

## READING/GRAMMAR SECTION

All answers must be indicated on the MARK SHEET.

### I Read the passage and answer the questions below.

① When I was growing up, our house backed onto woods, a thin two-acre remnant of a once-mighty wilderness. This was in a Maryland city where the enlightened planners had provided a number of such lingering areas of green. They were as tame as can be, our woods, and yet at night they still filled with mysterious shadows. In the winter they lay deep in snow and seemed to absorb, to swallow whole, all the ordinary noises of your body and your world. Scary things could still be imagined to take place in those woods. It was the place into which the bad boys fled after they threw eggs at your windows on Halloween and left your pumpkins smashed in the driveway. There were no Indians in those woods, but there had been once. We learned about them in school. Patuxent Indians, they'd been called. Swift, straight-shooting, silent as deer. Gone but for their lovely place names: Patapsco, Wicomico, Patuxent.

When you went out into those woods behind our house, you could still feel the history, the battles and dramas and romances, the stories. You could work it into your games, your imaginings, your lonely flights from the arguments or boredom of your life at home. My friends and I spent hours there.

② But the wilderness of childhood had nothing to do with trees or nature. I could lose myself on vacant lots and playgrounds, in the alleyway behind the general store, in the neighbors' yards, on the sidewalks, anywhere I could reach on my bicycle. On it I covered the neighborhood along a regular route for half a mile in every direction. I knew the locations of all my classmates' houses, the number of pets and siblings they had, the brand of ice cream they served, the potential dangerousness of their fathers. Any journey through this wilderness had its hazards: angry dogs, hostile humans, temptations and traps.

③ A striking feature of literature for children is the number of stories that feature the adventures of a child, more often a group of children, acting in a world where adults, particularly parents, are completely out of the picture. Think of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, *The Railway Children*, or Charles Schultz's *Peanuts*. Then there is the very rich tradition of children's literature that dramatizes the lives of famous Americans—Washington, Jefferson, Kit Carson, Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, Daniel Boone—when they were children. One element that was almost universal in these stories was the vast amount of time the famous historical boys were said to have spent wandering with close companions, with friendly Indian boys or a devoted slave, through the once-mighty wilderness, entirely free of adult supervision.

④ Though the wilderness available to me had shrunk to a mere green scrap of its former enormousness, though so much about childhood had changed in the years between the days of young George Washington's adventuring on his side of the Potomac River and my own suburban exploits on mine, there was still a connection there, a continuum of childhood. Eighteenth-century Virginia, twentieth-century Maryland, tenth-century Britain, Narnia, Neverland—it was all the same wilderness. Those legendary wanderings of Boone and Carson, those games of war and exploration I read about, those frightening encounters with genuine menace, far from the help or interference of mother and father, seemed to me at the time absolutely familiar.

⑤ The thing that strikes me now when I think about the wilderness of childhood is the incredible degree of freedom my parents gave me to adventure there. A very grave, very significant shift in our idea of childhood has occurred since then. The wilderness of childhood has gone; the days of adventure are past. The land ruled by children, to which a kid might exile himself for at least some portion of every day from the neighboring kingdom of adulthood, has in large part been taken over, colonized, and finally absorbed by the neighbors. We adults now provide for our children a kind of door-to-door escort service. We schedule their encounters for them, driving them to and from one another's houses so they never get a chance to discover the unexplored lands between. If they are lucky, we send them out to play in the backyard, where they can be safely fenced in and even, in extreme cases, monitored with

security cameras. When my family and I moved to our street in Berkeley, the family next door included a nine-year-old girl; in the house two doors down the other way, there was a nine-year-old boy, like her, a lifelong resident of the street. They had never met. The playgrounds and creek beds, the alleys and woodlands have been abandoned in favor of a system of reservations—Chuck E. Cheese, the Jungle, the Discovery Zone: jolly, controlled places mapped and planned by adults with no blank spots aside from doors marked STAFF ONLY. When children roller-skate or ride their bikes, they go forth armored as for battle, and their parents typically stand nearby.

⑥ There are reasons for all of this. The helmeting and monitoring, the herding of children into certified zones of safety, is in part the product of the generally increased consciousness, in America, of safety and danger. To this one might add the growing demands of insurance companies and the national pastime of filing lawsuits. But the primary reason for this curtailing of adventure is the increased anxiety we all feel over the abduction of children by strangers. This is not a rational fear; in 1999, for example, according to the Justice Department, the number of abductions by strangers in the United States was 115. Such crimes have always occurred at about the same rate; being a child is exactly no more and no less dangerous than it ever was. What has changed is that the horror is so much better known. At times it seems as if parents are being deliberately encouraged to fear for their children's lives, though only a cynic would suggest that there was money to be made in doing so.

⑦ What is the impact of the closing down of the wilderness on the development of children's imaginations? I grew up with a freedom, a liberty that now seems breathtaking and almost impossible. Recently, my younger daughter, after the usual struggle and exhilaration, learned to ride her bicycle. Her joy at her achievement was rapidly followed by a creeping sense of puzzlement and disappointment as it became clear to both of us that there was nowhere for her to ride it—nowhere that I was willing to let her go. There is a small grocery store around the corner, not over two hundred yards from our front door. Can I let her ride there alone to experience the special pleasure of buying herself an ice cream on a hot summer day and eating it on the sidewalk, alone with her thoughts? Soon after she learned to ride, we went out together after dinner, she on her bike, with me following along at a safe distance behind. What struck me at once on that lovely summer evening, as we wandered the streets of our residential neighborhood at that after-dinner hour that had once represented the magic hour of my own childhood, was that we didn't encounter a single other child.

⑧ Art is a form of exploration, of sailing off into the unknown alone, heading for those unmarked places on the map. If children are not permitted—not taught—to be adventurers and explorers as children, what will become of the world of adventure, of stories, of literature itself?

[Adapted from Michael Chabon, "Manhood for Amateurs: The Wilderness of Childhood" (2009).]

(1) Choose the best way to complete the following sentences about Paragraphs ① to ⑧.


- |                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 In Paragraph ① the writer mainly | 5 In Paragraph ⑤ the writer mainly |
| 2 In Paragraph ② the writer mainly | 6 In Paragraph ⑥ the writer mainly |
| 3 In Paragraph ③ the writer mainly | 7 In Paragraph ⑦ the writer mainly |
| 4 In Paragraph ④ the writer mainly | 8 In Paragraph ⑧ the writer mainly |

- A argues that adults are often absent from both fiction and non-fiction written for children.
- B blames the increasing frequency of abduction in America for the declining freedom of children today.
- C criticizes parents today for forcing their children to wear armor when they go into battle on their bicycles.
- D describes the woods behind his childhood home as a space that set children's imaginations free.
- E explains what he knew about the inhabitants of the neighborhood he lived in as a child and how he knew it.
- F presents the woods behind his childhood home as a dark and terrifying place that was to be avoided.
- G proposes that the freedom children once enjoyed to experience danger for themselves has been taken away by adults.
- H regrets that he feels unable to allow his daughter to go out alone and wonders whether he should let her.
- I states that adult fears about the dangers faced by children today are unfounded.
- J suggests that children today are being sent to unknown places without a map to help them enjoy their adventures.
- K worries that contemporary child-rearing practices will have a negative effect on literary production in the future.
- L writes that he experienced his own childhood and the childhoods he read about in books as in many ways the same.

(2) Choose the one way to complete each of these sentences that is NOT correct.

- 1 When the author was growing up,
- A he and his friends often played in woods where the Native American Patuxent people once lived.
- B he enjoyed reading stories about both real and imaginary children.
- C he often rode his bicycle around the neighborhood and knew it intimately.
- D he wished that he had lived in eighteenth-century Virginia like George Washington.
- E his parents allowed him to do things that parents nowadays do not allow their children to do.
- 2 As described by the author, the "wilderness of childhood"
- A includes places such as Chuck E. Cheese and the Jungle these days.
- B is no longer found anywhere.
- C was a land run by children that excluded adults.
- D was found in the neighborhoods where children lived.
- E was found in the woods and other wild areas where children played.
- 3 In the author's Berkeley neighborhood,
- A a grocery store close to the author's home sells ice cream.
- B at least two other children live on the same street as the author and his family.
- C children who live on the same street may not know each other.
- D in the summer the children ride their bicycles on the streets after dinner.
- E the author follows his daughter when she goes out on her bicycle.

(3) Which ONE of the following sentences best sums up the author's argument in the passage?

- A America is now so dangerous that children are not allowed to ride their bicycles around their neighborhoods alone.
- B Americans' consciousness of danger has increased and therefore children are safer than they once were.
-  C Children nowadays are not allowed to experience danger and as a consequence their capacity for creativity may decline.
- D Famous Americans such as George Washington and Daniel Boone had somewhat similar childhoods to his own.
- E The amount of wilderness available to children now has shrunk and as a consequence America is a much safer place than it was.



## II Read the passage and answer the questions below.

① In the summer of 1990, a group of teenagers in the city of St. Paul, Minnesota, burned a cross in front of the house of an African-American family. The teenagers were arrested and charged with violating a St. Paul law called the "Bias-motivated Crime Ordinance." The law made it illegal to place "on public or private property a symbol...which one knows or has reasonable grounds to know arouses anger, alarm or resentment in others on the basis of race, color, creed, religion or gender." The teenagers challenged the legal basis of their arrest, and in 1992, the US Supreme Court declared the St. Paul law an unconstitutional violation of freedom of speech. A European court would almost certainly have decided the case differently. Domestic national courts in Europe, as well as the European Court of Human Rights, are far more likely than their American counterparts to  "extreme speech"—speech that offends personal dignity on the basis of factors such as race, ethnicity, religion and sexual orientation. Hate crime prohibitions are familiar throughout Europe—laws that would not stand a chance of being accepted as constitutional in the United States. The differences between American and European approaches to the law raise pressing questions about the nature and limits of expressive freedom in democratic nations. What role, if any, should the law play in democracies in policing speech? Are there limits beyond which offensive or hateful speech deserves to be suppressed by state power? Do efforts to punish extreme speech produce a healthier democracy?

② One way to determine the extent to which free speech should be guaranteed would be to take into consideration the cultural and historical context. Some legal scholars point to such differences between Europe and the United States as the reason for the differences in their perspectives. For example, Dieter Grimm, a former justice in the *Bundesverfassungsgericht* [the German Constitutional Court], explains and justifies the criminalization, in Germany, of saying the Holocaust did not happen, as a message to its Jewish population that "atrocities like these should never happen again under the responsibility of the German state." It could be argued that the United States can afford to give greater tolerance to such views that deny the Holocaust than can Germany, where such tolerance would raise memories of the state's involvement in the genocide.

③ , factors other than simply the cultural and historical setting must also be taken into account when debating control over the right to express oneself. A re-examination of liberal ideas of freedom of expression will help make clear what such factors are. Liberals typically have three distinct arguments for protecting speech from state control. According to John Stuart Mill's classic statement, offensive speech deserves protection because it may lead to the discovery and expression of novel truths. Others, such as Alexander Meiklejohn, have insisted that the free expression of ideas must be protected as necessary for an informed democracy. Still others, such as Ronald Dworkin, insist that the idea of a morally independent self is connected to the right to personal development through speech, whether