

## SECTION III

### Sub Section III-A: Number of Questions = 45

**Directions for Questions 98 to 118:** Each of the five passages given below is followed by a set of questions. Choose the best answer to each question.

#### PASSAGE I

Recently I spent several hours sitting under a tree in my garden with the social anthropologist William Ury, a Harvard University professor who specializes in the art of negotiation and wrote the bestselling book, *Getting to Yes*. He captivated me with his theory that tribalism protects people from their fear of rapid change. He explained that the pillars of tribalism that humans rely on for security would always counter any significant cultural or social change. In this way, he said, change is never allowed to happen too fast. Technology, for example, is a pillar of society. Ury believes that every time technology moves in a new or radical direction, another pillar such as religion or nationalism will grow stronger - in effect, the traditional and familiar will assume greater importance to compensate for the new and untested. In this manner, human tribes avoid rapid change that leaves people insecure and frightened.

But we have all heard that nothing is as permanent as change. Nothing is guaranteed. Pithy expressions, to be sure, but no more than clichés. As Ury says, people don't live that way from day-to-day. On the contrary, they actively seek certainty and stability. They want to know they will be safe.

Ever so, we scare ourselves constantly with the idea of change. An IBM CEO once said: 'We only re-structure for a good reason, and if we haven't re-structured in a while, that's a good reason.' We are scared that competitors, technology and the consumer will put us out of business - so we have to change all the time just to stay alive. But if we asked our fathers and grandfathers, would they have said that they lived in a period of little change? Structure may not have changed much. It may just be the speed with which we do things.

Change is over-rated, anyway. Consider the automobile. It's an especially valuable example, because the auto industry has spent tens of billions of dollars on research and product development in the last 100 years. Henry Ford's first car had a metal chassis with an internal combustion, gasoline-powered engine, four wheels with rubber tyres, a foot operated clutch assembly and brake system, a steering wheel, and four seats, and it could safely do 18 miles per hour. A hundred years and tens of thousands of research hours later, we drive cars with a metal chassis with an internal combustion, gasoline-powered engine, four wheels with rubber tyres, a foot operated clutch assembly and brake system, a steering wheel, four seats - and the average speed in London in 2001 was 17.5 miles per hour!

That's not a hell of a lot of return for the money. Ford evidently doesn't have much to teach us about change. The fact that they're still manufacturing cars is not proof that Ford Motor Co. is a sound organization, just proof that it takes very large companies to make cars in great quantities - making for an almost impregnable entry barrier. Fifty years after the development of the jet engine, planes are also little changed. They've grown bigger, wider and can carry more people. But those are incremental, largely cosmetic changes.

Taken together, this lack of real change has come to mean that in travel - whether driving or flying - time and technology have not combined to make things much better. The safety and design have of course accompanied the times and the new volume of cars and flights, but nothing of any significance has changed in the basic assumptions of the final product.

At the same time, moving around in cars or aeroplanes becomes less and less efficient all the time. Not only has there been no great change, but also both forms of transport have deteriorated as more people clamour to use them. The same is true for telephones, which took over hundred years to become mobile, or photographic film, which also required an entire century to change.

The only explanation for this is anthropological. Once established in calcified organizations, humans do two things: sabotage changes that might render people dispensable, and ensure industry-wide emulation. In the 1960s, German auto companies developed plans to scrap the entire combustion engine for an electrical design. (The same existed in the 1970s in Japan, and in the 1980s in France.) So for 40 years we might have been free of the wasteful and ludicrous dependence on fossil fuels. Why didn't it go anywhere? Because auto executives understood pistons and carburetors, and would be loath to cannibalize their expertise, along with most of their factories.

98. According to the passage, which of the following statements is true?

1. Executives of automobile companies are inefficient and ludicrous.
2. The speed at which an automobile is driven in a city has not changed much in a century.
3. Anthropological factors have fostered innovation in automobiles by promoting use of new technologies.
4. Further innovation in jet engines has been more than incremental.

**Sol. Ans.(2).** The same is manifested in paragraph 4, which talks about how automobile industry, inspite of spending tens of billions of dollars on research, still ended up with the same things, as were a century back. Even the average speed of driving in a city more or less remained same! The rest of the options are negated in the passage.

99. Which of the following views does the author fully support in the passage?

1. Nothing is as permanent as change.
2. Change is always rapid.
3. More money spent on innovation leads to more rapid change.
4. Over decades, structural change has been incremental.

**Sol. Ans.(4).** This is manifested in the 5th paragraph in which the author quotes the example of jet planes, in addition to the automobile (ford) example quoted earlier. He states that the only changes to have taken place are incremental and largely cosmetic. The rest are negated in the passage.

100. Which of the following best describes one of the main ideas discussed in the passage?

1. Rapid change is usually welcomed in society.
2. Industry is not as innovative as it is made out to be.
3. We should have less change than what we have now.
4. Competition spurs companies into radical innovation.

**Sol. Ans.(2).** It is one of the main ideas as the author has quoted the examples of Ford and jet planes to prove that industry is not as innovative as it looks to be. The rest are not in line as per the passage and are discarded.

101. According to the passage, the reason why we continued to be dependent on fossil fuels is that:

1. Auto executives did not wish to change.
2. No alternative fuels were discovered.
3. Change in technology was not easily possible.
4. German, Japanese and French companies could not come up with new technologies.

**Sol. Ans.(1).** The same is manifested in the last paragraph which states that if the recommended change happened, the auto executives would be rendered useless since they understood pistons and carburetors and an electrical engine would scrap the entire need for the same. The rest of the options are not supported by the passage.

*The passage looked easy enough to attempt but had inferential questions. Students with diverse reading habit would easily manage this.*

## PASSAGE II

The painter is now free to paint anything he chooses. There are scarcely any forbidden subjects, and today everybody is prepared to admit that a painting of some fruit can be as important as a painting of a hero dying. The Impressionists did as much as anybody to win this previously unheard-of freedom for the artist. Yet, by the next generation, painters began to abandon the subject altogether, and began to paint abstract pictures. Today the majority of pictures painted are abstract.

Is there a connection between these two developments? Has art gone abstract because the artist is embarrassed by his freedom? Is it that, because he is free to paint anything, he doesn't know what to paint? Apologists for abstract art often talk of it as the art of maximum freedom. But could this be the freedom of the desert island? It would take too long to answer these questions properly. I believe there is a connection. Many things have encouraged the development of abstract art. Among them has been the artists' wish to avoid the difficulties of finding subjects when all subjects are equally possible.

I raise the matter now because I want to draw attention to the fact that the painter's choice of a subject is a far more complicated question than it would at first seem. A subject does not start with what is put in front of the easel or with something which the painter happens to remember. A subject starts with the painter deciding he would like to paint such-and-such because for some reason or other he finds it meaningful. A subject begins when the artist selects something for *special mention*. (What makes it special or meaningful may seem to the artist to be purely visual—its colours or its form.) When the subject has been selected, the function of the painting itself is to communicate and justify the significance of that selection.

It is often said today that subject matter is unimportant. But this is only a reaction against the excessively literary and moralistic interpretation of subject matter in the nineteenth century. In truth the subject is literally the beginning and end of a painting. The painting begins with a selection (I will paint this and not everything else in the world); it is finished when that selection is justified (now you can see all that I saw and felt in this and how it is more than merely itself).

Thus, for a painting to succeed it is essential that the painter and his public agree about what is significant. The subject may have a personal meaning for the painter or individual spectator; but there must also be the possibility of their agreement on its general meaning. It is at this point that the culture of the society and period in question precedes the artist and his art. Renaissance art would have meant nothing to the Aztecs—and vice versa. If, to some extent, a few intellectuals can appreciate them both today it is because their culture is an historical one: its inspiration is history and therefore it can include within itself, in principle if not in every particular, all known developments to date.

When a culture is secure and certain of its values, it presents its artists with subjects. The general agreement about what is significant is so well established that the significance of a particular subject accrues and becomes traditional. This is true, for instance, of reeds and water in China, of the nude body in Renaissance, of the animal in Africa. Furthermore, in such cultures the artist is unlikely to be a free agent: he will be employed *for the sake of particular subjects*, and the problem, as we have just described it, will not occur to him.

When a culture is in a state of disintegration or transition the freedom of the artist increases—but the question of subject matter becomes problematic for him: he, himself, has to choose for society. This was at the basis of all the increasing crises in European art during the nineteenth century. It is too often forgotten how many of the art scandals of that time were provoked by the choice of subject (Gericault, Courbet, Daumier, Degas, Lautrec, Van Gogh, etc.).

By the end of the nineteenth century there were, roughly speaking, two ways in which the painter could meet this challenge of deciding what to paint and so choosing for society. Either he identified himself with the people and so allowed their lives to dictate his subjects to him; or he had to find his subjects within himself as painter. By *people* I mean everybody except the bourgeoisie. Many painters did of course work for the bourgeoisie according to their copy-book of approved subjects, but all of them, filling the Salon and the Royal Academy year after year, are now forgotten, buried under the hypocrisy of those they served so sincerely.

102. When a culture is insecure, the painter chooses his subject on the basis of:

1. The prevalent style in the society of his time.
2. Its meaningfulness to the painter.
3. What is put in front of the easel.
4. Past experience and memory of the painter.

**Sol. Ans.(2).** The same is manifested in paragraph no.8 where it is stated that in a culture which is in a state of disintegration or transition, the painter chooses his subject in two ways, either from the lives of the people or finds his subjects within himself. Hence, the meaningfulness of subject to the painter. The rest of the options cannot be substantiated.

103. In the sentence, "I believe there is a connection" (second paragraph), what two developments is the author referring to?

1. Painters using a dying hero and using a fruit as a subject of painting.
2. Growing success of painters and an increase in abstract forms.
3. Artists gaining freedom to choose subjects and abandoning subjects altogether.
4. Rise of Impressionists and an increase in abstract forms.

**Sol. Ans.(3).** The same is manifested in the 1st paragraph where the passage states that a painter is today free to paint anything he chooses and there is no such thing as forbidden subject. So the two developments are the freedom of the painter and the abandonment of the subject. The rest are not correct in context to the question.

104. Which of the following is NOT necessarily among the attributes needed for a painter to succeed:

1. The painter and his public agree on what is significant.
2. The painting is able to communicate and justify the significance of its subject selection.
3. The subject has a personal meaning for the painter.
4. The painting of subjects is inspired by historical developments.

**Sol. Ans.(4).** The passage doesn't mention that the selection of subjects should be inspired by historical developments for a painter to succeed.

105. In the context of the passage, which of the following statements would NOT be true?

1. Painters decided subjects based on what they remembered from their own lives.
2. Painters of reeds and water in China faced no serious problem of choosing a subject.
3. The choice of subject was a source of scandals in nineteenth century European art.
4. Agreement on the general meaning of a painting is influenced by culture and historical context.

**Sol. Ans.(1).** This option is not true, as it does not find any mention in the passage. The rest of the options are mentioned and true in context to the passage and hence are discarded.

106. Which of the following views is taken by the author?

1. The more insecure a culture, the greater the freedom of the artist.
2. The more secure a culture, the greater the freedom of the artist.
3. The more secure a culture, more difficult the choice of subject.
4. The more insecure a culture, the less significant the choice of the subject.

**Sol. Ans.(1).** The answer can be found in the 2nd last paragraph, which states that when a culture is in a state of disintegration or transition, the painter has more freedom of choice. The rest of the options are not correct in context to the question.

*The passage was moderate to tough. Students comfortable with philosophical / art kind of subjects could attempt this.*

### PASSAGE III

The viability of the multinational corporate system depends upon the degree to which people will tolerate the unevenness it creates. It is well to remember that the 'New Imperialism' which began after 1870 in a spirit of Capitalism Triumphant, soon became seriously troubled and after 1914 was characterized by war, depression, breakdown of the international economic system and war again, rather than Free Trade, Pax Britannica and Material Improvement. A major reason was Britain's inability to cope with the by-products of its own rapid accumulation of capital; i.e., a class-conscious labour force at home; a middle class in the hinterland; and rival centres of capital on the Continent and in America. Britain's policy tended to be atavistic and defensive rather than progressive—more concerned with warding off new threats than creating new areas of expansion. Ironically, Edwardian England revived the paraphernalia of the landed aristocracy it had just destroyed. Instead of embarking on a 'big push' to develop the vast hinterland of the Empire, colonial administrators often adopted policies to arrest the development of either a native capitalist class or a native proletariat which could overthrow them.

As time went on, the centre had to devote an increasing share of government activity to military and other unproductive expenditures; they had to rely on alliances with an inefficient class of landlords, officials and soldiers in the hinterland to maintain stability at the cost of development. A great part of the surplus extracted from the population was thus wasted locally.

The New Mercantilism (as the Multinational Corporate System of special alliances and privileges, aid and tariff concessions is sometimes called) faces similar problems of internal and external division. The centre is troubled: excluded groups revolt and even some of the affluent are dissatisfied with the roles. Nationalistic rivalry between major capitalist countries remains an important divisive factor. Finally, there is the threat presented by the middle classes and the excluded groups of the underdeveloped countries. The national middle classes in the underdeveloped countries came to power when the centre weakened but could not, through their policy of import substitution manufacturing, establish a viable basis for sustained growth. They now face a foreign exchange crisis and an unemployment (or population) crisis—the first indicating their inability to function in the international economy and the second indicating their alienation from the people they are supposed to lead. In the immediate future, these national middle classes will gain a new lease of life as they take advantage of the spaces created by the rivalry between American and non-American oligopolists striving to establish global market positions.

The native capitalists will again become the champions of national independence as they bargain with multinational corporations. But the conflict at this level is more apparent than real, for in the end the fervent nationalism of the middle class asks only for promotion within the corporate structure and not for a break with that structure. In the last analysis their power derives from the metropolis and they cannot easily afford to challenge the international system. They do not command the loyalty of their own population and cannot really compete with the large, powerful, aggregate capitals from the centre. They are prisoners of the taste patterns and consumption standards set at the centre.

The main threat comes from the excluded groups. It is not unusual in underdeveloped countries for the top 5 per cent to obtain between 30 and 40 per cent of the total national income, and for the top one-third to obtain anywhere from 60 to 70 per cent. At most, one-third of the population can be said to benefit in some sense from the dualistic growth that characterizes development in the hinterland. The remaining two-thirds, who together get only one-third of the income, are outsiders, not because they do not contribute to the economy, but because they do not share in the benefits. They provide a source of cheap labour which helps keep exports—to the developed world at a low price and which has financed the urban-biased growth of recent years. In fact, it is difficult to see how the system in most underdeveloped countries could survive without cheap labour since removing it (e.g. diverting it to public works projects as is done in socialist countries) would raise consumption costs to capitalists and professional elites.

107. The author is in a position to draw parallels between New Imperialism and New Mercantilism because

1. both originated in the developed Western capitalist countries.
2. New Mercantilism was a logical sequel to New Imperialism.
3. they create the same set of outputs—a labour force, middle classes and rival centres of capital.
4. both have comparable uneven and divisive effects.

**Sol. Ans.(4).** The author describes the fallout of the New Imperialism and New mercantilism by explaining how it creates the same set of output, which creates disturbances. Option 3 is a close call as it explains the process of these two that results in such fallout.

108. According to the author, the British policy during the 'New Imperialism' period tended to be defensive because

1. it was unable to deal with the fallouts of a sharp increase in capital.
2. its cumulative capital had undesirable side-effects.
3. its policies favoured developing the vast hinterland.
4. it prevented the growth of a set-up which could have been capitalistic in nature.

**Sol. Ans.(1).** The same is manifested in the 1st paragraph, which mentions the reasons of Britain becoming defensive because of its inability to cope with its rapid accumulation of capital. The rest of the options are irrelevant in context to the question.

109. In the sentence, "They are prisoners of the taste patterns and consumption standards set at the centre." (fourth paragraph), what is the meaning of 'centre'?

1. National government.
2. Native capitalists.
3. New capitalists.
4. None of the above.

**Sol. Ans.(4).** The Centre here means the new mercantilism as stated in paragraph 3. the rest are wrong.

110. Under New Mercantilism, the fervent nationalism of the native middle classes does not create conflict with the multinational corporations because they (the middle classes)

1. negotiate with the multinational corporations.
2. are dependent on the international system for their continued prosperity.
3. are not in a position to challenge the status quo.
4. do not enjoy popular support.

**Sol. Ans.(3).** The answer is manifested in the second last paragraph, which states that it seeks only for promotion within the corporate structure and not for a break with that structure. The rest are irrelevant and hence are discarded.

*This passage was tough. The inherent meaning of the passage had to be grasped in order to crack this one.*