

JC 2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION
in preparation for General Certificate of Education Advanced Level
Higher 1

GENERAL PAPER

8807/01

Paper 1

17 August 2016

1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer Paper

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name and class on all the work you hand in.
Write in dark blue or black pen on both sides of the paper.
Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Answer **one** question.

Note that up to **20** marks out of **50** will be awarded for your use of language.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.
All questions in this paper carry equal marks.

Question No.	
For Examiner's Use	
Content	/30
Language	/20
Total	/50

This document consists of 2 printed pages.



Answer **one** question.

Answers should be between 500 and 800 words in length.

- 1 Consider the view that advancements in artificial intelligence will result in more divides.
- 2 Can fiction ever be truthful?
- 3 'There is no place for politics in sport.' Do you agree?
- 4 'We need less, not more, choice.' How true is this today?
- 5 'There is no value in visiting museums today.' Discuss.
- 6 'There is now a greater need for the family.' How true is this of your society?
- 7 Should poorer countries address environmental issues when the basic needs of their own people are not being met?
- 8 Has technology really increased our productivity?
- 9 How valuable is selflessness in today's world?
- 10 'Far too little attention is given to the Arts in education today.' How true is this?
- 11 To what extent are human rights important for people in your society?
- 12 Discuss the claim that young people are doing nothing good despite being better informed.

From Passage 1

1. What does the word “enshrined” (line 2) suggest about how Americans viewed freedom of speech? [1]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
This amendment enshrined the freedom of speech, as it was henceforth illegal to make any law that impeded on the freedom of religion, press, and the right to peacefully assemble or petition the government.	They saw it as sacred // something to be venerated/revered/protected // had high regard/ deep respect for it.

2. Why has the author written the word “talking” in italics (line15)? [1]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
In talking about free speech, we are <i>talking</i> , not fighting . We are not settling our disagreement by arm-wrestling or a pistol duel.	(a) He wants to emphasise the contrast between the use of words to handle/manage disputes and the use of physically harmful ways/violence to do so.

3. “As soon as you show up to a debate to argue against free speech, you have lost it” (lines 16–17).

Why does the author make this claim? **Use your own words as far as possible.** [3]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
The very thing we are doing when we ask whether free speech should be fundamental — exchanging and evaluating ideas — presupposes that we have the right to exchange and evaluate ideas ... As soon as you show up to a debate to argue against free speech, you have lost it.	(a) A discussion involving opposing viewpoints requires//is only possible with free speech. [1] (b) Thus, the person participating in such a discussion to oppose free speech, is already conceding defeat [1] (c) as he is actually proving that the other side is right//free speech is essential. [1] (<i>Inferred</i>)

4. What “logic” is the author illustrating with the story of “The Emperor’s New Clothes” (line 26)? **Use your own words as far as possible.** [2]

From the Passage	Suggested answer
The victimised subjects did little to resist the tyrannical regime. The reason that citizens did not resist is that they lacked common knowledge — the awareness that everyone shared their knowledge . People will expose themselves to the risk of reprisal by a repressive regime only if they know that others are exposing themselves to that risk at the same time. The story of “The Emperor’s New Clothes” illustrates the logic. When the little boy shouted that the emperor was naked, he was not telling them anything they did not	The logic he is illustrating is that (a) only when an oppressed people learn/realise that all the rest think alike/ in a similar way OR all the rest in society face the danger together with them [1] (b) will they be more likely to face the possibility of retaliation by an oppressive government// stand up to their oppressors [1]

<p>already know. But he was changing their knowledge nonetheless, because now everyone knew that everyone else knew that the emperor was naked. That emboldened them to challenge the emperor's authority with their laughter</p>	
---	--

5. "humour is no laughing matter" (line 30).

Explain why this is a paradox. Use your own words as far as possible. [3]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
<p>...humour is no laughing matter — why humour, even when tasteless, is terrifying to dictators and protected by democracies. Humour, especially satire and ridicule, can stealthily challenge assumptions by forcing its audience to see that those assumptions lead to consequences that everyone recognises are absurd.</p>	<p>(a) It seems <u>contradictory/absurd</u> to say that humour, which is the expression of something light-hearted/funny, is serious// has alarming consequences.</p> <p><u>In reality, it makes sense</u> because humour can</p> <p>(b) surreptitiously/furtively</p> <p>(c) go against/defy expectations/beliefs//basic norms/understandings</p> <p>(d) by making/compelling its recipients (to) recognise that these basic norms bring ridiculous/illogical ramifications/outcomes.</p> <p>(a) = 1m (a)+(c), (a)+(b) or (a)+(d) = 2m (a)+(b)+(c)/(d) = 3m</p>

From Passage 2

6. Explain the author's use of the word "even" in the phrase "anyone who even questions free speech" (line 2). [2]

From the Passage	Suggested answer
<p>Millions of Americans support free speech... and that anyone who even questions free speech had better shut up.</p>	<p>The word suggests that</p> <p>(a) Americans uphold the value of free speech to such an extent/ to such an extreme that// Americans' faith in the need for absolute freedom of speech is so strong that [1]</p> <p>(b) merely inquiring//having doubts/reservations about the value of free speech is intolerable/unacceptable to them [1]</p>

7. How do the victims of hate speech suffer “more than” (lines 7–8) the victims of hate crime? Use your own words as far as possible. [1]

From the Passage	Suggested answer
emotional harm... is even <u>more</u> long-lasting and traumatic	The injury/Their suffering can be <u>more sustained/ enduring</u> and <u>more distressing/ harrowing/ disturbing/ upsetting/ shocking/ hurtful/ painful</u> .

8. Based on lines 14–16, what does the author suggest about how most defenders of free speech view those who argue against it? [2]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
Most defenders of free speech argue that those who pretend to be worried about the harms of free speech are more interested in trampling your right to say whatever you please. Arguments about harm are not even worth answering .	Those who argue against free speech are viewed by defenders of free speech as (a) insincere in their concerns about the evils of free speech // people who are not really concerned about the evils of free speech (b) show wanton/blatant/callous/brutal/flagrant disregard of // desire to crush others' right to free speech (c) illogical people // people with faulty reasoning // people to be treated with disdain (<i>Inferred</i>) Any 2 out of 3 pts = 2m

9. What was the price of free speech that the Europeans were “unwilling to pay” (line 39)? Use your own words as far as possible. [2]

From the Passage	Suggested Answer
... genuine pain and intimidation . In America, where everyone had the right to speak their mind, civil-rights and women's-rights advocates were subjected to vile abuse in public and private, and gay men and lesbians endured decades of deafening homophobic propaganda before the tide of public opinion turned.	The price that the Europeans were unwilling to pay was (a) real hurt (b) and inducement of fear in/bullying of (c) minority groups (<i>inferred</i>) 1-2 pts = 1m 3 pts = 2m

10. Using material from paragraphs 3–5, summarise what the author has to say about why free speech can be harmful and needs to be limited, and the rationale for allowing it.

Write your summary in **no more than 120 words**, not counting the opening words which are printed below. Use your own words as far as possible. [8]

Free speech can be harmful because...

	From the Passage	Suggested Paraphrasing
		<i>Why free speech can be harmful and needs to be limited</i>

1	verges on becoming corrosive (I.22)	it can become caustic/destructive
2	Exercised by an unconstrained media (I.22–23) ..the damage that its unfettered exercise may cause (I.30)	when deployed by (a) completely free/unbridled/unrestrained/uncontrolled press/publishers/content providers
3	commentators seek to incite reaction (I.23)	whose pundits/correspondents/ analysts aim to provoke/rouse/whip up responses
4	(with) ever more inflammatory words (I.23–24)	with increasingly provocative/fiery/explosive comments
5	those tapping away behind screens of anonymity (I.24)	or by those commenting without revealing their identities/while hiding their identities.
6	hideous, hurtful things are said (I.24–25)	Dreadful/Ugly/Horrendous/Monstrous and distressing/destructive/nasty/unkind/malicious/upsetting comments are made
7	(This can make people) fearful (I.24)	which make people anxious/frightened/scared/wary,
8	(This can make people) angry (I.24)	enraged/annoyed/hostile
9	(This can make people) defensive (I.24)	and guarded/over-sensitive/easily offended/prickly.
10	It does not turn the level of civilization up (I.24–25)	It fails to make society develop/advance/progress/more cultured,
11	(There are issues of) security (I.26)	undermines protection of the community/society
12	and personal safety (I.26)	and (the protection of) individuals
13	(There are issues of) the value of truth and honesty (I.26)	It erodes/decreases the significance/worth/importance of accuracy/correctness and integrity/veracity
14	(There are issues of) the need to treat others with respect (I.26–27)	and the obligation/duty/necessity to be considerate/courteous/ have regard for people.
15	ignorant, dishonest, malicious, corrupt words (I.27–28)	Uninformed, untruthful, hateful and fraudulent utterances,
16	can also do enormous damage (I.28)	cause immense/great destruction/harm.
17	democratic institutions (I.34)	Constitutional/egalitarian/representative/lected structures/bodies/establishments
18	can be destroyed from within (I.34)	can be torn apart/wrecked/ravaged/severely damaged from the inside
19	incitement to racial hatred, (I.36–37)	when freedom of speech is abused to evoke hostility of ethnic groups
20	and propaganda for war (I.37)	or indoctrinating/ conditioning the citizenry for armed conflict/battle

21	...pay...a price in genuine pain (l.39-40)	resulting in real hurt
22	and intimidation (l.40)	and bullying/ terrorising/ coercion/threatening
23	civil-rights and women's-rights advocates were subjected to vile abuse in public and private (l.40-41) gay men and lesbians endured decades of deafening homophobic propaganda (l.42)	<i>Point from example</i> of minority/marginalised groups
<i>Rationale for allowing free speech</i>		
24	It must be that we prefer that people harm each other, and society, through speech than through bullets and bombs (l.45-46)	However, it is better for people to hurt one another with words than with weapons .
25	That does not mean there are no casualties (l.47-48)	But this does not rule out people getting hurt/victimised //People may still get hurt/be victimised
26	it does not mean the right side will always win . (l.48)	nor does it guarantee that the correct party will prevail in a debate.// Sometimes the wrong party will be victorious .// The victor may not be correct .

No. of points	Marks
≥ 14	8
12-13	7
10-11	6
9	5
7-8	4
5-6	3
3-4	2
1-2	1

JC 2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION
in preparation for General Certificate of Education Advanced Level
Higher 1

CANDIDATE
NAME

CLASS

INDEX NUMBER

GENERAL PAPER

8807/02

Paper 2

17 August 2016

1 hour 30 minutes

Candidates answer on the Question Paper.

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name and class on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, glue or correction fluid.

Answer **all** questions.

The Insert contains the passages for comprehension.

Note that up to **15** marks out of **50** will be awarded for your use of language.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

For Examiner's Use	
Content	/35
Language	/15
Total	/50

This document consists of **6** printed pages and **1** Insert.



Read the passages in the Insert and then answer **all** the questions. Note that up to fifteen marks will be given for the quality and accuracy of your use of English throughout this Paper.

NOTE: When a question asks for an answer IN YOUR OWN WORDS AS FAR AS POSSIBLE and you select the appropriate material from the passage for your answer, you must still use your own words to express it. Little credit can be given to answers which only copy words and phrases from the passage.

From Passage 1

- 1 What does the word “enshrined” (line 2) suggest about how Americans viewed freedom of speech?

.....
..... [1]

- 2 Why has the author written the word “talking” in italics (line 15)?

.....
..... [1]

- 3 “As soon as you show up to a debate to argue against free speech, you have lost it” (lines 16–17).

Why does the author make this claim? **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
..... [3]

- 4 What “logic” is the author illustrating with the story of “The Emperor’s New Clothes” (line 26)? **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....
.....
.....
..... [2]

5 "humour is no laughing matter" (line 30).

Explain why this is a paradox. **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
..... [3]

From Passage 2

6 Explain the author's use of the word "even" in the phrase "anyone who even questions free speech" (line 2).

.....
.....
.....
..... [2]

7 How do the victims of hate speech suffer "more than" (lines 7-8) the victims of hate crime? **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....
..... [1]

8 Based on lines 14-16, what does the author suggest about how most defenders of free speech view those who argue against it?

.....
.....
.....
..... [2]

JC 2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION
in preparation for General Certificate of Education Advanced Level
Higher 1

GENERAL PAPER

8807/02

Paper 2

17 August 2016

INSERT

1 hour 30 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

This Insert contains the passages for Paper 2.

This document consists of **3** printed pages and **1** blank page.



Passage 1. *Steven Pinker argues that the right to free speech is fundamental.*

- 1 More than two centuries ago, the First Amendment to the Constitution was adopted in the United States. This amendment enshrined the freedom of speech, as it was henceforth illegal to make any law that impeded on the freedom of religion, press, and the right to peacefully assemble or petition the government. Now, the right to free speech is very much in the news. Incidents like the massacre of French cartoonists working with the Charlie Hebdo magazine, which publishes satirical articles about politics and culture, or the adherence to campus speech codes, which prohibit topics that may instigate hateful feelings within the university populace, have forced the democratic world to examine the roots of its commitment to free speech. Is free speech merely a symbolic talisman, like a national flag or motto? Is it just one of many values that we trade off against each other? Did the Charlie Hebdo cartoonists “cross a line that separates free speech from toxic talk,” as the dean of a school of journalism recently opined? May universities muzzle some students to protect the sensibilities of others? Or is free speech fundamental? 5 10
- 2 The answer is that free speech is indeed fundamental. The very thing we are doing when we ask whether free speech should be fundamental — exchanging and evaluating ideas — presupposes that we have the right to exchange and evaluate ideas. In talking about free speech, we are *talking*, not fighting. We are not settling our disagreement by arm-wrestling or a pistol duel. As soon as you show up to a debate to argue against free speech, you have lost it. 15
- 3 Free speech is essential to democracy and safeguards against tyranny. How did the monstrous regimes of the 20th century, the century of the Holocaust and two World Wars, gain and hold power? The answer is that groups of armed fanatics silenced their critics and adversaries. Once in power, the totalitarians criminalised any criticism of the regime. The victimised subjects did little to resist the tyrannical regime. The reason that citizens did not resist is that they lacked common knowledge — the awareness that everyone shared their knowledge. People will expose themselves to the risk of reprisal by a repressive regime only if they know that others are exposing themselves to that risk at the same time. 20 25
- 4 The story of “The Emperor’s New Clothes” illustrates the logic. When the little boy shouted that the emperor was naked, he was not telling them anything they did not already know. But he was changing their knowledge nonetheless, because now everyone knew that everyone else knew that the emperor was naked. That emboldened them to challenge the emperor’s authority with their laughter. The story reminds us why humour is no laughing matter — why humour, even when tasteless, is terrifying to dictators and protected by democracies. Humour, especially satire and ridicule, can stealthily challenge assumptions by forcing its audience to see that those assumptions lead to consequences that everyone recognises are absurd. That is why humour so often serves as an accelerant to social progress and should not be suppressed. 30
- 5 There are a number of laws that provide needed protection and regulations that set the standards for how our media operates. There are, however, too many strictures that inhibit free expression. Finding the appropriate balance can only be achieved through open debate, the very right we seek to protect. 35

Passage 2. *Garrett Epps argues that the right to free speech must be balanced by other considerations.*

- 1 Millions of Americans support free speech. They firmly believe that America is the only country to have free speech, and that anyone who even questions free speech had better shut up. European countries and Israel outlaw certain kinds of speech — Nazi symbols, anti-Semitic slurs, and speech that incites hatred on the basis of race, religion, and so forth but the American law of free speech assumes that the only function of law is to protect people against physical harm; it tolerates unlimited emotional harm. However, emotional harm can be equal in intensity to that experienced by the body, and is even more long-lasting and traumatic. Thus, victims of hate speech suffer as much as or more than victims of hate crime. Why should speech be exempt from concern when its social costs can be even more injurious than that of physical injury? I think defenders of free speech need to face two facts: First, the American system of free speech is not the only one; most democracies maintain relatively open societies under a different set of rules. Second, the system is not cost-free. Repressing speech has costs, but so does allowing it. The only mature way to judge is to look at both sides of the ledger. 5
- 2 Most defenders of free speech argue that those who pretend to be worried about the harms of free speech are more interested in trampling your right to say whatever you please. Arguments about harm are not even worth answering. Then, there is the more thoughtful response. Hate speech may be incredibly painful for individual members of minorities, but its toleration is to their great benefit: in a climate of free intellectual exchange, hateful and bigoted ideas are refuted and discredited, not merely suppressed. But the argument is not complete without conceding something most free speech advocates do not like to admit: While it may produce social good much of the time, there is no guarantee that ensures that overall it does more good than harm. 10 15 20
- 3 In fact, freedom of speech as we exercise it verges on becoming corrosive. Exercised by an unconstrained media, voiced by commentators who seek to incite reaction with ever more inflammatory words — or by those tapping away behind screens of anonymity — hideous, hurtful things are said. This can make people fearful, angry and defensive. It does not turn the level of civilisation up. There are issues of security and personal safety, the value of truth and honesty, and the need to treat others with respect. It is not true that only sticks and stones can hurt; ignorant, dishonest, malicious, corrupt words can also do enormous damage. Finding appropriate boundaries to frame freedom of speech is a constant struggle and judgement is essential. The right needs to be balanced against the damage that its unfettered exercise may cause. 25 30
- 4 Europeans also remember a time when free speech did not produce a happy ending. They take free speech seriously, and in fact many of them think their system of free speech is freer than the American system. However, their view of human rights was forged immediately after World War II, and one lesson they learnt was that democratic institutions can be destroyed from within by forces like the Nazis who use mass communication to dehumanise whole races and religions, preparing the population to accept exclusion and even extermination. For that reason, they argue that incitement to racial hatred, and propaganda for war, not only may but must be forbidden. They strongly protect freedom of expression and opinion, but they also set a boundary at what we call “hate speech”. The price that the Europeans were unwilling to pay — which Americans paid and continue to pay every day — was a price in genuine pain and intimidation. In America, where everyone had the right to speak their mind, civil-rights and women’s-rights advocates were subjected to vile abuse in public and private, and gay men and lesbians endured decades of deafening homophobic propaganda before the tide of public opinion turned. 35 40 45
- 5 I admire people on both sides who admit that we cannot be sure we have drawn the line properly. The reason that we allow free speech cannot be that it is harmless. It must be that we prefer that people harm each other, and society, through speech than through bullets and bombs. Social conflict and change are bruising, ugly things, and in democracies they are carried on with words. That does not mean there are no casualties, and it does not mean the right side will always win. 45

BLANK PAGE