

2019

1º Semestre



Inglês

VESTIBULAR FGV

GRADUAÇÃO EM RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS – SP

Instruções para a Prova de INGLÊS:

- Confira se seu nome e RG estão corretos.
- Não se esqueça de assinar a capa deste caderno, no local indicado, com caneta azul ou preta.
- Você terá **4 horas** para realizar as provas.
- Antes de iniciar a prova, verifique se o caderno contém 3 questões e se a impressão está legível.
- A prova de **Inglês** é composta por 3 questões. Atenção: A **Questão 1** deve ser respondida **em português**; as **Questões 2 e 3** devem ser respondidas **em inglês**. As três questões desta prova valem, no total, 10 pontos, assim distribuídos:
 - **Questão 1** – 3 pontos.
 - **Questão 2** – 3 pontos.
 - **Questão 3** – 4 pontos.
- As respostas deverão ser redigidas nos espaços destinados a elas, com letra legível e, obrigatoriamente, com caneta de tinta azul ou preta.
- Não se identifique em nenhuma das folhas do corpo deste caderno, pois isso implicará risco de anulação.
- O candidato só poderá deixar definitivamente o local das provas a partir de 1 hora e meia após seu início.
- Não haverá substituição deste caderno.
- O candidato é responsável pela devolução deste caderno ao fiscal de sala.
- Adverte-se que o candidato que se recusar a entregar este caderno, dentro do período estabelecido para realização das provas, terá automaticamente sua prova anulada.
- Estará automaticamente eliminado do processo seletivo o candidato que obtiver **nota bruta inferior a 2,0** na prova de **Inglês**.

NOME:

IDENTIDADE:

INSCRIÇÃO:

LOCAL:

DATA: 18/11/2018

SALA:

ORDEM:

Assinatura do Candidato: _____

 INGLÊS

ISRAEL AND PALESTINE
Background

Zionism is the name of the movement that sought to recover for the Jewish people its historic Palestinian homeland (the Eretz Israel) after centuries of dispersion, or Diaspora – the term used to describe the scattering of Jews in the world outside the land of Israel in ancient times. The modern Zionist movement arose in the late 19th century with plans for Jewish colonization of Palestine, and under Theodor Herzl also developed a political program to obtain sovereign state rights over the territory.

In 1917, the British Balfour Declaration endorsed Zionism's objectives, as long as rights for non-Jews in Palestine were not impaired. From 1920 to 1948, the United Kingdom administered Palestine, which was viewed by the Jews as the "Promised Land," but which also contained an Arab Muslim majority as well as many Islamic holy sites associated with Mohammed. After World War II, Jewish immigrants (strongly supported by the United States) flooded into Palestine. Tension between Jews and Arabs (i.e., native Palestinians) led the UN in 1947 to propose the formation of two states in Palestine, one Jewish and the other Arab. When the Arab side rejected this, David Ben-Gurion (Israel's first prime minister) announced the creation of the independent State of Israel on 14 May 1948. Although its Arab neighbors immediately invaded, Israel was victorious and gained more land than had been allotted by the UN. Over 700,000 Arab refugees left the Israeli-occupied areas.

Since then, several wars and armed conflicts have taken place between Israel and neighboring Arab countries. And the relationship between Israelis and Palestinians, especially those Palestinians living in Gaza and the West Bank, which are under Israeli control (although the Palestinians living there do enjoy some measure of self rule), remains marked by animosity, bitterness, and violence, all of which have been exacerbated by, among other things, Palestinian accusations of Israeli oppression (and encroaching occupation and colonization) and Israeli accusations of Palestinian terrorism and anti-Semitism.

As for Zionism itself, it is still active as a movement encouraging Jews worldwide to immigrate to and take an interest in the Jewish state.

Adapted from the Chambers Dictionary of World History.

TWO TERRORISMS

By Henry Siegman

To a great extent, Jewish terrorism and war crimes marked the creation of Israel. Those who are told about this history dismiss it as a fabrication. What they deny or ignore is that these charges have been fully documented not only by historians, including Israeli ones, but also by Israel's own military. The point of recognizing this history is not to justify terrorism by either Israelis or Palestinians, but to acknowledge the outrageous double standard that has been applied to the two parties and has undermined the possibility of a peace accord. Without knowing that history, it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand the extent to which Israeli propaganda has succeeded in shaping a narrative about the creation of Israel that presents the Palestinians who were brutally expelled from their homes as the aggressors and the Jews as their victims. Without that history, it is impossible to understand the outrage Palestinians feel over having been portrayed as the bad guys for so long.

Palestinians opposed the UN partition plan and started the 1948 war, but they did so not because of their hatred of Jews or their unhappiness with the partition plans, but because they didn't want to accept exile, homelessness and disenfranchisement. What other people would have reacted differently? What other people would have agreed to go into exile to accommodate a group that came from outside its borders, claiming a homeland lost two thousand years ago, a principle of ownership that has no parallel in international law? Acceptance of Zionist claims necessarily meant exile for the Palestinians: the Jews of Palestine in 1948 were a minority and if the Jewish state was to be a democracy, it would need a Jewish majority, meaning that the 750,000 Palestinians who lived there would have been expelled even if they hadn't rejected the partition plan or declared war on the new Jewish state. As Benny Morris and other historians have written, the war crimes ordered by David Ben-Gurion and executed by his generals were not intended for any purpose other than ensuring the departure of a panicked Arab population.

The point is not that Israelis have no right to defend themselves against Palestinian terrorism, but that the Israeli argument that there is no moral equivalent between Palestinian terrorism and Israeli preventive and retaliatory violence is deeply flawed. The relevant comparison is between the way Jews acted during their struggle for statehood – not after they achieved it – and the way Palestinians, still very much in the midst of their hopeless struggle for statehood, are acting now. It is also flawed because you cannot condemn terrorism if you do not offer people under occupation a credible route towards achieving viable statehood through non-violent means. That is something Israel has never offered the Palestinians.

Adapted from the London Review of Books 24 May 2018.

 INGLÊS

Introduction

In the above passage, taken from the article "Two Terrorisms," author Henry Siegman (himself a Jew and a refugee from The Holocaust, as well as president emeritus of the US/Middle East Project and a former senior fellow at the Council of Foreign Relations) discusses polemical aspects (both current and historical) of the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians.

After reading the separate **Background** section and then Siegman's text, 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 1 must be written in Portuguese, but your answers to Questions 2 and 3 must be written in English. With these last two questions, you may use American English or British English, but you must be consistent throughout.

Question 1 (to be answered in Portuguese)

(This question tests your understanding of the text, as well your ability to identify and paraphrase the relevant pieces of information. Your answer should fill up approximately 15 to 20 lines in the space provided.)

As outlined in both the **Background** and the passage, the year 1948 witnessed the founding of the State of Israel. In the opinion of the author of the passage, what circumstances characterized that founding? What measures did the Jews take to guarantee the creation and survival of Israel? How did the Palestinians react? Why, for example, do you think the author has entitled his article "Two Terrorisms"?

Last, does the author think the Palestinians have been treated fairly or unfairly during this conflict? What reasons does he give to support his opinion?

In supporting your points of view, you may take into account legal, ethical, practical, historical, and even religious considerations, but please try to be as objective as possible.

RESPOSTA	
5	
10	
15	
20	
	NOTA

INGLÊS

Question 2 (to be answered in English)

(This question tests your ability to express yourself in a manner that is clear, precise, and relevant. Your answer should fill up approximately 15 to 20 lines in the space provided.)

In its 4 January 2018 issue, the *London Review of Books* presented an article (“The ‘New Anti-Semitism’”) in which the author, Neve Gordon, a Jew as well as a professor at Israel’s Negev University, points out that because of her active (but non-violent) support of Palestinian self-determination and her protests against what she considers Israel’s violations of Palestinian human rights, she has been accused of a new kind of anti-Semitism.

In distinguishing between this “new anti-Semitism” and traditional anti-Semitism, Gordon writes the following: “The ‘new anti-Semitism,’ we are told, takes the form of criticism of Zionism and of the actions and policies of Israel, and is often manifested in campaigns holding the Israeli government accountable to international law. . . In this it is different from ‘traditional’ anti-Semitism, understood as hatred of Jews per se, the idea that Jews are naturally inferior, belief in a worldwide Jewish conspiracy or in the Jewish control of capital etc.”

Gordon goes on to affirm that “The logic of the ‘new anti-Semitism’ can be formulated as a syllogism: (i) anti-Semitism is hatred of Jews; (ii) to be Jewish is to be a Zionist; (iii) therefore anti-Zionism is anti-Semitic.”

What is your opinion of the above syllogism? For example, do you think it is reasonable to insist that a sincere, conscientious Jew must also be a Zionist? Can one be a sincere, conscientious Jew, but have no interest in or even oppose the Zionist policies of the Israeli government? Moreover, considering the Israeli government’s often-harsh treatment of Palestinians, does concern for the Palestinian people – some of whom have certainly practiced acts of terrorism against Israelis – make anyone, even a Jew, automatically an anti-Semite, at least in the traditional sense? In your opinion, what would be some of the consequences for Jews around the world if Israel no longer existed?

In answering the above questions, you should support your points of view with clear, well-balanced, and specific reasons. And while you may take into account legal, ethical, practical, historical, and even religious considerations, please try to be as objective as possible.

RESPOSTA	
5	
10	
15	
20	
	NOTA

 INGLÊS

Question 3 (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 quotations below underscore a crucial aspect of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Read the quotations and answer the question. Your answer should fill up approximately 15 to 20 lines in the space provided.)

Note: Given the Israeli-Palestinian conflict's great complexity, many experts favor the so-called two-state solution, which would enable an independent Palestinian state to co-exist alongside Israel. Unquestionably, a significant number of Israelis and Palestinians support this option. Nevertheless, not only do certain radical Palestinians refuse to recognize the Jewish state, but also many Israelis oppose the creation of a Palestinian state, as Henry Siegman makes clear in the following quotations taken from his article.

- "To this day, the official position of Likud, Israel's ruling party for much of the past half-century, is that it will never allow the establishment of a Palestinian state anywhere in Palestine."
- "The two-state solution died because [Israeli prime minister Binyamin] Netanyahu and successive Israeli governments were determined to kill it, and those who could have prevented its demise lacked the resolve and moral courage to do so. America failed in the mission it thought itself uniquely qualified to accomplish because it failed to understand that the diplomatic objective of a great power, and particularly the world's greatest power, should not be peace, a goal that Netanyahu dishonestly embraced, but justice – or at least the avoidance of injustice so egregious as to discredit the values and institutions on which the future of humanity depends."

Considering the above ideas and information (as well as the ideas and information presented in Question 1 and Question 2), why do you think the two-state solution is or is not the best option for a lasting and just peace between Israelis and Palestinians?

If you advocate the two-state solution, how do you think it could be implemented? Should the Palestinians and Israelis work out such an accord by themselves, or should the international community, led by the U.S. or by the UN (or both), exert diplomatic pressure and/or impose economic sanctions to force the Israelis and Palestinians to reach an agreement? If and when the two states become a fact, should an outside entity, such as the U.S., NATO, or the UN, guarantee the security of both countries or should they be left alone to defend their own borders?

If you are against the two-state solution – and assuming that you do not want the present situation, with all its attendant violence, injustice, and suffering, to continue – what solution would you propose and why?

In any event, whether you are for or against the two-state solution, considering the following questions may help you to formulate your answer:

- Can Palestinians and Israelis ever live together peacefully, or must they live separately in their own communities or countries?
- Considering that unfriendly and even hostile Arab countries already surround Israel, won't the creation of an independent Palestine compromise Israel's national security? Couldn't a Palestinian state serve as a base for terrorists or to launch a military invasion?
- Should Israel be allowed to incorporate all of the Palestinian lands (including Gaza and the West Bank) into one Greater Israel, in which Palestinians residents are deprived of their civil rights?
- Since the majority rules in a democracy, if Palestinians living in Israel enjoy full civil rights, and if one day they outnumber Jews, can that country survive as a Jewish homeland?
- Do the Jews have an exclusive right to Palestinian territory merely because their ancestors occupied that land 2,000 years ago?
- Should the Palestinians get all of their original territory back and send the Jews on their way? (In pondering this question, you might ask yourself whether the descendants of European colonizers should hand Brazil over to the Indigenous peoples whose ancestors originally inhabited this land.)

In answering Question 3, you may take into account legal, ethical, practical, historical, and even religious considerations, but please strive to be as clear-sighted and logical as possible, supporting your point of view with specific arguments and examples.

VESTIBULAR  FGV

www.fgv.br/processoseletivo

(11) 3799-7711 (São Paulo e grande São Paulo)

0800 770 0423 (demais localidades)