

PROVA ESCRITA DE INGLÊS

Na prova a seguir, faça o que se pede, usando, caso julgue necessário, as páginas correspondentes do caderno de rascunho. Em seguida, transcreva os textos para as respectivas folhas do **CADERNO DE TEXTOS DEFINITIVOS**, nos locais apropriados, pois **não serão avaliados fragmentos de texto escritos em locais indevidos**. Utilize os limites mínimos e máximos de palavras estabelecidos. Qualquer texto com extensão aquém da mínima será apenado, e qualquer fragmento de texto que ultrapasse a extensão máxima será desconsiderado.

ATENÇÃO! Nas **folhas do caderno de textos definitivos**, identifique-se apenas na capa, pois **não serão avaliados** os textos que tenham qualquer assinatura ou marca identificadora fora do local apropriado.

EXAMINADORES:

Manuel A. Carlos Montenegro Lopes da Cruz

Edite do Céu Faial Jacques

Mark David Ridd

PART 1 – TRANSLATION A

Translate the following passage into English:

Depois da Síria, agora o Irã é a bola da vez. Em comunicado endossado pelos EUA e outros países, a Agência Internacional de Energia Atômica (AIEA) declarou que Teerã falhou ao deixar de cumprir as obrigações de salvaguarda nuclear e que o programa nuclear iraniano é “preocupante”. Washington acusa o governo iraniano de construir uma usina para o enriquecimento de urânio. Enfático, Bush afirmou que os EUA não vão tolerar armas nucleares em território iraniano. “A comunidade internacional deve se unir para sinalizar claramente ao Irã que não toleramos o desenvolvimento de armas nucleares no País. O Irã torna-se perigoso caso venha a fabricar um dispositivo nuclear”, disse. Washington pressiona Teerã para que aceite incondicionalmente as inspeções da ONU. O presidente iraniano, Mohammed Khatami, negou a fabricação de bombas atômicas. “Não acreditamos que armas atômicas tragam segurança à nação”, afirmou Khatami. Para o analista Mario Sznajder, da Universidade de Jerusalém, a razão da pressão é o petróleo na Península Arábica. “Se algum estado do Golfo Pérsico ameaçar usar armas nucleares, isso prejudica a extração de petróleo e destroça a economia mundial, porque 60% da produção no mundo vem da região”, disse à revista **IstoÉ**.

Adaptado de **IstoÉ**, 25 de junho de 2003.

(10 marks)

Part 1 – TRANSLATION B

In 1938, Graciliano Ramos served on a panel of judges in a literary contest that passed up Guimarães Rosa's **Sagarana** to select Luís Jardim's **Maria Perigosa**. The excerpt below is adapted from Ramos' "Conversa de Bastidores," which was included as a preface to the seventh edition of **Sagarana**.

Translate this excerpt into English:

Pois nesse júri cinco indivíduos, murchos com o golpe de 10 de novembro, indispostos ao elogio, enfasiados, decidiram ler mais de cinqüenta volumes. Podem imaginar como a tarefa se realiza. A gente folheia o troço, bocejando, fazendo caretas, admite enfim que a leitura é desnecessária; solta-o, pega um papel, rabisca um zero, às vezes qualquer reflexão enérgica. E passa adiante. Alguma coisa razoável é posta de lado e mais tarde se examina.

Aborrecendo-me assim, abri um cartapácio de quinhentas páginas grandes: uma dúzia de contos enormes, assinados por certo Viator. Em tais casos, rogamos a Deus que o original não preste e nos poupe o dever de ir ao fim. Não se deu isso: aquele era trabalho sério em demasia. Certamente de um médico mineiro e lembrava a origem: montanhoso, subia muito, descia — e os pontos elevados eram magníficos, os vales me desapontavam.

No dia do julgamento, ficamos horas hesitando entre esse volume desigual e outro: **Maria Perigosa**, que não se elevava nem caía muito. Optei pelo segundo.

Viator desapareceu sem deixar vestígio. Desgostei-me: eu desejava sinceramente vê-lo crescer, talvez convencer-me de meu engano ao preteri-lo.

Em fim de 1944, Idelfonso Falcão apresentou-me J. Guimarães Rosa, secretário de embaixada, recém-chegado da Europa.

- O senhor figurou num júri que julgou um livro meu em 1938.
- Como era o seu pseudônimo?
- Viator.
- Sabe que votei contra o seu livro?
- Sei, respondeu-me sem nenhum ressentimento.

(20 marks)

PART 2 – SUMMARY

Read the following text and summarise it in up to 200 words:

At some point in the technological era we have taken a wrong fork on the road. Diverted from the struggle for survival against harsh, forbidding Nature, scientific research and development of technology have become an urge not only to dominate and control Nature, but also to wage war on such a scale that man and nature may both be obliterated. Science and technology have become a force for destruction rather than creation. Furthermore, military technology has become so sophisticated that one person, safe from harm himself, now has the capability to annihilate hundreds of thousands or (in the case of nuclear warriors in secret underground missile silos) millions, utterly shielded from the result of his actions. The abstract nature of this kind of war breeds alienation allowing individuals unperturbed by moral qualms or misgivings to kill with impunity.

Moreover, in the West technology for portraying war to the general public has been developed deliberately to obviate moral outrage. An example of such avoidance is the forced cancellation of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki exhibition at the Smithsonian Institute in 1995 because it was deemed that the American people were not ready to face this. Another is the television depiction of the Iraq war, which was essentially a computerised simulation from which the armed forces and the thousands of civilian casualties were curiously absent.

Another deviant path is that travelled by the ancient idea of perfecting the self, originally a philosophical ideal concerning the soul and spiritual perfection. It has become an external technological manifestation, an exercise in perfecting the body through scientific and technological manipulation, from face lifts to transplants and endless prolongation of life through technological fixes or cloning.

Albert Schweitzer tells us that "Wherever consciousness is lost that every man is an object of concern to us simply because he is a man, civilisation and morals are shaken, and the advance to fully developed inhumanity is only a question of time."

As long as a dispassionate, unreflecting science reigns supreme, and the scientific model of nature is mathematical, devoid of the human factor, it is "only a question of time." As long as the only ethical requirement for science is to tell the truth, and as long as the only responsibility for the scientist, in Oppenheimer's words, is "to remain dedicated," it is "only a question of time."

As long as scientific enquiry and technological development remain unbridled, perhaps it is "only a question of time." The bounds to scientific enquiry are financial and imposed solely by the nature of humanity. "The human brain," claims Barrow, "was not evolved with science in mind." The language of science, mathematics, unlike communicative language, which is innate, is learned language — thus foreign to human minds.

British culture critic Raymond Williams reminds us that technology is not an inevitable series of transformations careering along the ringing grooves of change. Rather, it is a set of humanly decided and humanly alterable options for the application of skills. Lewis Mumford makes the point that the most important thing to come out of the mine is not coal or ore. Rather, the most important thing to come out of the mine is the miner.

Since the Enlightenment, according to Schweitzer, philosophy has "philosophised about everything except civilisation. She went on working unswervingly to establish a theoretical view of the universe, as though by means of it everything could be restored. She failed to cogitate that this theory, even were it to be completed, would be fashioned exclusively out of history and science, and would accordingly be unoptimistic and unethical. It would ever remain an 'impotent theory of the universe,' too puny to muster the energies needed to establish and maintain the ideals of civilisation."

If Heidegger is correct and we are "beings tending towards death," then Barrow's idea of progress, that is bereft of ideals "about progress of the whole," is our rationale for existence in the technological era. I, however, side with Socrates who on his deathbed wagered that we are beings tending towards Good and asserted that "absence of the knowledge of Good is not ignorance but madness."

Adapted from "Only A Question of Time: Science, Ethics and Weapons of Mass Destruction," a lecture delivered by Jennifer Allen Simons at the Center for Theoretical Study, Charles University & Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic, 10th Anniversary Conference (The Diverse Landscape of Knowing: Can We Cope With It) August 28th - 30th, 2000.

(20 marks)

PART 3 – COMPOSITION

Length: 300 to 400 words

Read the following text on Leonardo da Vinci and, in the light of it and any of the ideas broached in the texts in Sections 1 & 2 above, **discuss the uses of art and technology and their relation to ethics in the current diplomatic scenario.**

Ever the perfectionist, Leonardo turned to science in the quest to improve his artwork. His study of nature and anatomy emerged in his stunningly realistic paintings, and his dissections of the human body paved the way for remarkably accurate figures. He was the first artist to study the physical proportions of men, women and children and to use these studies to determine the "ideal" human figure. Unlike many of his contemporaries — Michelangelo for example — he didn't get carried away and paint ludicrously muscular bodies, which he referred to as "bags of nuts."

All in all, Leonardo believed that the artist must know not just the rules of perspective, but all the laws of nature. The eye, he believed, was the perfect instrument for learning these laws, and the artist the perfect person to illustrate them.

Leonardo the scientist bridged the gap between the shockingly unscientific medieval methods and our own trusty modern approach. His experiments in anatomy and the study of fluids, for example, absolutely blew away the accomplishments of his predecessors. Beginning with his first stay in Milan and gathering pace around 1505, Leonardo became more and more wrapped up in his scientific investigations. The sheer range of topics that came under his inquiry is staggering: anatomy, zoology, botany, geology, optics, aerodynamics and hydrodynamics, among others.

As his curiosity took him in ever wilder directions, Leonardo always used this method of scientific inquiry: close observation, repeated testing of the observation, precise illustration of the subject, object or phenomenon with brief explanatory notes. The result was volumes of remarkable notes on an amazing variety of topics, from the nature of the sun, moon and stars to the formation of fossils and, perhaps most notably, the mysteries of flight.

Artists have always found it difficult to make a living off their art. And even a master like Leonardo was forced to sell out in order to support himself. So he adapted his drawing skills to the more lucrative fields of architecture, military engineering, canal building and weapons design. Although a peacenik at heart, Leonardo landed a job working for the Duke of Milan by calling himself a military engineer and outlining some of his sinister ideas for weapons and fortifications. Like many art school types in search of a salary, he only briefly mentioned to the Duke that he could paint as well.

Lucky for Leonardo, he was actually really talented as an engineer. Good illustrators were a dime a dozen in Renaissance Italy, but Leonardo had the brains and the diligence to break new ground, usually leaving his contemporaries in the dust. Like many crackpot geniuses, Leonardo wanted to create "new machines" for a "new world."

Adapted from texts at <<http://www.mos.org/leonardo>>.

(50 marks)