



EXAME DE SELEÇÃO – 2024/2 MESTRADO E DOUTORADO

PROVA DE LÍNGUA INGLESA

Código do (a) Candidato (a): _____ DATA: ____/____/____.

Instruções

- 1) A prova tem duração de 2 (duas) horas, sendo permitido o uso de dicionários impressos durante todo o período. Não são permitidos equipamentos eletrônicos ou consultas digitais. Também não é permitido o empréstimo, uns aos outros, de dicionários impressos.
- 2) A folha de alçaço carimbada e rubricada deve ser utilizada apenas para o registro das respostas definitivas, pois será fornecido outro papel para rascunho.
- 3) O código do candidato (jamais o nome) constará da lista de presença e deverá ser registrado em todas as folhas, inclusive nas utilizadas para rascunho das respostas. Todo o material (prova, rascunhos e respostas) deve ser entregue ao final da prova.
- 4) Essa prova tem como objetivo avaliar a capacidade de leitura, compreensão e análise de um texto em língua inglesa.

Todas as questões da prova referem-se ao texto em anexo: “Cultural Studies”, escrito por John Beverley, publicado no seguinte periódico: *Latin American Literary Review*, Vol. 20, No. 40 (Jul. -Dec., 1992), pp. 19-22, disponível em <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20119618>.

Para cada conjunto de questões, o candidato deverá ler o trecho do texto escolhido, devendo respondê-las em português, o mais completamente possível, com base nas informações contidas em cada trecho de texto.

São quatro conjuntos de questões e no total são oito questões, cada uma delas valendo 1,25 pontos, totalizando o máximo de 10 pontos.

TEXTO 1

Hernán Vidal has observed that Latin American literary criticism "finds itself in a crucial moment of its history; the tradition of canonizing and privileging certain texts of official high culture as fundamental instruments in the creation of national identities has no meaning before the effects of a transnational culture industry. Faced with this, the only road for renewal is for this criticism to constitute and recognize itself as a Latin American form of cultural studies."¹ Similar pressures are evident on the social sciences side of Latin American studies, increasingly concerned with problems of identity and subjectivity, deterritorialization, multiple social logics, new social movements, critiques of modernization and development paradigms and of their anchoring in positivist epistemologies, interfaces with advanced literary theory, etc. The recent work of figures like Vidal himself, Nestor García Canclini, José Joaquín Brunner, Nelly Richard, Jesús Martín Barbero, Carlos Monsivais, Beatriz Sarlo, Roberto Schwarz, John Rowe and Vivian Schelling, Michael Taussig, and the Latin American Subaltern Studies Group constitutes something like an initial corpus of this emerging field of Latin American Cultural Studies, The Rockefeller Foundation is planning an international congress of Latin American practitioners of Cultural Studies in Mexico City in 1993.

QUESTÕES

- a) Conforme Hernan Vidal, em qual momento crítico se encontra a literatura latino-americana? (1,25 pontos)
- b) Como Vidal propõe que essa crítica se renove em resposta aos efeitos de uma indústria cultural transnacional? (1,25 pontos)

TEXTO 2

Cultural Studies was in part the consequence of the deconstructive impact of mass culture itself in the human sciences. But to the extent that mass or popular culture can be re-aestheticized, as a sort of "supplement" to economic transnationalization, it is possible for the humanities and social sciences to regroup around their disciplinary specificities, against the threat that Cultural Studies was going to usurp their territory or blur its frontiers. The fact/value distinction, which previously regulated the separation of the humanities from the sciences and which it was the main challenge of "theory" to weaken, can now be reinscribed within Cultural Studies itself. In such an articulation of the field, the relation between humanities and social and natural sciences becomes dialogical, in the sense that they both can "speak to" and "learn from" each other. But the point of Cultural Studies was not so much to create a dialogue between disciplines as to challenge the integrity of disciplinary boundaries per se, "infiltrating" into them — the metaphor is Gayatri Spivak 's — a trans-(rather than inter-) disciplinary practice, whose models included new forms of Marxism, feminism, structuralism and poststructuralism, and deconstruction.

QUESTÕES

c) Qual é o principal desafio que a "teoria" visa enfraquecer no contexto dos Estudos Culturais? (1,25 pontos)

d) Qual é o propósito dos Estudos Culturais em relação às fronteiras disciplinares? (1,25 pontos)

TEXTO 3

This suggests that the axis of ideological struggle is shifting in the academy from the opposition of a broad center-left coalition to the New Right offensive in higher education (in the U.S. the form of this has been Teachers for a Democratic University) to emerging conflicts between the components of that coalition itself about who will define the future of projects like Cultural Studies. The conversion of Cultural Studies from a form of academic radicalism — a "postmodernism of resistance," if you will — to the avant garde of bourgeois hegemony will be driven by three major concerns: 1) making Cultural Studies acceptable to faculty, administrators, and trustees rather than to students (whereas Cultural Studies in its inception aimed to liberate students from disciplinary requirements by allowing them to vote with their feet, so to speak, in elaborating their own research projects); 2) diluting its potential to become a form of ideological-epistemological agency of the social groups and movements outside the university whose subalternity it is precisely concerned with theorizing; and, 3) keeping Cultural Studies from impinging too strongly on the Natural Sciences and the sphere of technology and the professional schools (Education, Law, Business, Medicine, International Administration and area studies), where its consequences — given the foundation of these schools in various forms of usually unquestioned and often vulgar positivism — would be dramatic.

QUESTÕES

e) Por que John Beverley se refere aos Estudos Culturais como “pós-modernismo de resistência”?

f) Com base no trecho, quais são as principais preocupações que impulsionam a conversão dos Estudos Culturais de uma forma de radicalismo acadêmico para a vanguarda da hegemonia burguesa? (1,25 pontos)

TEXTO 4

"Both varidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity models (like political pluralism) are modes of eclecticism-forms of (ack)nowledgement" accumulating knowledge without having to confront the ideology of the production of knowledge. Transdisciplinarity, on the other hand, is as aware of the status of knowledge as of the modes of the ideological construction of reality in any given discipline and thus through its self-reflexivity attempts not simply to accumulate knowledge but to ask what constitutes knowledge, why and how and by whose authority certain modes of understanding are certified as knowledge.... Transdisciplinarity is a 'transgressive' space in which configurations of knowledges are displayed as ultimately power-related." Mas'ud Zavarzadeh and Donald Morton, "Theory Pedagogy Politics: The Crisis of 'The Subject' in the Humanities," *boundary 2* 15, 1-2 (1986/87). They credit this distinction in turn to Teresa Ebert.

QUESTÕES

g) De acordo com o trecho, quais são os pontos de contato e confronto entre os modelos de varidisciplinaridade, interdisciplinaridade e transdisciplinaridade? (1,25 pontos)

h) Qual dos três modelos confronta a ideologia ou a norma imposta? Por quê? (1,25 pontos)

CULTURAL STUDIES[*]

JOHN BEVERLEY

Hernán Vidal has observed that Latin American literary criticism "finds itself in a crucial moment of its history; the tradition of canonizing and privileging certain texts of official high culture as fundamental instruments in the creation of national identities has no meaning before the effects of a transnational culture industry. Faced with this, the only road for renewal is for this criticism to constitute and recognize itself as a Latin American form of cultural studies."¹ Similar pressures are evident on the social sciences side of Latin American studies, increasingly concerned with problems of identity and subjectivity, deterritorialization, multiple social logics, new social movements, critiques of modernization and development paradigms and of their anchoring in positivist epistemologies, interfaces with advanced literary theory, etc. The recent work of figures like Vidal himself, Nestor García Canclini, José Joaquín Brunner, Nelly Richard, Jesús Martín Barbero, Carlos Monsivais, Beatriz Sarlo, Roberto Schwarz, John Rowe and Vivian Schelling, Michael Taussig, and the Latin American Subaltern Studies Group constitutes something like an initial corpus of this emerging field of Latin American Cultural Studies, The Rockefeller Foundation is planning an international congress of Latin American practitioners of Cultural Studies in Mexico City in 1993.²

If we are heading in the direction of Cultural Studies, however, we should bear in mind some dangers that may lie along the road. In spite of its characteristic appeal to the local and everyday, to *petites histoires* instead of *grands récits*, there is a kind of aesthetic utopianism in the celebration of popular culture or mass culture that has been a central strand of Cultural

Studies from Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* to the current idealization of Madonna as a poststructuralist heroine. There is the danger that such a celebration (which I have both shared and protagonized)³ may involve simply a new variation of the ideology of the literature it purports to critique, via the displacement of a modernist program from the sphere of high culture to the popular, now seen as more aesthetically dynamic and effective, as if the shift from high to low involved something like the Formalist principle of estrangement or *ostranenie*.⁴

Cultural Studies was in part the consequence of the deconstructive impact of mass culture itself in the human sciences. But to the extent that mass or popular culture can be re-aestheticized, as a sort of "supplement" to economic transnationalization, it is possible for the humanities and social sciences to regroup around their disciplinary specificities, against the threat that Cultural Studies was going to usurp their territory or blur its frontiers. The fact/value distinction, which previously regulated the separation of the humanities from the sciences and which it was the main challenge of "theory" to weaken, can now be reinscribed within Cultural Studies itself. In such an articulation of the field, the relation between humanities and social and natural sciences becomes dialogical, in the sense that they both can "speak to" and "learn from" each other. But the point of Cultural Studies was not so much to create a dialogue between disciplines as to challenge the integrity of disciplinary boundaries per se, "infiltrating" into them — the metaphor is Gayatri Spivak's — a trans-(rather than inter-) disciplinary practice, whose models included new forms of Marxism, feminism, structuralism and poststructuralism, and deconstruction.⁵

While in its inception, particularly in the work of the Birmingham School and of figures like Fanon or Foucault, Cultural Studies seemed precisely the pedagogic embodiment of cultural materialism and radicalism, its rapid institutionalization (along with a multicultural curriculum) in the United States, suggests that it may have become more or less compatible with a revision of the forms of academic knowledge in and around the humanities demanded by the present stage of capitalism, however one chooses to characterize it. It seems clear now that the MLA-style "liberals" like Stanley Fish, Catherine Stimpson or Henry Gates have in fact won the debate with the New Right over the future of the humanities in the North American university, and that multiculturalism and Cultural Studies are being prepared as the places for a redefinition of educational curricula and disciplinary structures in the coming period.

This suggests that the axis of ideological struggle is shifting in the academy from the opposition of a broad center-left coalition to the New Right offensive in higher education (in the U.S. the form of this has been Teachers for a Democratic University) to emerging conflicts between the components of that coalition itself about who will define the future of projects like Cultural Studies. The conversion of Cultural Studies from a form of academic radicalism — a "postmodernism of resistance," if you will — to the avant garde of bourgeois hegemony will be driven by three major concerns: 1) making Cultural Studies acceptable to faculty, administrators, and trustees rather than to students (whereas Cultural Studies in its inception aimed to liberate students from disciplinary requirements by allowing them to vote with their feet, so to speak, in elaborating their own research projects); 2) diluting its potential to become a form of ideological-epistemological agency of the social groups and movements outside the university whose subalternity it is precisely concerned with theorizing; and, 3) keeping Cultural Studies from impinging too strongly on the Natural Sciences and the sphere of technology and the professional schools (Education, Law, Business, Medicine, International Administration and area studies), where its consequences — given the foundation of these schools in various forms of usually unquestioned and often vulgar positivism — would be dramatic.

The key moves in this direction will be to detach Cultural Studies from its connection to discourses like Marxism, feminism and the more oppositional forms of poststructuralism that imply both the inadequacy of existing forms of academic disciplinarity and the need for structural transformation of the existing social relations. The code words of this project will be "pluralism" and "interdisciplinarity," but the underlying effect will be depoliticization.⁶

This is in fact more or less what, after seven years of successful operation, has happened to the graduate program in Cultural Studies that I was involved in forming at the University of Pittsburgh. Admittedly, that experience (which involved very specific local factors and personalities) colors my vision. I understand that for many of you the problem is how to get a Cultural Studies perspective in your departments or programs in the first place. Nevertheless, I believe that even as the struggle to institutionalize Cultural Studies is still going on at many places, the likelihood is that it will be naturalized in the curriculum as something like an epistemological (and elite) "Faculty Club," rather than as a way of carrying into the academy issues of decolonization, subalternity, anti-racism, women's liberation and the like that vitally concern us as Latin Americanists. This means that instead of seeing Cultural Studies as an automatic solution to the problems of reforming knowledge, we must begin to subject it to the same kind of critique we have levelled against the limits of our disciplines. I believe it is still worth making the struggle for (and in) Cultural Studies, but just at the moment when its presence in the contemporary university seems assured in both North and South America, Cultural Studies has begun to lose the radicalizing force that accompanied its emergence as a field.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

NOTES

¹ Hernán Vidal, "Postmodernism, Post-leftism and Neo-vanguardism: The Case of Chile's *Revista de Crítica Cultural*," forthcoming in J. Beverley and J. Oviedo, eds. *The Postmodernism Debate in Latin America*, a special issue of *boundary 2* (Spring, 1993).

² One factor in this development was undoubtedly the powerful impact on Latin American studies of poststructuralist theory in the late seventies and eighties. But Latin America has been a pioneer as well as a follower in the area of Cultural Studies. The nineteenth century "national essay" a la Sarmiento or Martí was already an incipient form of Cultural Studies discourse, and it has been seconded by the work in a modernist vein of figures like Fernando Ortiz, Octavio Paz, Ezekiel Martínez Estrada, Mariategui, etc.

³ See e.g. "La ideología de la música postmoderna y la política de izquierda," *Nuevo Texto Crítico* 6 (1991) and *Revista de Crítica Cultural* 7 (1992); and "By Lacan': Política cultural y crisis del marxismo en las Américas," *Nuevo Texto Crítico* 8-9 (1992).

⁴ Lyotard himself has often noted that aesthetic postmodernism in its desire to be ruptural and "new" is an extension of the very modernist ideology that it supposedly displaces. One example is the tendency in certain forms of postcolonial discourse—I am thinking of Homi Bhabha in particular—to make what is in effect a modernist aesthetic program the locus of "oppositional" political-cultural agency. I am more sympathetic to Michael Taussig's appropriation of Walter Benjamin's aesthetics in his studies of Latin American shamanism, but I think it involves a similar problem. Any number of essays in the new canonic Cultural Studies, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler (New York and London:

Routledge, 1992) illustrate the persistence of vanguardism in what seems nominally a populist discourse of decanonization and multiculturalism.

5 "Both varidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity models (like political pluralism) are modes of eclecticism-forms of (ack)nowledgement" accumulating knowledge without having to confront the ideology of the production of knowledge. Transdisciplinarity, on the other hand, is as aware of the status of knowledge as of the modes of the ideological construction of reality in any given discipline and thus through its self-reflexivity attempts not simply to accumulate knowledge but to ask what constitutes knowledge, why and how and by whose authority certain modes of understanding are certified as knowledge.... Transdisciplinarity is a 'transgressive' space in which configurations of knowledges are displayed as ultimately power-related." Mas'ud Zavarzadeh and Donald Morton, "Theory Pedagogy Politics: The Crisis of 'The Subject' in the Humanities," *boundary 2* 15, 1-2 (1986/87). They credit this distinction in turn to Teresa Ebert.

6 Stuart Hall puts his finger on what I think is the main problem that is entailed in the "interdisciplinary" institutionalization of Cultural Studies. Admitting that even as coherent a model of Cultural Studies as the practice of the Birmingham School was constructed out of radically different conjunctures, concerns, methodologies, and theoretical positions (which would then seem to suggest that the organization of the field must an "open-ended" one), he asks:

(D)oes it follow that cultural studies is not a policed disciplinary area? That it is whatever people do, if they choose to call or locate themselves within the project and practice of cultural studies? I am not happy with that formulation either. Although cultural studies as a project is open-ended, it can't be simply pluralist in that way. Yes, it refuses to be a master discourse or a meta-discourse of any kind. Yes, it is a project that is always open to that which it doesn't yet know, to that which it can't yet name. But it does have some will to connect; it does have some stake in the choices it makes. It does matter whether cultural studies is this or that. It can't be just any old thing which chooses to march under a particular banner. It is a serious enterprise, or project, and that is inscribed in what is sometimes called the "political" aspect of cultural studies.

Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies," in op cit *Cultural Studies*, p. 278.

[*] *Latin American Literary Review*, Vol. 20, No. 40 (Jul. - Dec., 1992), pp. 19-22 (4 pages). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20119618>