

Passage 2, Questions 11-20. Read the following passage from the introduction to *Blink* by Malcolm Gladwell carefully before you choose your answers.

(5) In September of 1983, an art dealer by the name of Gianfranco Becchina approached the J. Paul Getty Museum in California. He had in his possession, he said, a marble statue dating from the sixth century BC. It was what is known as a kouros – a sculpture of a nude male youth standing with his left leg forward and his arms at his sides. There are only about two hundred kouroi in existence, and most have been recovered badly damaged or in fragments from grave sites or archeological digs. But this one was almost perfectly preserved. It stood close to seven feet tall. It had a kind of light-colored glow that set it apart from other ancient works. It was an extraordinary find. Becchina's asking price was just under \$10 million.

(10) The Getty moved cautiously. It took the kouros on loan and began a thorough investigation. Was the statue consistent with other known kouroi? The answer appeared to be yes. The style of the sculpture seemed reminiscent of the Anavyssos kouros in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens, meaning that it seemed to fit with a particular time and place. Where and when had the statue been found? No one knew precisely, but Becchina gave the Getty's legal department a sheaf of documents relating to its more recent history. The kouros, the records stated, had been in the private collection of a Swiss physician named Lauffenberger since the 1930s, and he in turn had acquired it from a well-known Greek art dealer named Roussos.

(15) A geologist from the University of California named Stanley Margolis came to the museum and spent two days examining the surface of the statue with a high resolution stereomicroscope. He then removed a core sample measuring one centimeter in diameter and two centimeters in length from just below the right knee and analyzed it using an electron microscope, electron microprobe, mass spectrometry, X-ray diffraction, and X-ray fluorescence. The statue was made of dolomite marble from the ancient Cape Vathy quarry on the island of Thasos, Margolis concluded, and the surface of the statue was covered in a thin layer of calcite – which was significant, Margolis told the Getty, because dolomite can turn into calcite only under the course of hundreds, if not thousands, of years. In other words, the statue was old. It wasn't some contemporary fake.

(20) The Getty was satisfied. Fourteen months after their investigation of the kouros began, they agreed to buy the statue. In the fall of 1986, it went on display for the first time. The *New York Times* marked the occasion with a front-page story. A few months later, the Getty's curator of antiquities, Marion True, wrote a long, glowing account of the museum's acquisition for the art journal *The Burlington Magazine*. "Now standing erect without external support, his closed hands fixed firmly to his thighs, the kouros expresses the confident vitality that is characteristic of the best of his brothers." True concluded triumphantly, "God or man, he embodies all the radiant energy of the adolescence of western art."

(25) The kouros, however, had a problem. It didn't look right. The first to point this out was an Italian art historian named Federico Zeri, who served on the Getty's board of trustees. When Zeri was taken down to the museum's restoration studio to see the kouros in December of 1983, he found himself staring at the sculpture's fingernails. In a way he couldn't immediately articulate, they seemed wrong to him. Evelyn Harrison was next. She was one of the world's foremost experts on Greek sculpture, and she was in Los Angeles visiting the Getty just before the museum finalized the deal with Becchina. "Arthur Houghton, who was then the curator, took us down to see it," Harrison remembers. "He just swished a cloth off the top of it and said, 'Well, it isn't ours

yet, but it will be in a couple of weeks.' And I said, 'I'm sorry to hear that.'"
 What did Harrison see? She didn't know. In that very first moment, when
 (55) Houghton swished off the cloth, all Harrison had was a hunch, an instinctive
 sense that something was amiss. A few months later, Houghton took Thomas
 Hoving, the former director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York,
 down to the Getty's conservation studio to see the statue as well. Hoving always
 makes a note of the first word that goes through his head when he sees
 (60) something new, and he'll never forget what the word was when he first saw the
 kouros. "It was 'fresh' – 'fresh,'" Hoving recalls. And "fresh" was not the right
 reaction to a two-thousand-year-old statue. Later, thinking back on that moment,
 Hoving realized why that thought had popped into his mind: "I had dug in
 Sicily, where we found bits and pieces of these things. They just don't come out
 (65) looking like that. The kouros looked like it had been dipped in the very best
 caffè latte from Starbucks."

Hoving turned to Houghton. "Have you paid for this?"

Houghton, Hoving remembers, looked stunned.

"If you have, try to get your money back," Hoving said. "If you haven't,
 (70) don't."

The Getty was getting worried, so they convened a special symposium on
 the kouros in Greece. They wrapped the statue up, shipped it to Athens, and
 invited the country's most senior sculpture experts. This time the chorus of
 dismay was even louder.

(75) Harrison, at one point, was standing next to a man named George Despinis,
 the head of the Acropolis Museum in Athens. He took one look at the kouros
 and blanched. "Anyone who has ever seen a sculpture coming out of the
 ground," he said to her, "could tell that that thing has never been in the ground."
 Georgios Dontas, head of the Archeological Society in Athens, saw the statue
 (80) and immediately felt cold. "When I saw the kouros for the first time," he said, "I
 felt as though there was a glass between me and the work." Dontas was
 followed in the symposium by Angelos Delivorrias, director of the Benaki
 Museum in Athens. He spoke at length on the contradiction between the style of
 the sculpture and the fact that the marble from which it was carved came from
 (85) Thasos. Then he got to the point. Why did he think it was a fake? Because when
 he first laid eyes on it, he said, he felt a wave of intuitive repulsion." By the time
 the symposium was over, the consensus among many of the attendees appeared
 to be that the kouros was not at all what it was supposed to be. The Getty, with
 its lawyers and scientists and months of painstaking investigation, had come to
 (90) one conclusion, and some of the world's foremost experts in Greek sculpture –
 just by looking at the statue and sensing their own "intuitive repulsion" – had
 come to another? Who was right?

For a time it wasn't clear. The kouros was the kind of thing that art experts
 argued about at conferences. But then, bit by bit, the Getty's case began to fall
 (95) apart. The letters the Getty's lawyers used to carefully trace the kouros back to
 the Swiss physician Lauffenberger, for instance, turned out to be fakes. One of
 the letters dated 1952 had a postal code on it that didn't exist until twenty years
 later. Another letter dated 1955 referred to a bank account that wasn't opened
 until 1963. Originally the conclusion of long months of research was that the
 (100) Getty kouros was in the style of the Anavyssos kouros. But that, too, fell into
 doubt: the closer experts in Greek sculpture looked at it, the more they began to
 see it as a puzzling pastiche of several different styles from several different
 places and time periods. The young man's slender proportions looked a lot like
 those of the Tenea kouros, which is in a museum in Munich, and his stylized,
 (105) beaded hair was a lot like that of the kouros in the Metropolitan Museum in New
 York. His feet, meanwhile, were, if anything, modern. The kouros it most
 resembled, it turned out, was a smaller, fragmentary statue that was found by a
 British art historian in Switzerland in 1990. The two statues were cut from

- similar marble and sculpted in quite similar ways. But the Swiss kouros didn't
 (110) come from ancient Greece. It came from a forger's workshop in Rome in the
 early 1980s. And what of the scientific analysis that said the surface of the Getty
 kouros could only have aged over many hundreds or thousands of years? Well, it
 turns out things weren't that cut and dried. Upon further analysis, another
 geologist concluded that it might be possible to "age" the surface of a dolomite
 (115) marble statue in a couple of months using potato mold. In the Getty's catalogue,
 there is a picture of the kouros, with the notation "About 530 BC, or modern
 forgery."

- When Frederico Zeri and Evelyn Harrison and Thomas Hoving and
 Georgios Dontas – and all the others – looked at the kouros and felt an "intuitive
 (120) repulsion," they were absolutely right. In the first two seconds of looking – in a
 single glance – they were able to understand more about the essence of the
 statue than the team at the Getty was able to understand after fourteen months.

Blink is a book about those first two seconds.

-
 (125) The part of our brain that leaps to conclusions like this is called the adaptive
 unconscious, and the study of this kind of decision making is one of the most
 important new fields in psychology. The adaptive unconscious is not to be
 confused with the unconscious described by Sigmund Freud, which was a dark
 and murky place filled with desires and memories and fantasies that were too
 (130) disturbing for us to think about consciously. This new notion of the adaptive
 unconscious is thought of, instead, as a kind of giant computer that quickly and
 quietly processes a lot of the data we need in order to keep functioning as human
 beings. When you walk out into the street and suddenly realize that a truck is
 bearing down on you, do you have time to think through all your options? Of
 (135) course not. The only way that human beings could ever have survived as a
 species for as long as we have is that we've developed another kind of decision-
 making apparatus that's capable of making very quick judgments based on very
 little information. As the psychologist Timothy D. Wilson writes in his book
Strangers to Ourselves: "The mind operates most efficiently by relegating a
 (140) good deal of high-level, sophisticated thinking to the unconscious, just as a
 modern jetliner is able to fly on automatic pilot with little or no input from the
 human, 'conscious' pilot. The adaptive unconsciousness does an excellent job of
 sizing up the world, warning people of danger, setting goals, and initiating
 (145) action in a sophisticated and efficient manner."

- Wilson says that we toggle back and forth between our conscious and
 unconscious modes of thinking, depending on the situation. A decision to invite
 a co-worker over for dinner is conscious. You think it over. You decide it will
 be fun. You ask him or her. The spontaneous decision to argue with that same
 (150) co-worker is made unconsciously – by a different part of the brain and
 motivated by a different part of your personality.

- Whenever we meet someone for the first time, whenever we interview
 someone for a job, whenever we react to a new idea, whenever we're faced with
 making a decision quickly and under stress, we use that second part of our brain.
 (155) How long, for example, did it take you, when you were in college, to decide
 how good a teacher your professor was? A class? Two classes? A semester? The
 psychologist Nalini Ambady once gave students three ten-second videotapes of
 a teacher – with the sound turned off – and they found they had no difficulty at
 all coming up with a rating of the teacher's effectiveness. Then Ambady cut the
 (160) clips back to five seconds, and the ratings were the same. They were remarkably
 consistent even when she showed the students just *two* seconds of videotape.
 The Ambady compared those snap judgments of teacher effectiveness with
 evaluations of those same professors made by their students after a full semester
 of classes, and she found that they were also essentially the same. A person
 (165) watching a silent two-second video clip of a teacher he or she has never met will