2021

1° Semestre

BLOCO 2

- Língua Portuguesa
- Inglês

VESTIBULAR FGV

GRADUAÇÃO EM DIREITO SP

01/11/2020

Texto para as perguntas de 1 a 8

À medida que os valores e as certezas naufragam, eles são substituídos pelo riso. Não foi ele que os derrubou. A derrisão não tem poder sobre as crenças e as ideologias; estas são impermeáveis a qualquer ironia. Nem mesmo a razão pode muito contra elas. A idiotia é uma couraça invulnerável, capaz de proteger as crenças mais absurdas. E é quando elas começam a se esboroar que o riso e a razão têm a oportunidade de intervir eficazmente. Porque o riso só pode penetrar pelas fissuras, para alargá-las.*

Foi assim que o século XVIII troçou da religião, do absolutismo; no século XIX, a sátira e a caricatura aumentaram as brechas dos governos monárquicos, autoritários, participaram das lutas sociais, políticas e econômicas; no século XX, elas contribuíram para o recuo das ideologias. Pouco a pouco, o riso insinuou-se nas brechas abertas pela filosofia, no seio da consciência humana individual. O humor está sempre nos calcanhares da dúvida. Ele aparece quando as ciências humanas mostram a fraqueza e a complexidade do ser humano. Este começa a rir de si mesmo, a zombar de suas antigas pretensões, a não se levar a sério. É a vez do próprio ser, da existência, que, tendo perdido o sentido, se torna objeto de derrisão. O riso engolfou-se por todas as brechas abertas pelas ciências, nas certezas humanas.

É assim que ele termina, na época atual, por cobrir tudo, numa sociedade humorística em que tudo se banha numa derrisão divertida. Certamente existem redutos de seriedade aqui e ali – integrismos e fanatismos de toda espécie –, mas eles só são sérios aos próprios olhos; o resto do mundo os ignora ou os olha com curiosidade. O riso moderno é incerto, porque não sabe mais onde se fixar. Ele não é afirmação nem negação, antes, é interrogação, flutuando sobre o abismo em que as certezas naufragaram.*

Georges Minois, **História do riso e do escárnio**, 2003. Adaptado.

*** Glossário:**
"derrisão": riso zombeteiro; dito que denota desprezo por outrem, geralmente de forma irônica;
"integrismo": conservadorismo, fundamentalismo.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 1**

No texto, a que tipo de "valores e certezas" (L. 1) o autor se refere? Explique sucintamente.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 2**

Sem alterar seu sentido, mude a oração sublinhada para a voz ativa.

"À medida que os valores e as certezas naufragam, <u>eles são substituídos pelo riso</u>."

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 3**

Segundo o autor, qual o papel da filosofia e da ciência em relação às "certezas humanas" (L. 9)?

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 4**

Reescreva a oração sublinhada, iniciando-a com uma conjunção adequada ao contexto e fazendo as modificações necessárias:

"É a vez do próprio ser, da existência, que, <u>tendo perdido o sentido</u>, se torna objeto de derrisão."

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 5**

Em seu uso habitual, os advérbios "aqui" e "ali" indicam, respectivamente, "lugar onde está o falante" e "lugar distante daquele em que estão o falante e o ouvinte". É com esses sentidos que esses advérbios foram usados no trecho "Certamente existem redutos de seriedade aqui e ali" (L. 11)? Justifique.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 6**

Proponha dois sinônimos para o termo sublinhado, adequados ao contexto, de tal forma que o primeiro tenha também caráter metafórico, e o segundo seja empregado em sentido próprio.

"A idiotia é uma <u>couraça</u> invulnerável" (L. 2).

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 7**

Examine a charge e responda sucintamente.



Duke, **O Tempo**, 20/11/2019.

O alvo do humor e da sátira presentes na charge corresponde a algum aspecto mencionado no texto de George Minois, citado no início da prova? Justifique.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 8**

Examine a charge e responda sucintamente.



Duke, **O Tempo**, 20/11/2019.

No trecho "flutuando sobre o abismo em que as certezas naufragaram" (final do texto), a palavra sublinhada foi empregada apenas em sentido figurado.

Na charge, ocorre o mesmo com o emprego dessa palavra? Justifique.

Texto para as perguntas de 9 e 10

Leia o texto e responda ao que se pede.

CLICHÊS: Quando uma expressão surgir pronta e de imediato na sua cabeça, há um grande risco de que seja um clichê. Embora essas expressões pré-fabricadas sejam úteis, elas banalizam a escrita e sugerem a falta de reflexão por parte do autor.
Um texto tenderá a ser melhor se contiver imagens originais e palavras escolhidas a dedo.

Manual da Redação, PubliFolha, 2018.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 9**

Quanto ao uso de "clichês", pode-se afirmar que o redator desse verbete seguiu suas próprias recomendações? Justifique.

(valor: 1,0) **PERGUNTA 10**

Reescreva o trecho "Um texto tenderá a ser melhor se contiver imagens originais", mudando o verbo "tenderá" para o futuro do pretérito e fazendo as modificações necessárias.

Texto para as perguntas de 11 a 13

MARBLE MONSTERS

In 1895 the burghers [*burgueses*] of Bristol in southwest England, swept up by the Victorian fervor for celebrating city fathers, were casting about for a big historical figure of their own. They settled on Edward Colston, a 17th-century merchant who had endowed charities that have lifted innumerable indigent Bristolians out of poverty and educated hordes [*multidões*] of its young citizens over the centuries. But, by modern standards, they picked the wrong guy: Colston made his money largely through the Royal African Company, which shipped slaves from Africa to the West Indies. On June 17th protesters chucked [*arremessaram*] his statue into the city's harbor.

Statues become flashpoints [*pontos de inflamação*] at times of social change because they honor values, and reflect hierarchies, of the times in which they were erected. What some in one era celebrate, others then and later often reject – hence the battles over statues of Confederate heroes in the southern United States, many of which were put up long after the Civil War, which lasted from 1861-1865 and in which the South tried to secede from the United States and set up a new country – the Confederate States of America – based on white supremacy and the perpetual slavery of African-Americans. Yet statues also provide a record of a country's past, and the desire to respect and understand that history of commemoration argues against dismantling them. It is these conflicting urges that make this area so tricky [*complicada*].

It would be foolish to throw overboard all those figures who have in any way offended modern morality, just as it would be to preserve every bronze villain just because he's ancient. Great figures should have a place in public spaces, even when their record is tarnished. As a rule, someone whose failings were subordinate to his or her claim to greatness should stay, whereas [*ao passo que*] someone whose main contribution to history was malignant should go.

These guidelines would allow most of those about whom Britain is now arguing to remain where they are. Colston doesn't deserve such consideration. Oliver Cromwell, by contrast, caused terrible suffering in Ireland, but his role in democracy's development justifies his presence in Parliament Square – he established in England the republican regime known as the Commonwealth, which lasted from 1649 to1653. Cecil Rhodes is a harder case. He was not the worst imperialist, but he drove many black Africans off their land. He left a huge, grubby [*suja, imunda*] fortune to charity. As his statue is the property of Oriel College, Oxford, it ought to put him in a museum.

America honors many people who happened to be slave owners – and so it should, in the case of such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, known chiefly for their contribution to their country. But the pressure for change is forcing America to reassess its statuary. Many Confederate leaders have been removed in the past few years, and more should go, including Ben Tillman, a white supremacist still honored outside South Carolina's state house; and Nathan Bedford Forrest, a brilliant Civil War general – but also a slave trader and, after the war, a founder of the Ku Klux Klan – whose bust is in the state capital in Tennessee.

Yet it matters not just that the undeserving are taken off their pedestals, but also how they go. The indignation of those who brought down Colston may have been righteous [*justificada, virtuosa*], but they were wrong to topple [*derrubar*] him themselves. Statues should be taken down, just as they ought to be put up, by social consensus; and even if the authorities dither [*vacilar, perder tempo*] for years – as Bristol's city council has done over the erection of a plaque explaining Colston's sins – that is no excuse for the mob [*populacho, multidão desordenada*] to take charge.

Prosecuting the topplers [*os que derrubam*] would not, however, be a good use of the state's resources; nor should Colston be reinstated. He has been dredged out of the river, and the Bristol City Council is planning to put him in a museum.

Adapted from *The Economist*, June 13th 2020.

Introduction

This article from *The Economist* examines an increasingly widespread and polemical act, the removal of controversial statues from public spaces. In its analysis, the article offers guidance on how such removals could be justified and on what to do with statues that have been removed. Read the text and answer the questions below. You are advised to read the questions carefully and give answers that are of direct relevance. Remember: Your answer to Question 11 must be written in Portuguese, but your answers to Questions 12 and 13 must be written in English. With these last two questions, you may use American English or British English, but you must be consistent throughout.

(valor: 3,0) **Question 11 (to be answered in Portuguese)**
(This question tests your understanding of the text, as well as your ability to identify and paraphrase the relevant pieces of information. Your answer, to be written in the space provided, should comprise approximately 180 to 300 words.)

To memorialize a past considered notable, it is an ancient practice for governments, both national and local, to erect public statues of historical figures. But times change, and interpretations of history change as well: yesterday's heroes can become today's villains.

The article from *The Economist* offers a look at some examples of popular anti-statuary action motivated, in large part, by growing outrage at the enduring phenomenon of racism against Black people. Therefore, in your own words, describe what has happened in Bristol, England and in the United States, and explain why it has happened.

In answering, you should consider the following:

• Who exactly was Edward Colston? What made him at first such an object of admiration among the citizens of Bristol, and, later, such a target of indignation? Why were the people who removed his statue right or wrong to act as they did? How have the city officials of Bristol responded to what happened?

• Why do you think the statues of Confederate heroes have become so controversial in the United States? Why does the author of the article in *The Economist* distinguish George Washington and Thomas Jefferson from the Confederates? Since all those men were, in one way or another, involved with slavery in the United States, why do you think this distinction is justified or unjustified? In your opinion, should statues of the Confederate heroes be taken down? And what about statues of Washington and Jefferson?

In supporting your arguments, you may take into account legal, ethical, moral, political, and practical considerations, but please try to be as objective as possible.

(valor: 3,0) **Question 12 (to be answered in English)**
(This question tests your ability to express yourself in a manner that is clear, precise, and relevant. Your answer, to be written in the space provided, should comprise approximately 180 to 300 words.)

In the following excerpt from the article *"Political Rage Over Statues? Old News in the Old World"* (*The New York Times*, August 17, 2017), Rick Lyman looks at how some of the former Communist countries of Eastern Europe have dealt with their controversial statues:

***

Recent episodes of rage and bloodshed over the removal of Confederate status in the United States have a familiar ring [não soam estranhos] *for Europeans, who have been battling over their historical narratives and tearing down statues of noxious former leaders since the Bronze Age — and probably before.*

"There are some similarities between what is happening in Poland and what is happening in the United States," said Antoni Dudek, a contemporary historian and board member at Poland's Institute of National Remembrance, created after the fall of communism to document the totalitarian crimes of the past.

"The argument about monuments, which should be resolved mostly between historians and citizens, has become a substitute for everyday political fights," he said. "The same goes for the United States now that President Trump has joined the debate. Suddenly, the argument got much more intense."

Under legislation passed in June, Poland's right-wing government has given local officials and landowners just one year to remove all public monuments and memorials that "pay tribute to persons, organizations, events or dates symbolizing communism or other totalitarian systems." About 500 have been identified, almost all from the Communist era as the Soviets had already removed Nazi ones.

Battles over public monuments are a regular feature of life on a continent whose national boundaries have frequently shifted under wave after wave of migration, ideology and military might [força, poder], sometimes leaving former ethnic rivals struggling to live together within new borders or finding their former nation splintered [estilhacado].

Take the Czech Republic, for instance.

After World War I, statues from the vanished Hapsburg Empire were quickly taken down and replaced by Czechoslovakia's new, democratic heroes, like Tomas Garrigue Masaryk, its first president. After World War II, Communists erased [apagaram] *Masaryk from public tributes, but he was put back in place after that system collapsed. One statue of Masaryk in the small town of Holesov was taken away and re-erected five times, said Zdenek Lukes, a historian and architect in Prague.*

Mr. Lukes opposes the removal of such statues, but he said that in some cases a little historical context must be added. "I like the solution they used in the town of Litomysl," Mr. Lukes said. "Instead of removing a statue of the Communist minister of culture, they placed a plaque there explaining who he was and what he did."

***

According to the information in the article, why were statues removed during the Communist period and the post-Communist period? How do those reasons compare to the reasons that led people in Bristol, England to remove Edward Coston's statue and in the United States to remove the statues of Confederate heroes? In what ways could the motives of the people in Eastern Europe and of the people in England and the U.S. be similar? Considering the historical context of each region and what the groups in those regions have been protesting, how would you describe a fundamental difference between the reasons that statues have been removed in Eastern Europe and the reasons they have been removed in the U.S. and England?

Last, the articles from *The Economist* and *The New York Times* have mentioned four possible ways of dealing with a so-called offensive statue: (1.) leave it where it is and do nothing, (2.) put a plaque there explaining who the person was and what he or she did – both good and bad, (3.) place it in a museum, where it can serve an educational/historical purpose, and (4.) throw it away.

What is your opinion of these four options? Could any of them be considered the best way – or at least the most practical way – to deal with a controversial statue? Why or why not? In answering, you should present clear, well-balanced, and specific reasons for your point of view.

(valor: 4,0) **Question 13 (to be answered in English)**

(This question tests your ability to construct a balanced, considered, and fluent argument in the form of a short composition. The passage below (taken from the *Chambers Dictionary of World History*) gives a brief history of the *bandeirantes*: Read the passage and the accompanying Observations, and then, keeping that information in mind, answer the final question. Your answer, to be written in the space provided, should comprise approximately 180 to 300 words.)

In the following excerpt from the article *"Political Rage Over Statues? Old News in the Old World"* (*The New York Times*, August 17, 2017), Rick Lyman looks at how some of the former Communist countries of Eastern Europe have dealt with their controversial statues:

***

"The *bandeirantes* were 17th-century slave-raiders and explorers. Parties of *bandeirantes* (literally, followers of the *bandeira*) sought [*procuraram*] Indian slaves from the interior from among the sedentary Jesuit-led Guaraní peoples of the Platine Basin and peoples of the Amazon to labor on the coastal plantations [*fazendas*]. Initially permitted by the colonial government, their expeditions into the interior became a means by which the Portuguese could extend their rule well beyond the formal limits established by the Treaty of Tordesilhas. Their conflicts with Indian peoples took them into the gold-and-diamond-bearing districts of Minas Gerais and Bahia, which had been discovered by the late 17th century. Their legendary feats [*façanhas*] in securing the interior of Brazil against Spanish, French, or Dutch penetration secured them the mythical role of "pioneers" in Brazilian history."

***

Observation 1: Nowadays, many Brazilians, while not denying the courage, vigor, and geo-political achievements of the *bandeirantes*, criticize them as little more than gangsters who enriched themselves by grabbing gold and precious gemstones in the Brazilian interior and slaughtering and enslaving many thousands of indigenous peoples.

Observation 2: One of the most famous of the *bandeirantes* was Manuel de Borba Gato (1649-1718), whose 10-meter-high statue (13 meters including its pedstal) was sculpted by Julio Guerra and erected in the early 1960s, in the Praça Augusto Tortorelo de Araújo, as part of the the 400th-anniversary celebration of São Paulo's Santo Amaro district. Nowadays, many are calling for the removal of Borba Gato, affirming that it is morally wrong to honor a murderer, rapist, and slave-trader. Keep in mind that, whatever crimes Borba Gato may have committed in those violent and lawless days, they probably were not motivated by feelings of white supremacy, since the *bandeirantes*, in general, were usually of mixed Indian, Black, and White blood.

Observation 3: It's important to keep in mind that, while generating a certain socio-political controversy, the statue of Borba Gato has rarely been accused of beauty. Many think it should be removed simply because of its alleged ugliness [*feiura*]. Supporters of the statue's permanence often respond to that criticism by stating that "Well, I like it. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder." [*A beleza está no olho de quem observa, ou seja, gosto não se discute*.]

Observation 4: If judged by today's draconian standards, Michelangelo's statue of Moses probably should be removed or even destroyed. What are its "crimes"?

1. Michelangelo (1475-1564) was an Italian Catholic who sculpted in white marble a Jewish prophet, at the request of Pope Julius II (1443-1513), head of the Roman Catholic Church (a multinational religious organization that at certain times in history has been lenient towards anti-Semitism). The statue was commissioned for the Pope's tomb, which is housed in the church of San Pietro in Vincoli in Rome, though Julius himself is in fact buried in St. Peter's Basilica. In any event, surely the statue of Moses must be considered a glaring [*gritante*] example of **cultural appropriation**. (Imagine the uproar [*tumulto, gritaria*] if a chief rabbi, say, in Israel commissioned the statue of a Roman Catholic saint for his tomb.)

2. Michelangelo sculpted Moses with horns on his head. Obviously, human beings don't normally have horns on their heads. While many art historians have attributed Michelangelo's wild aberration to his possible misunderstanding of a flawed [*falhosa*] translation in the commonly used Bible of that period, doesn't it also imply **anti-Semitism** on the part of Michelangelo and the Pope? Shouldn't the horns at least be cut off, to give a fairer, more respectful, more human appearance to Moses?

Observation 5: Strangely enough, no one ever seems to seriously call for the removal or modification or destruction of Michelangelo's Moses. Rather, the statue is considered one of the greatest works of art of the High Renaissance and for centuries has attracted thousands upon thousands of people from around the world to gaze, awestruck, at its power and beauty. Apparently, thousands upon thousands of people from around the world do not travel to Santo Amaro to gaze, awestruck, at the power and beauty of Borba Gato. But if Borba Gato goes, shouldn't Moses go, too?

Observation 6: Maybe we're expecting too much from Borba Gato. After all, it's just a mute sculpture [*escultura muda*] without the ability to defend itself (which is probably the main reason it is so often attacked). Plus, is it even art? Borba Gato was erected to help the burghers of Santo Amaro celebrate their district's 400th birthday and also to promote a certain socio-political concept of Brazilian history that nowadays may be old-fashioned [*ultrapassado*]. Even the most skillful, artistic marketing can outlive its usefulness. And when that happens, can't we, with a clear conscience, simply discard it? Besides, if Borba Gato is removed, will the situation of Brazil's poor and oppressed suddenly improve – and will all Brazilians mysteriously forget everything they ever learned about the bandeirantes and their role in the nation's development?

So, the question you need to answer is simply this: Why do you think Borba Gato should stay or why do you think it should go?

In answering, you may take into account legal, ethical, political, and practical considerations, but please strive to be as clear-sighted and logical as possible, supporting your point of view with specific arguments and examples. (And at the risk of sounding vague, we ask you to try to think like a *lawyer*.)