The art becoming a trade commodity

Art suddenly became a product of commerce. Despite their limited understanding of art, nobles used it for the purpose of their personal glorification. Museums used it to increase their monetary worth. Furthermore, traders and thieves made it a thing that is tradeworthy. After 1980, art started to disapper from public area when it started becoming a personal commodity. Since its trade has become a profitable business, its quality is only judged through its market value. Besides, countries lack the resources to acquire it to keep it for the public display at museums. Eventually, the art would completely become private property, and it would be a souce of great fortune for some private individuals.

Approx: words in passage: 313
words in prècis: 114

National Officers Academy

Mock Exams Special CSS & CSS-2024

June 2023 (Mock-3)

ENGLISH (PRECIS AND COMPOSITION)

TIME ALLOWED: THREE HOURS	**PART-I (MCQS)**	**MAXIMUM MARKS = 20**
PART-I(MCQS): MAXIMUM 30 MINUTES	**PART-II**	**MAXIMUM MARKS = 80**

NOTE:

i. **Part-II** is to be attempted on the separate **Answer Book**.
ii. Attempt **ALL** questions from **PART-II**.
iii. All the parts (if any) of each Question must be attempted at one place instead of at different places.
iv. Write Q. No. in the Answer Book in accordance with Q. No. in the Q. Paper.

PART-II

Q. 2 Make a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title. **(15+5=20)**

Art, despite its religious and magical origins, very soon became a commercial venture. From bourgeois patrons funding art they barely understood in order to share their protegee's prestige, to museum curators stage-managing the cult of artists in order to enhance the market value of museum holdings, entrepreneurs have found validation and profit in big-name art. Speculators, thieves, and promoters long ago created and fed a market where cultural icons could be traded like commodities.

This trend toward commodification of high-brow art took an ominous, if predictable, turn in the 1980s during the Japanese "bubble economy." At a time when Japanese share prices more than doubled, individual tycoons and industrial giants alike invested record amounts in some of the West's greatest masterpieces. Ryoei Saito, for example, purchased van Gogh's Portrait of Dr. Gachet for a record-breaking $82.5 million. The work, then on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art, suddenly vanished from the public domain. Later learning that he owed the Japanese government $24 million in taxes, Saito remarked that he would have the paining cremated with him to spare his heirs the inheritance tax. This statement, which he later dismissed as a joke, alarmed and enraged many. A representative of the Van Gogh museum, conceding that he had no legal redress, made an ethical appeal to Mr. Saito, asserting, "a work of art remains the possession of the world at large."

Ethical appeals notwithstanding, great art will increasingly devolve into big business. Firstly, great art can only be certified by its market value. Moreover, the "world at large" hasn't the means of acquisition. Only one museum currently has the funding to contend for the best pieces–the J. Paul Getty Museum, founded by the billionaire oilman. The art may disappear into private hands, but its transfer will disseminate once static fortunes into the hands of various investors, collectors, and occasionally the artist.