



PUC - RIO VESTIBULAR 2010

Outubro / 2009

INGLÊS - RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS

LEIA ATENTAMENTE AS INSTRUÇÕES ABAIXO.

- 01 - Você recebeu do fiscal o seguinte material:
a) este caderno, com o enunciado das 20 questões objetivas de **INGLÊS - RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS**;
b) um **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA**, com seu nome e número de inscrição, destinado às respostas das questões objetivas formuladas na prova de **INGLÊS - RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS**.
- 02 - Verifique se este material está em ordem, se o seu nome e número de inscrição conferem com os que aparecem no **CARTÃO**. Caso contrário, notifique **IMEDIATAMENTE** ao fiscal.
- 03 - Após a conferência, o candidato deverá assinar no espaço próprio do **CARTÃO**, preferivelmente a caneta esferográfica de tinta na cor preta.
- 04 - No **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA**, a marcação das letras correspondentes às respostas certas deve ser feita preenchendo todo o espaço do círculo, a **lápiz preto nº 2** ou **caneta esferográfica de tinta na cor preta**, com um traço contínuo e denso. A LEITORA ÓTICA utilizada na leitura do **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA** é sensível a marcas escuras, portanto, preencha os campos de marcação completamente, sem deixar claros.
- Exemplo: (A) ● (C) (D) (E)
- 05 - Tenha muito cuidado com o **CARTÃO**, para não o **DOBRAR**, **AMASSAR** ou **MANCHAR**. O mesmo **SOMENTE** poderá ser substituído caso esteja danificado em suas margens superiores e/ou inferiores – **BARRA DE RECONHECIMENTO PARA LEITURA ÓTICA**.
- 06 - Para cada uma das questões objetivas são apresentadas 5 alternativas classificadas com as letras (A), (B), (C), (D) e (E); só uma responde adequadamente ao quesito proposto. Você só deve assinalar **UMA RESPOSTA**: a marcação em mais de uma alternativa anula a questão, **MESMO QUE UMA DAS RESPOSTAS ESTEJA CORRETA**.
- 07 - As questões são identificadas pelo número que se situa acima de seu enunciado.
- 08 - **SERÁ ELIMINADO** do Concurso Vestibular o candidato que:
a) se utilizar, durante a realização das provas, de máquinas e/ou relógios de calcular, bem como de rádios gravadores, *headphones*, telefones celulares ou fontes de consulta de qualquer espécie;
b) se ausentar da sala em que se realizam as provas levando consigo o **CADERNO DE QUESTÕES** e/ou o **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA**;
c) não assinar a Lista de Presença e/ou o **CARTÃO**.
- 09 - Reserve os 30 (trinta) minutos finais para marcar seu **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA**. Os **rascunhos** nos Cadernos de Questões **NÃO SERÃO LEVADOS EM CONTA**.
- 10 - Quando terminar, entregue ao fiscal o **CADERNO DE QUESTÕES** e o **CARTÃO-RESPOSTA** E **ASSINE A LISTA DE PRESENÇA**.
- 11 - **O TEMPO DISPONÍVEL PARA ESTA PROVA DE QUESTÕES OBJETIVAS É DE 2 (DUAS) HORAS**.

BOA PROVA!

INGLÊS - RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS

TEXT 1



After The Fall: 1989, Twenty Years On

Joshua Muravchik

Nineteen eighty-nine was a most extraordinary year. There are other years that are imprinted on historic memory, yet most of them were occasions for horrible events (1917 or 1939) or disappointing ones (1789 or 1848) or the conclusions of great tragedies (1648 or 1945). The year 1989 was that rare moment when dramatic things happened that were overwhelmingly beneficent. As we watched the world change before our eyes, we learned many things. Looking back today on how the world has evolved in twenty years since that momentous time, we can distill several additional insights.

The economist Robert Heilbroner wrote in 1989: "Less than 75 years after it officially began, the contest between capitalism and socialism is over: capitalism has won." This outcome reflected a startling reversal because as recently as the decade before, socialism — considering all its diverse forms lumped together — seemed at the apex of its global sweep, apparently confirming Marx's prophecy that it was not merely desirable but destiny.

Heilbroner's observation was noteworthy because he himself was not unsympathetic to socialism, and doubly so because he was no communist. Given the hostile breach between communism and democratic socialism, why should Heilbroner have conceded that the fall of the Soviet empire was tantamount to the end of socialism? Why did he not accept the claim advanced by some socialists that the end of communism would only clear the way for a purer form of socialism?

Heilbroner also saw that the fall of communism culminated a trend. With social democratic parties having already forsaken the dream of replacing capitalism and with the developing world having realized that markets rather than state planning offered the surest path from poverty, the Soviet collapse sealed the issue. Socialism was finished.

Has the economic meltdown of 2008–09 reopened the question? Is socialism on the table again? Not at all. It only shows that you can always have too much of a good thing. The fact that free markets are the best mechanism for making economic decisions does not imply that freer is always better. The smooth functioning of the private sector depends on government to maintain a legal framework, to protect the public against

unscrupulous behavior, and to provide vital goods that are not profitable for the private sector to furnish. Libertarians who dream of an economy entirely free of government are no less utopian than socialists.

In the realm of politics Mikhail Gorbachev has cut a sad figure these last two decades: first supporting Putin then criticizing him, clinging to vestiges of socialist ideas, and rebuking Washington for necessary exercises of power, all the while unable to raise his own popularity among his countrymen above single digits. Nonetheless, he is arguably the greatest figure of the twentieth century.

The most famous names of the century were mass murderers. Of those who are remembered for the good they did, who was irreplaceable? The Axis would have been defeated without Roosevelt and even without Churchill, although Britain might have fallen first. India would have gained independence without Gandhi. Segregation would have been ended in America without Martin Luther King Jr. But would the Soviet empire have dissolved, the Cold War ended, and communism been repealed — all these blessings achieved *peacefully* — without Gorbachev?

I don't think so. It has been argued that the Soviet Union collapsed under the dead weight of its absurd economy, but its economy had been absurd for generations and it had not collapsed. Would Soviet inefficiency and low productivity eventually have brought the whole system to its knees? Perhaps, but that might have taken generations more — and in the meantime the state might have been able to replenish itself by means of blackmail and plunder, or it might, in its desperation, have generated a new world war. The dinosaur's brain was dead, but its massive tail still might have lashed destructively.

Yes, goods and construction were shoddy: televisions containing cardboard parts sometimes combusted spontaneously in people's living rooms (except that most Soviet citizens didn't have living rooms). But the weapons worked, and while a tad less advanced than those of America, what the Red Army lacked in quality it made up for in quantity.

In other words, despite its economic difficulties, the Kremlin fielded as much military might as it wished, more than any other state then or ever. If this required shortchanging the consumer sector of the economy, so be it. No one dared complain. Further, the rule of the Communist Party was entirely unchallenged, as was Gorbachev's ascendancy within the party, at least until very late in the game. He was the most powerful single individual on earth, and he could have held that power — and all the perks that went with it — until he went to his grave, as had most of his predecessors. Instead he tossed it away.

WORLD AFFAIRS, Vol. 13, n° 2, Summer 2009.
<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/2009%20-%20Summer/full-Muravchik.html>

1

What is the main purpose of the text?

- (A) Justify Gorbachev's resistance against the Glasnost and Perestroika.
- (B) Blame the end of communism for the economic meltdown of 2008-09.
- (C) Report on the disastrous political events that impacted the world after 1989.
- (D) Discuss the relevance of the Soviet collapse for the current state of world affairs.
- (E) Explain the importance of Churchill, Gandhi and Martin Luther King to the economic scenario of our times.

2

In paragraph 1, the year 1989 is described as a momentous time because it was a(n)

- (A) historical moment of stability that will find no parallel with other time periods.
- (B) significant historical moment when extraordinarily fortunate events took place.
- (C) awesome occasion that marked the end of a tragic era, though not quite peacefully.
- (D) very brief moment in time when people forgot about the tragic events that had been affecting humanity.
- (E) remarkable moment of tranquility among nations in which the conflicts between communism and democratic socialism came to an end.

3

According to the author of the text, the economist Robert Heilbroner

- (A) supported socialism and thus severely criticized the defeat of capitalism.
- (B) recognized that the sudden fall of the Soviet empire could have been avoided.
- (C) claimed that capitalism had defeated socialism through hostile belligerent means.
- (D) admitted that socialism was no longer a political solution after the fall of the Soviet empire.
- (E) believed that the end of communism would make way for a purer form of socialism to emerge.

4

Muravchick does not defend a libertarian viewpoint since he advocates that

- (A) communism is really the best solution for the unscrupulous behavior of the private sector.
- (B) the government has no right to restrict the actions and economic decisions of capitalist companies.
- (C) free markets without any legal restrictions will allow for more profitable economic results.
- (D) the only economic system that can eliminate poverty without governmental support is capitalism.
- (E) the government has a role in protecting the citizens against the destructive attitudes of private enterprises.

5

Gorbachev, according to Muravchik, has

- (A) made a poor impression of himself to the world lately.
- (B) gained enormous popularity among his fellow citizens.
- (C) fully supported Washington criticisms of socialist ideas.
- (D) approved the American government's defense of free markets.
- (E) been considered, unquestionably, the greatest political figure of the modern world.

6

The fragment "all these blessings" (line 66) refers to the

- (A) divine inspiration that put an end to Gorbachev's administration.
- (B) end of the Cold War, the rejection of communism and the Independence of India.
- (C) peaceful riot lead by Martin Luther King struggling against segregation in America.
- (D) questionable role that Churchill and Roosevelt played in leading the Allies to victory.
- (E) positive consequences derived from the bloodless end of the Cold War and defeat of communism.

7

Mark the alternative that contains a correct match of meaning, considering the use of the word in the text.

- (A) "lumped" (line 18) – split
- (B) "conceded" (line 26) – denied
- (C) "forsaken" (line 33) – abandoned
- (D) "rebuking" (line 53) – praising
- (E) "perks" (line 96) – disadvantages

8

Choose the alternative in which the word in **bold type** and the *italicized* one convey equivalent ideas.

- (A) "... **yet** most of them were occasions for horrible events..." (lines 3-4) – *thus*
- (B) "**Nonetheless**, he is arguably the greatest figure..." (lines 55-56) – *moreover*
- (C) "... **although** Britain might have fallen first." (line 61) – *while*
- (D) "In other words, **despite** its economic difficulties," (line 87) – *regardless of*
- (E) "**Further**, the rule of the Communist Party..." (lines 91-92) – *meanwhile*

9

In "Would Soviet inefficiency and low productivity eventually have brought the whole system to its knees?" (lines 71-73), the expression "bring the system to its knees" could be paraphrased by

- (A) force the system to submit.
- (B) mitigate the impact of economy.
- (C) enhance the power of the system.
- (D) defeat those who oppose the system.
- (E) improve the functioning of the system.

10

In the fragment “India would have gained independence without Gandhi.” (lines 61-62), the author conveys

- (A) the frustration of having lost a charismatic leader.
- (B) the unlikely political result after a very dramatic event.
- (C) his conviction of an outcome, given a different historical scenario.
- (D) his uncertainty about the strength of peaceful popular movements.
- (E) a remote possibility under the circumstance of a hypothetical situation.

11

When the author comments “I don’t think so.” (line 68) he expresses that

- (A) Gorbachev should not be accused of mass murder as he was a peaceful leader.
- (B) Gorbachev was insensitive to world issues and the dramatic state of the Soviet economy.
- (C) only a new world war would have changed the state of political affairs between the US and the Soviet Union.
- (D) the inefficiency of Soviet industry and commerce would have definitely destroyed the nation in a short time.
- (E) the nonbelligerent end of communism and the Cold War was a direct result of the Soviet leader’s political decisions.

12

The metaphor of the dinosaur’s brain and its tail used in lines 77-79, represents, respectively, the

- (A) Soviet economy and the Red Army.
- (B) Soviet union and the new world war.
- (C) Soviet political regime and its economy.
- (D) old and new generations in the Soviet Union.
- (E) state officials and blackmailers/plunderers.

13

In terms of reference, it is correct to affirm that

- (A) “ones” (line 4) refers to “years”.
- (B) “It” (line 40) refers to “meltdown”.
- (C) “his” (line 54) refers to “Putin”.
- (D) “its” (line 87) refers to “Red Army”.
- (E) “it” (line 96) refers to “individual”.

TEXT 2

Fragments 1 and 2 below were extracted from Joshua Muravchik’s original article “After the Fall: 1989, Twenty Years On”. Read them and the comments that follow in order to answer questions 14 through 20 below.

FRAGMENT 1, from Joshua Muravchik’s original article:

But even as we in the West saw the defeat of communism as a triumph for our ways and values, other observers saw it quite differently. Osama bin Laden and his cohorts and sympathizers believed the Soviet Union had been defeated not by us but by the Muslim believers of Afghanistan and the foreign jihadists who had joined their ranks. Far from demonstrating that our civilization represented an end point, it proved its transience. If radical Islam could defeat one superpower, it could defeat the other. If it had outlasted communism, it would outlast democratic capitalism, too.

A dozen years after 1989—on September 11, 2001, to be exact—this new ideology shattered the peace of the post-history world. It poses a challenge that cannot be dismissed by Francis Fukuyama’s observation that no species of nationalism can pose a historic challenge to democratic capitalism because they inherently lack “universal significance.” For one thing, Islamism purports to speak for a populace—the umma or world community of believers—larger than that comprised by any mere nation. More important, its aspirations encompass all mankind.

COMMENT 1, Posted by Syed Qamar Afzal Rizvi | July 22, 2009 4:09 AM EDT

Having fully endorsed the views of Joshua Muravchik, I would like to add that the apparently ending of the Cold War era has not yet fulfilled the prophesies—of those peace-minded optimists who had thought that the world beyond the year 1989 would probably usher in the new heraldry of peace and prosperity—in so far as a neo-Cold War seems to have begun between the Islamists and the non-Islamists (an era of the West’s economic indoctrination of controlling the strategic developing world).

FRAGMENT 2, from Joshua Muravchik’s original article:

The picture is not completely rosy. There is powerful evidence that where ruthless rulers are prepared to employ it, repression continues to succeed. In 1989, while freedom fighters against communism triumphed all over Europe, protesters in China’s Tiananmen Square were brutally repressed. At the time, it seemed that this bloody deed would postpone the inevitable only briefly. As America’s former ambassador to that country, Winston Lord, wrote: “The current discredited regime is clearly a transitional one. . . . We can be confident that, however grim the interlude, a more enlightened leadership will emerge within a few years. . . . It may well turn out that the tragic events in China this year have foreshortened that great nation’s march toward democracy.”

Twenty years later, while China's standard of living has soared, freedom has advanced scarcely if at all. Nor is China alone. Communist regimes also hang on with apparent ease in Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

55

COMMENT 2, Posted by Jason Ryan | July 30, 2009 5:21 PM EDT

This article presupposes that democracy is universal. I would argue that it is not, as the author pointed out in the case of China. Economic freedom and expansion are not necessarily democratic and it's easy to envision a world of many powers of a China or Putanist model. The biggest threat to democracy is not from outsiders but from nations that are unable to see through the inevitably difficult process of democratization. In my opinion, democracy may be universal in its appeal but it is by no means inevitable in practice.

60

65

Comments extracted from:
<http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/2009%20-%20Summer/comments/comments-Muravchik.html>

14

In **Fragment 1**, Joshua Muravchick exposes his view that

- (A) radical Islamism would outlast democratic capitalism.
- (B) no nationalistic ideology will challenge capitalistic democracy.
- (C) the westerners believe that it was capitalism that defeated socialism.
- (D) believers of Islamism have aspirations that represent all of humanity.
- (E) September 11, 2001 shattered peace in the same way that the events in 1989 did.

15

"This new ideology" (**Fragment 1** – line 14) refers to the idea that

- (A) democratic capitalism should prevail over Islamic aspirations.
- (B) democratic capitalism is strong enough to survive communism.
- (C) our civilization will endure despite the constant fights between superpowers.
- (D) Islam is capable of outliving not only communism but also democratic capitalism.
- (E) the Soviet Union was not strong enough to defeat Muslim believers and sympathizers.

16

Both **Fragment 1** and **Comment 1** discuss the

- (A) peace and prosperity that has emerged from the Islamic doctrine.
- (B) economic dominance of the West as the cause for the defeat of communism.
- (C) inadequacy of the expression neo-Cold War to refer to the Islamic–capitalist conflict.
- (D) lack of challenge to democratic capitalism as defended by peace-minded optimists.
- (E) current state of affairs between Islamists and sympathizers versus the non-Islamists.

17

China is mentioned in both **Fragment 2** and **Comment 2** because

- (A) China does not seem to represent a menace to democratic institutions.
- (B) Chinese protesters in 1989 were not repressed by the authoritative regime.
- (C) Chinese leaders will never understand the benefits of economic freedom.
- (D) it has still not attained total democracy, despite the growth of its economy.
- (E) its model of government will certainly remain unchanged for the next few years.

18

Fukuyama's observation in **Fragment 1** and Winston Lord's words in **Fragment 2** reveal that these men are

- (A) optimistic about the triumph of democracy.
- (B) hopeful about the aspirations of future generations.
- (C) enthusiastic about the advances of nationalism worldwide.
- (D) enraged with the brutal violation of human rights in China.
- (E) indifferent to the attacks democratic capitalism has been suffering.

19

"Usher in" (**Comment 1** – lines 30-31) and "see through" (**Comment 2** – line 64) can be correctly substituted by, respectively

- (A) 'conclude' and 'analyze'.
- (B) 'announce' and 'restore'.
- (C) 'precede' and 'overlook'.
- (D) 'investigate' and 'neglect'.
- (E) 'introduce' and 'comprehend'.

20

Concerning the authors' reactions in **Comment 1** and **Comment 2**, it is correct to affirm that

- (A) both Syed Rizvi and Jason Ryan are completely supportive of the ideas advanced by Muravchik in **Fragments 1** and **2**.
- (B) neither Syed Rizvi nor Jason Ryan provide a critical analysis of the issues introduced by Muravchik in **Fragments 1** and **2**.
- (C) Syed Rizvi totally agrees with Muravchik's ideas in **Fragment 1**, while Jason Ryan expresses a point of view about democratization which diverges from that exposed in **Fragment 2**.
- (D) Syed Rizvi expands some of the ideas introduced by Muravchik in **Fragment 1** whereas Jason Ryan reinforces the perspectives advanced in **Fragment 2**.
- (E) Syed Rizvi, in **Fragment 1**, is not fully convinced of Muravchik's opinions about the end of the Cold War, while Jason Ryan's comments express complete approval of Muravchik's views on democracy in **Fragment 2**.