difficult to achieve and had limited military value, because the mass slaughter of civilians, they believed, would frighten enemies into surrendering and drive neutrals into port. So they ordered the reluctant submariners to abandon surface attacks in favour of the more murderous, but much less effective, submerged attack. The German submariners knew (as did the British) that the economic blockade was Germany's most effective weapon. But economic blockade was an alien concept to German senior officers, and had little to do with victory as they understood it: they weren't fighting to win so much as to assert the social values of the German military and claim their rightful status in the command of society.*

By N.A.M. Rodger
Adapted from the *London Review of Books* 22 September 2016.

39. Which of the following is most supported by the information in the article?

- a) Warships are as useful in peacetime as they are in time of war.
- b) Language and cultural barriers make it impossible to reach a global agreement on what a warship symbolizes.
- c) Nowadays warships are more useful as symbols of national power than as actual instruments of destruction.
- d) Of all warships, submarines are both the most feared and the most controversial.
- e) There are no warships that have only one purpose.

Resolução:

A resposta pode ser lida no trecho: *Warships are built for war, but not only for war. They have always had an eloquent symbolic value as expressions of power, wealth and resolve, as instruments of threat or reassurance.*

Alternativa E

40. According to the information in the article, the word “U-boat”

- a) was created by the British during the Second World War as a term for any non-British submarine.
- b) was used by the British as a propaganda tool during the Second World War.
- c) was used by the British to symbolize German military atrocities committed on land and sea during the Second World War.
- d) meant something different to each country involved in the Second World War.
- e) because of its sinister connotations, is no longer used by the German Navy.

Resolução:

Pode-se ler a resposta no seguinte trecho:

During the Second World War, the British officially described all enemy submarines as ‘U-boats’, regardless of nationality, so that they would all be tainted by the sinister connotations of the German word, and so that the public would not confuse their activities with the heroic campaigns of British and allied submariners.

Alternativa B

41. In paragraph 2, the term “unrestricted submarine warfare” most likely

- a) refers to a military strategy that the Germans adopted at the beginning of the Second World War.
- b) refers to a military strategy adopted by both the British and Germans at the beginning of the Second World War.
- c) implies a paradox, since all warfare must observe some restrictions.
- d) should, from a juridical point of view, be considered inaccurate.
- e) was a distortion of the truth deliberately fabricated by the British as part of their anti-German propaganda efforts during the First World War.

Resolução:

A resposta pode ser lida no trecho:

Unrestricted submarine war’ implies the rejection of legal restraints that did not exist, for international law as yet had taken almost no note of the existence of submarines.

Alternativa D

42. According to the information in the article, during World War One, U-boats in general

- a) were interested in sinking cargo ships but not in killing their crews.
- b) preferred to attack enemy warships and cargo ships in daylight in coastal waters.
- c) preferred to attack on the surface because they were unable to remain underwater for long periods.
- d) were directed by a highly centralized and efficient chain of command.
- e) concentrated on cargo ships because such vessels had no defense against torpedoes.

Resolução:

Encontra-se a resposta no trecho:

The German submarine force was divided into different commands that followed different policies and operated different types of boat, but most of them were occupied with stopping cargo ships on the surface in daylight in coastal waters, then allowing the crews to escape in their boats before sinking the ships by shellfire or scuttling charges.

Alternativa A

43. Which of the following probably best expresses an ironic aspect of the 1916 patrol of the German submarine U-35?

- a) Although the patrol took place at the height of the war, U-35 sank no enemy warships.
- b) Although the patrol took place more than 100 years ago, it still holds the record as the most destructive in history.
- c) Although the patrol was highly destructive, it was not very exciting.
- d) Despite the destruction it caused, U-35 was not involved in any atrocities or war crimes.
- e) U-35 sank 54 ships; not one was confiscated for German use.

Resolução:

A resposta pode ser lida no trecho:

The quayside was black with cheering crowds, ‘and yet,’ he commented, ‘so far we had scarcely had any adventures. It was all rather humdrum.’

Alternativa C

44. At the beginning of paragraph 3, the phrase "...German senior officers were not cheering..." most likely refers to which of the following?

- German senior officers believed that U-35 should have sunk even more cargo ships.
- German senior officers feared that the submarine warfare policy was harmful to Germany's image.
- German senior officers believed that U-35 was merely doing its duty and therefore deserved no special praise.
- German senior officers were worried that, despite occasional successes, they were losing the war.
- German senior officers were struggling to abolish any civilian control over the war effort.

Resolução:

Pode-se ler a resposta no trecho:

But economic blockade was an alien concept to German senior officers, and had little to do with victory as they understood it: they weren't fighting to win so much as to assert the social values of the German military and claim their rightful status in the command of society.

Alternativa B

45. With respect to the economic blockade enforced by U-boats in the early years of the First World War, the information supports all of the following **except**

- both Germans and British considered it an efficient war policy.
- German admirals and generals thought it sent the wrong message to enemies and neutrals.
- German admirals and generals accepted it as the lesser of two evils.
- German admirals and generals detested it as a civilian rather than military idea.
- for German admirals and generals, what it accomplished was secondary to what it represented.

Resolução:

Com relação ao bloqueio econômico imposto pelos U-boats nos primórdios da Primeira Guerra Mundial, a informação no texto não sustenta *que os almirantes e generais alemães o aceitaram como o menor de dois males.*

Alternativa C

COMENTÁRIO DO CPV

A Prova de Inglês do Vestibular FGV Administração 2017-2 manteve seu padrão em relação aos vestibulares anteriores, ao apresentar dois textos para interpretação das 15 questões.

Mas nessa edição da prova, os artigos não eram recentes:

o primeiro texto foi retirado da revista *Foreign Affairs*, da edição de novembro/dezembro 2014 e foi base para 8 questões;

o segundo texto foi extraído da *London Review of Books*, da edição de 22 de setembro de 2016 e foi base para 7 questões.

O que surpreendeu foi o alto nível de dificuldade: bem acima da média, se comparado aos exames anteriores.

Ressaltamos que nem todas as questões foram bem elaboradas; além disso, exigiam muita atenção do candidato para que ele assinalasse a alternativa correta. O problema foi a imprecisão entre alguns enunciados propostos e a forma de resolução. Algumas questões, por exemplo, pediam para ter a resposta fundamentada no texto, mas, de fato, só poderiam ser marcadas por inferência do artigo.

Discordamos da tradução de alguns termos dos textos, uma vez que essa prática favorece o aluno mediano e reduz a vantagem competitiva dos alunos que são melhor preparados.

A prova de Inglês, com certeza, terá média baixa e terá importante papel para selecionar os candidatos preparados que buscam ingressar no curso de Administração da FGV.