

SECTION I

Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow.

The print media of our times has been called a champion of freedom of expression and the sword-arm of democracy. It is an institution which commands awe and respect of nations as well as individuals, because it is the most powerful investigative machinery that exposes their misdeeds. In a world where politicians are busy looting their countries, where the drug mafia and crime syndicates are generating human misery and anarchy, and where ordinary human beings having no links with power-lords have been reduced to a state of helplessness, only the print media champions the cause of the have-nots and acts as a balm on their wounds.

The print media does much good by highlighting many ills of society such as nepotism, cronyism and corruption in institutions which should be virginal and puritanical in their make and behaviour and by carrying on a relentless campaign against them. But sometimes it also does much harm when it spoils human relations and international harmony with its biased and propaganda-laden criticism. The press has acquired this potential for mischief, because in some countries it is not free in the true sense of the term. It is controlled by media barons, industrial houses and governments wielding dictatorial powers.

All these media lords use the press to serve their interests which are always at odds with humanitarian considerations and which often fuel fires of hatred, strife and anarchy, instead of cementing bonds of love and brotherhood among people belonging to different nations, classes or creeds. Under the protective arm of these overlords flourish many types of parasitical individuals including writers and would-be-seekers of power, name and fame. It is no secret that many media men are hand in glove with politicians, bureaucrats, educationists and guardians of law and order. Their editorials and write ups justify all acts of omission and commission of their patrons and proteges. Some change colour like the chameleon as they praise the actions of a man in power or of a party inching its way to power today, and denounce their former favourite a couple of weeks later. Such shifts, twists and somersaults can be traced in the editorials of many newspapers.

There is no doubt that the institution of the press has been instrumental in causing the downfall of ruthless dictators and oppressive regimes in many countries of the world. Editors and writers of articles against the excesses of men in power have been jailed, tortured and humiliated for asserting freedom of expression and freedom of the voice of conscience, upholding humanitarian causes and giving support to struggles for the emancipation of enslaved people. They have unearthed political scandals, kickbacks received by highly

placed men in countries like Japan and Italy which led to their downfall, security scams of stockbrokers and even sex aberrations of men and women who had cleverly shrouded their nefarious deeds in apparently transparent and spotless apparels of lechery. Some journalists and editors have sacrificed their lucrative jobs to uphold certain cherished principles by refusing to toe the line of their bosses. Some fearless journalists have defied censorship laws to expose the misdeeds of rulers. The American press and also the British press have established their reputation as the most fearless champions of freedom of expression. All these are highly commendable achievements of the print media.

But all is not well under the towering roof of the structure of journalism. It overshadows and dwarfs many institutions of society which have their usefulness to man. Newspapers with a few exceptions reflect partisan attitudes, sectarian outlook and biased individualism, and some carry on a war with their rivals on issues that generate heat and harm national interests. Codes of conduct framed by associations of journalists are violated and old scores are settled in the name of freedom of expression. Many editors perch themselves on high pedestals from which they preach sermons to both the high and low. They claim that they can predict the colour of coming events with oracular accuracy.

This mantle of preachers and prophets gives the aura of dignity to their highly intellectual frame, and they need not cast it off. But what they say should be impartial, non-partisan and universally acceptable. There are some cherished values associated with clean journalism and these should not be bartered with opportunistic gains.

There was a time when the press was a champion of the rights of the oppressed, of sound principles of morality, of justice to those who were illegally and arbitrarily denied what was due to them, and of many other noble causes. How many modern newspapers are not champions of their own commercial interests? How many do not boost their sales by reviving old hatreds and enmities between classes and countries? What most papers give their readers is simply sensation-creating stuff. They publish stories about the private lives of princes and presidents and photographs of female nudity to pander to the morbid and vulgar demands of readers, and peeping Toms. A glaring instance of the misuse of freedom of the press in the west is the growing tendency of some British papers to publish sex live. There is a circulation war going on in the corridors of "Fleet Street", to figure as victors in this war they publish articles on the "sexcapades" of the famous and not so famous. Both highbrow dailies and breast-baring tabloids are vying with each other to regale the public with sex scandals involving politicians and their mistresses, actresses and their lovers. In fact the world's print media as a whole does not feel any pricks of conscience while dealing with matters relating to sex. It regards modern morality as synonymous with sex-openness. Some of our Indian papers are beginning to

catch the plague of this sex-openness. You can see not less than a dozen photographs of actors and actresses displaying their semi-nudities in various flesh-uniting postures in many dailies of Northern India.

(From The Sterling Book of Essays by B.N. Kakkar)

Questions

- a) Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (02marks)
- b) i) Which good does the media do according to the writer? (08marks)
ii) How harmful has the media been according to the writer? (06 marks)
- c) What sacrifice have journalists made in their line of work? (04marks)
- d) How relevant is the passage to our society? (04marks)
- e) Give the meaning of the following words as used in the passage:
- i) balm (01mark)
 - ii) cronyism (01mark)
 - iii) proteges (01mark)
 - iv) scams (01mark)
 - v) cherished (01mark)
 - vi) pedestal (01mark)
 - vii) aura (01mark)
 - viii) vying (01mark)
 - ix) postures (01mark)
 - x) obsessed (01mark)

SECTION I

Read the passage below and answer the questions following it.

"The **male machine** is a special kind of being, different from women, children, and men who don't measure up. He is functional, designed mainly for work. He is programmed to tackle jobs, **override** obstacles, attack problems, overcome difficulties, and always **seize the offensive**. He will take on any task that can be presented to him in a competitive framework. His most positive reinforcement is victory.

He has armor plating that is virtually **impregnable**. His circuits are never scrambled or overrun by irrelevant personal signals. He dominates and outperforms his fellows, although without excessive flashing of lights or clashing of gears. His relationship with other male machines is one of respect but not intimacy; it is difficult for him to connect his internal circuits to those of others. In fact, his internal circuitry is something of a mystery to him and is maintained primarily by humans of the opposite sex".

The **foregoing** is, of course, a stereotype, an ideal that fits no one exactly. Yet stereotypes exist and exert influence because they are

believed a lot of the time by large numbers of people, and the image of the male machine remains the standard against which half the population judge themselves.

Boys learn the masculine ideal very early. Michael Lewis showed, for example, that after the age of six months, boys are picked up and hugged less than girls. The gap widens as children grow older, with boys discouraged from asking for human attention and pressured toward **autonomy**.

By five or six, boys know they aren't supposed to cry, ever be afraid, or (and this is the essence of the stereotype) be anything like girls. That is why calling another boy "a girl" is the worst thing one boy can say to another, and why little boys hate little girls. The strain of trying to pretend that we have no "feminine" feelings of doubt, disappointment, need for love and tenderness creates fear of those emotions in ourselves and hostility toward women, who symbolize these qualities.

The masculine stereotype makes sports into a **compulsion rather than a convivial pleasure**. Because violence is viewed as a male restorative, a way of getting in touch with the deepest roots of our maleness, the masculine stereotype makes men resort to it faster in personal relationships and in public policy. The male ideal tells us that to be real men we must be different from and superior to women, and thereby makes discrimination against women at work, in social clubs, and at home an **essential prop** for masculine self-esteem. The male premium on never losing, or always being and appearing tough, played a major role in keeping us in Vietnam after it became clear that **loss of face** ("national honor") was the only cost of getting out.

The tragedy, as Sandra Bern found in the research she reports here, is that men are fighting their nature as human beings in trying to conform to the male ideal. "Male" and "Female" characteristics are present in both men and women, although our culture has done its best to obscure this fact. Through feminism, women, have already begun to recognize this basic truth and to reclaim the side of life they have been shut out of. Perhaps in the future, men, too, will stop paying the high price of a restrictive and artificially polarized sex-role. Perhaps our lives will be shaped by a view of personality that will not assign fixed ways of behaving on the basis of sex.

Acceptance of androgyny would allow us instead to acknowledge that each person has the potential to be – depending on the circumstances – both assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, job and people – oriented, strong and gentle; that the most

effective and happy individuals are likely to be those who have accepted and developed both the “masculine” and “feminine” sides of themselves, and that to deny either is to **mutilate and deform**.

By **Marc Feigen Fasteau**

Questions

- a. Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (03 marks)
- b. What contradictions does the writer portray in the passage? (08 marks)
- c. What are the indicators of the masculine stereotype among children? (08 marks)
- d. What is the author's main argument in the passage? (05 marks)
- e. Explain the meaning of the following words and phrases as used in the passage.
 - i. *male machine*
 - ii. *override obstacles*
 - iii. *seize the offensive*
 - iv. *impregnable*
 - v. *foregoing*
 - vi. *autonomy*
 - vii. *compulsion rather than a convivial pleasure*
 - viii. *essential prop*
 - ix. *loss of face*
 - x. *mutilate and deform* (10 marks)

Read the following poem and answer the questions that follow.

If We Must Die!

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious sport,
While round us bark the mad and hungry dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.
If we must die, let it not be like hogs
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honour us, though dead!
Oh, kinsman! We must meet the common foe;
Though far outnumbered, let us still be brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one death blow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous cowardly pack,
Pressed to the wall, dying, but – fighting back!

Claude McKay

Questions

- a. Identify the speaking voice in the poem.
- b. Who the 'foe' in the poem?
- c. What is the poem about?
- d. Use the poem above and other poems in the course outline of research on the following.
 - i. Tone
 - ii. Mood
 - iii. Relevance of the title to the subject matter

NB: Use your friends in S.6 to help you in the research.

HW

**LITERATURE IN ENGLISH EXAMINATION
Prose and Poetry**

S. 5

Covid-19 holiday 2020

SECTION I

Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow.

The print media of our times has been called a champion of freedom of expression and the sword-arm of democracy. It is an institution which commands awe and respect of nations as well as individuals, because it is the most powerful investigative machinery that exposes their misdeeds. In a world where politicians are busy looting their countries, where the drug mafia and crime syndicates are generating human misery and anarchy, and where ordinary human beings having no links with power-lords have been reduced to a state of helplessness, only the print media champions the cause of the have-nots and acts as a balm on their wounds.

The print media does much good by highlighting many ills of society such as nepotism, cronyism and corruption in institutions which should be virginal and puritanical in their make and behaviour and by carrying on a relentless campaign against them. But sometimes it also does much harm when it spoils human relations and international harmony with its biased and propaganda-laden criticism. The press has acquired this potential for mischief, because in some countries it is not free in the true sense of the term. It is controlled by media barons, industrial houses and governments wielding dictatorial powers.

All these media lords use the press to serve their interests which are always at odds with humanitarian considerations and which often fuel fires of hatred, strife and anarchy, instead of cementing bonds of love and brotherhood among people belonging to different nations, classes or creeds. Under the protective arm of these overlords flourish many types of parasitical individuals including writers and would-be-seekers of power, name and fame. It is no secret that many media men are hand in glove with politicians, bureaucrats, educationists and guardians of law and order. Their editorials and write ups justify all acts of omission and commission of their patrons and proteges. Some change colour like the chameleon as they praise the actions of a man in

power or of a party inching its way to power today, and denounce their former favourite a couple of weeks later. Such shifts, twists and somersaults can be traced in the editorials of many newspapers.

There is no doubt that the institution of the press has been instrumental in causing the downfall of ruthless dictators and oppressive regimes in many countries of the world. Editors and writers of articles against the excesses of men in power have been jailed, tortured and humiliated for asserting freedom of expression and freedom of the voice of conscience, upholding humanitarian causes and giving support to struggles for the emancipation of enslaved people. They have unearthed political scandals, kickbacks received by highly placed men in countries like Japan and Italy which led to their downfall, security scams of stockbrokers and even sex aberrations of men and women who had cleverly shrouded their nefarious deeds in apparently transparent and spotless apparels of lechery. Some journalists and editors have sacrificed their lucrative jobs to uphold certain cherished principles by refusing to toe the line of their bosses. Some fearless journalists have defied censorship laws to expose the misdeeds of rulers. The American press and also the British press have established their reputation as the most fearless champions of freedom of expression. All these are highly commendable achievements of the print media.

But all is not well under the towering roof of the structure of journalism. It overshadows and dwarfs many institutions of society which have their usefulness to man. Newspapers with a few exceptions reflect partisan attitudes, sectarian outlook and biased individualism, and some carry on a war with their rivals on issues that generate heat and harm national interests. Codes of conduct framed by associations of journalists are violated and old scores are settled in the name of freedom of expression. Many editors perch themselves on high pedestals from which they preach sermons to both the high and low. They claim that they can predict the colour of coming events with oracular accuracy.

This mantle of preachers and prophets gives the aura of dignity to their highly intellectual frame, and they need not cast it off. But what they say should be impartial, non-partisan and universally acceptable. There are some cherished values associated with clean journalism and these should not be bartered with opportunistic gains.

There was a time when the press was a champion of the rights of the oppressed, of sound principles of morality, of justice to those who were illegally and arbitrarily denied what was due to them, and of many other noble causes. How many modern newspapers are not champions of their own commercial interests? How many do not boost their sales by reviving old hatreds and enmities between classes and countries? What most papers give their readers is simply sensation-creating stuff. They publish stories about the private lives of princes and presidents and photographs of female nudity to pander to the

morbid and vulgar demands of readers, and peeping Toms. A glaring instance of the misuse of freedom of the press in the west is the growing tendency of some British papers to publish sex live. There is a circulation war going on in the corridors of "Fleet Street", to figure as victors in this war they publish articles on the "sexcapades" of the famous and not so famous. Both highbrow dailies and breast-baring tabloids are vying with each other to regale the public with sex scandals involving politicians and their mistresses, actresses and their lovers. In fact the world's print media as a whole does not feel any pricks of conscience while dealing with matters relating to sex. It regards modern morality as synonymous with sex-openness. Some of our Indian papers are beginning to catch the plague of this sex-openness. You can see not less than a dozen photographs of actors and actresses displaying their semi-nudities in various flesh-uniting postures in many dailies of Northern India.

(From The Sterling Book of Essays by B.N. Kakkar)

Questions

- f) Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (02marks)
- g) i) Which good does the media do according to the writer? (08marks)
 ii) How harmful has the media been according to the writer? (06 marks)
- h) What sacrifice have journalists made in their line of work? (04marks)
- i) How relevant is the passage to our society? (04marks)
- j) Give the meaning of the following words as used in the passage:
- xi) balm (01mark)
- xii) cronyism (01mark)
- xiii) proteges (01mark)
- xiv) scams (01mark)
- xv) cherished (01mark)
- xvi) pedestal (01mark)
- xvii) aura (01mark)
- xviii) vying (01mark)
- xix) postures (01mark)
- xx) obsessed (01mark)

SECTION I

Read the passage below and answer the questions following it.

"The **male machine** is a special kind of being, different from women, children, and men who don't measure up. He is functional, designed mainly for work. He is programmed to tackle jobs, **override** obstacles,

attack problems, overcome difficulties, and always **seize the offensive**. He will take on any task that can be presented to him in a competitive framework. His most positive reinforcement is victory.

He has armor plating that is virtually **impregnable**. His circuits are never scrambled or overrun by irrelevant personal signals. He dominates and outperforms his fellows, although without excessive flashing of lights or clashing of gears. His relationship with other male machines is one of respect but not intimacy; it is difficult for him to connect his internal circuits to those of others. In fact, his internal circuitry is something of a mystery to him and is maintained primarily by humans of the opposite sex".

The **foregoing** is, of course, a stereotype, an ideal that fits no one exactly. Yet stereotypes exist and exert influence because they are believed a lot of the time by large numbers of people, and the image of the male machine remains the standard against which half the population judge themselves.

Boys learn the masculine ideal very early. Michael Lewis showed, for example, that after the age of six months, boys are picked up and hugged less than girls. The gap widens as children grow older, with boys discouraged from asking for human attention and pressured toward **autonomy**.

By five or six, boys know they aren't supposed to cry, ever be afraid, or (and this is the essence of the stereotype) be anything like girls. That is why calling another boy "a girl" is the worst thing one boy can say to another, and why little boys hate little girls. The strain of trying to pretend that we have no "feminine" feelings of doubt, disappointment, need for love and tenderness creates fear of those emotions in ourselves and hostility toward women, who symbolize these qualities.

The masculine stereotype makes sports into a **compulsion rather than a convivial pleasure**. Because violence is viewed as a male restorative, a way of getting in touch with the deepest roots of our maleness, the masculine stereotype makes men resort to it faster in personal relationships and in public policy. The male ideal tells us that to be real men we must be different from and superior to women, and thereby makes discrimination against women at work, in social clubs, and at home an **essential prop** for masculine self-esteem. The male premium on never losing, or always being and appearing tough, played a major role in keeping us in Vietnam after it became clear that **loss of face** ("national honor") was the only cost of getting out.

The tragedy, as Sandra Bern found in the research she reports here, is that men are fighting their nature as human beings in trying to conform

to the male ideal. "Male" and "Female" characteristics are present in both men and women, although our culture has done its best to obscure this fact. Through feminism, women, have already begun to recognize this basic truth and to reclaim the side of life they have been shut out of. Perhaps in the future, men, too, will stop paying the high price of a restrictive and artificially polarized sex-role. Perhaps our lives will be shaped by a view of personality that will not assign fixed ways of behaving on the basis of sex.

Acceptance of androgyny would allow us instead to acknowledge that each person has the potential to be – depending on the circumstances – both assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, job and people – oriented, strong and gentle; that the most effective and happy individuals are likely to be those who have accepted and developed both the "masculine" and "feminine" sides of themselves, and that to deny either is to **mutilate and deform**.

By **Marc Feigen Fasteau**

Questions

- f. Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (03 marks)
- g. What contradictions does the writer portray in the passage? (08 marks)
- h. What are the indicators of the masculine stereotype among children? (08 marks)
- i. What is the author's main argument in the passage? (05 marks)
- j. Explain the meaning of the following words and phrases as used in the passage.
 - xi. *male machine*
 - xii. *override obstacles*
 - xiii. *seize the offensive*
 - xiv. *impregnable*
 - xv. *foregoing*
 - xvi. *autonomy*
 - xvii. *compulsion rather than a convivial pleasure*
 - xviii. *essential prop*
 - xix. *loss of face*
 - xx. *mutilate and deform* (10 marks)

Read the following poem and answer the questions that follow.

If We Must Die!

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious sport,
While round us bark the mad and hungry dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honour us, though dead!
Oh, kinsman! We must meet the common foe;
Though far outnumbered, let us still be brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one death blow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous cowardly pack,
Pressed to the wall, dying, but – fighting back!

Claude McKay

Questions

- a. Identify the speaking voice in the poem.
- b. Who the 'foe' in the poem?
- c. What is the poem about?
- d. Use the poem above and other poems in the course outline of research on the following.
 - i. Tone
 - ii. Mood
 - iii. Relevance of the title to the subject matter

NB: Use your friends in S.6 to help you in the research.