**Questions 1-12** refer to the following information.

The passage below is an excerpt from an essay on violence in America, written by a contemporary historian.

On September 26, 1872, three mounted men rode up to the gate of the Kansas City
Fair, which was enjoying a huge crowd of perhaps 10,000 people. The bandits shot
at the ticket seller, hit a small girl in the leg, and made off for the woods with something
less than a thousand dollars. It was highhanded, and it endangered the lives of a whole (**5)** host of holiday-minded people for comparatively little reward.
 What makes the robbery and the violence notable is not the crime itself but the
way it was reported in the Kansas City *Times* by one John N. Edwards. In his front-page
story he branded the robbery "so diabolically daring and so utterly in contempt
of fear that we are bound to admire it and revere its perpetrators."

**(10)** Two days later the outlaws were being compared by the *Times* with knights of
King Arthur's Round Table:
 "It was as though three bandits had come to us from storied Odenwald, with the
halo of medieval chivalry upon their garments and shown us how the things were
done that poets sing of. Nowhere else in the United States or in the civilized world,

**(15)** probably, could this thing have been done."
 Quite likely this deed was perpetrated by the James brothers: Jesse and Frank, and
a confederate. The details really do not matter. What pertains is the attitude of the
innocent toward the uncertainly identified guilty. The act had been perpetrated by
violent, lawless men. If the *Times* is any indication, a respectable section of people

**(20)** approved of their action. No one, of course, thought to ask the little girl with the
shattered leg how she felt about such courage. Nearly 17 months later, Edwards
was quoted in the St. Louis *Dispatch* as preferring the Western highwayman to the
Eastern, for "he has more qualities that attract admiration and win respect . . . . This
comes from locality . . . which breeds strong, hardy men-men who risk much, who

**(25)** have friends in high places, and who go riding over the land, taking all chances that
come in the way." The purpose here is not to belabor one reasonably anonymous
newspaperman of nearly a century ago, but merely to point up a fact-and a problem-of
the American frontier.
 The frontier placed a premium on independent action and individual reliance.

**(30)** The whole history of the American frontier is a narrative of taking what was there
to be taken. The timid never gathered riches, the polite nearly never. The men
who first carved the wilderness into land claims and town lots were the men who moved
in the face of dangers, gathering as they progressed. The emphasis naturally came to
be placed on gathering and not on procedures. Great tales of gigantic attainments

**(35)** abound in this frontier story; equally adventurous tales of creative plundering mark
the march from Jamestown to the Pacific. It was a period peopled by giants, towers
of audacity with insatiable appetites. The heroes are not the men of moderate
attitudes, not the town planners and commercial builders, not the farmers nor the
ministers nor the teachers. The heroes of the period, handed along to us with all the

**(40)** luster of a golden baton, are the mighty runners from Mt. Olympus who ran without
looking back, without concern about social values or anywhere they might be going
except onward.
 We revere these heroes because they were men of vast imagination and daring.
We have also inherited their blindness and their excesses.

**1.** It can be inferred that the speaker knows the facts about the incident in Kansas City on September 26, 1872, because he

A. was an eyewitness to the events described.

B. happened to be a visitor to the fair.

C. interviewed the ticket seller.

D. read about it in a newspaper.

E. was related to the girl who got shot.

**2.** In which of the following ways does the sentence that starts "It was highhanded . . ." (line 4) differ from the other sentences in the paragraph?

I. It is a compound sentence.

II. It expresses the opinion of the speaker.

III. It employs alliterative language.

A. I only

B. III only

C. I and II only

D. II and III only

E. I, II, and III

**3.** In lines 6–7 "the way it was reported" refers to

A. the appearance of the story on the front page.

B. John N. Edwards's qualifications to write the story.

C. the reporter's praise of the bandits.

D. the flowery language used by the reporter.

E. the matter-of-fact tone in which the story was written.

**4.** In lines 6–15, the speaker's attitude toward John N. Edwards and his newspaper can best be described as one of

A. outright scorn.

B. profound disillusion.

C. extreme hatred.

D. honest skepticism.

E. exaggerated uneasiness.

**5.** Which of the following rhetorical devices is most in evidence in lines 10–15?

A. An inspiring myth

B. An analogy

C. A parable

D. A caricature

E. An annotation

**6.** Which of the following best describes the rhetorical effect of the sentence beginning "Quite likely . . ." (line 16)?

A. To restate the main idea of the passage

B. To reinforce a theory stated earlier in the passage

C. To shift the focus of the passage to an entirely new topic

D. To emphasize the foolishness of the preceding quotation

E. To endorse the position taken by the Kansas City newspaper

**7.** The phrase "such courage" (line 21) can best be described as an example of

A. a subtle use of irony

B. a metaphorical allusion

C. a witty analogy

D. a paradox

E. an oxymoron

**8.** In the context of the passage, the word "innocent" (line 18) can be interpreted to mean all of the following EXCEPT

A. gullible people.

B. those who cannot make up their minds.

C. individuals who don't know right from wrong.

D. uncritical readers.

E. simple-minded people.

**9.** The quotation from the St. Louis newspaper (lines 23–26) serves the author's purposes in which of the following ways?

A. It makes a case for more accuracy in newspaper writing.

B. It makes clear the author's intention to destroy Edwards's career as a reporter.

C. It further illustrates the thinking of many Americans.

D. It reinforces the author's view expressed earlier that the bandits were "violent" and "lawless."

E. It provides a generalization on which the author will comment in the next paragraph.

**10.** The author mentions "creative plundering" (line 35) as an example of which of the following?

A. Dividing up land for private property

B. Earning fortunes on the frontier

C. Ignoring dangers to life and limb

D. independent action and individual reliance (line 29)

E. taking what there was to be taken (lines 30–31)

**11.** The conclusions drawn in the last paragraph (lines 43–44) contribute to the unity of the passage in which of the following ways?

A. They reiterate a similar idea stated early in the passage.

B. They justify the lawlessness that dominated the frontier.

C. They indicate the similarity between frontier people and the knights of King Arthur.

D. They explain why the bandits in Kansas City were admired instead of condemned.

E. They mock the values of the frontier just as the author has mocked John N. Edwards.

**12.** As described in the passage, the bandits, the Knights of the Round Table, and the people of the frontier all share which of the following?

A. A concern for upholding their reputations

B. An intense commitment to strive for their goals

C. Uncertainty about their position in society

D. A sentimental attachment to the past

E. A reckless disregard of the truth

WRITTEN PORTION

Question 1

Suggested Writing Time: 40 minutes

 A new word has entered the American vocabulary: affluenza. A 1997 PBS documentary titled Affluenza introduced this new term and defined it: “ n. 1. The bloated, sluggish, and unfulfilled feeling that results from efforts to keep up with the Joneses. 2. An epidemic of stress, overwork, waste, and indebtedness caused by dogged pursuit of the American Dream. 3. An unsustainable addiction to economic growth.” Since then, scholars, journalists, political leaders, artists, and even comedians have made America’s ever-increasing consumption the subject of dire warnings, academic studies, social commentary, campaign promises, and late-night TV jokes.

Carefully read the following sources (including any introductory information). **Then, in an essay that synthesizes at least three of the sources, take a position that supports, opposes, or qualifies the claim that Americans are never satisfied. They are constantly wanting new things and are never content with what they have. There is a superabundance of “stuff,” and Americans have lost their sense of meaning. As Sheryl Crow’s 2002 lyrics state, “it’s not having what you want. It’s wanting what you’ve got.”**

Make certain that you take a position and that the essay centers on your argument. Use the sources to support your reasoning; avoid simply summarizing the sources. You may refer to the sources by their letters (Source A, Source B, etc.) or by the identifiers in the parentheses below.

 Source A (Aristotle’s Ethics)

Source B (The Declaration of Independence)

Source C (John Stuart Mill’s Utilitarianism)

Source D (Cartoon by Jim Sizemore)

Source E (Jessie H. O’Neill’s The Golden Ghetto: The Psychology of Affluence)

Source F (Lewis Lapham’s Money and Class in America) Source G (“Wealth” by Andrew Carnegie)

**Source A**

Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics

*Certainly the future is obscure to us, while happiness, we claim, is an end and something in every way final…. If so, we shall call happy those among living men in whom these conditions are, and are to be fulfilled.*

*Happiness is desirable in itself and never for the sake of something else. But honor, pleasure, reason, and every virtue we choose indeed for themselves, but we choose them also for the sake of happiness, judging that by means of them we shall be happy. Happiness, on the other hand, no one chooses for the sake of these, nor, in general, for anything other than itself. Happiness, then, is something final and self-sufficient.*

*He is happy who lives in accordance with complete virtue and is sufficiently equipped with external goods, not for some chance period but throughout a complete life.*

*To judge from the lives that men lead, most men seem to identify the good, or happiness, with pleasure: which is the reason why they love the life of enjoyment. The mass of mankind are evidently quite slavish in their tastes, preferring a life suitable to beasts.*

*With regard to what happiness is (men) differ, and the many do not give the same account as the wise. For the former think it is some plain and obvious thing, like pleasure, wealth, or honor. They differ, however, from one another—and often even the same man identifies it with different things, with health when he is ill, with wealth when he is poor.*

 **Source B**

*The Declaration of Independence*

From the opening paragraph of The Declaration of Independence.

*We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights: that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed …*

**Source C**

Utilitarianism, written by John Stuart Mill, an eighteenth-century British philosopher, in 1863. Available at <http://www.utilitarianism.com/mill2.htm>.

The following is an excerpt from Chapter 2 entitled “What Utilitarianism Is.”

*… The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure….*

*… no intelligent human being would consent to be a fool, no instructed person would be an ignoramus, no person of feeling and conscience would be selfish and base, even though they should be persuaded that the fool, the dunce, or the rascal is better satisfied with his lot than they are with theirs. They would not resign what they possess more than he for the most complete satisfaction of all desires which they have in common with him. If they ever fancy they would, it is only in cases of unhappiness so extreme, that to escape from it they would exchange their lot for almost any other, however undesirable in their own eyes. A being of higher faculties [humans] requires more to make him happy, is capable probably of more acute suffering, and certainly accessible to it at more points, than one of the inferior type [animals]: but in spite of these liabilities, he can never really wish to sink into what he feels to be a lower grade of existence…. Whoever supposes that this preference takes place at a sacrifice of happiness—that the superior being, in anything like equal circumstances, is not happier than the inferior—confounds two very different ideas, of happiness and content. It is indisputable that the being whose capacities of enjoyment are low, has the greatest chance of having them fully satisfied; and a highly endowed being will always feel that any happiness which he can look for, as the world is constituted, is imperfect. But he can learn to bear its imperfections, but only because he feels not at all the good which those imperfections qualify. It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than the fool satisfied. And if the fool, or the pig, are of different opinion, it is because they only know their own side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both sides.*

**Source D**

Cartoon by Jim Sizemore Available at http://www.cartoonstock.com/blowup.asp? imageref=jsi0087&artist=Sizemore,+Jim&topic=consumerism.

This cartoon appeared in a recent issue of The New Yorker.



**Source E**

O’Neill, Jesse H. The Golden Ghetto: The Psychology of Affluence, The Affluenza Project: Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1997.

The following is adapted from passages in Jesse H. O’Neill’s book and from the mission statement of The Affluenza Project founded by O’Neill. http://www.affluenza.com.

*The malaise that currently grips our country comes not from the fact that we don’t have enough wealth, but from a terrifying knowledge that has begun to enter our consciousness that we have based our entire lives, our entire culture and way of being on the belief that “just a little bit more” will finally buy happiness.*

 *Although many people in our culture are beginning to question the assumptions of the American Dream, we still live in a time of compulsive and wasteful consumerism.*

 *Statistics to consider:*

*• Per capita consumption in the United States has increased 45 percent in the past twenty years.*

*• During the same period, quality of life as measured by the index of social health has decreased by roughly the same percentage.*

*• The average working woman plays with her children forty minutes a week—and shops six hours.*

*• Ninety-three percent of teenage girls list shopping as their favorite pastime*

**Source F**

Lapham, Lewis. Money and Class in America: Notes and Observations on Our Civil Religion, Grove Press: New York, 1988. The following is a passage from Mr. Lapham’s text.

*I think it fair to say that the current ardor of the American faith in money easily surpasses the degrees of intensity achieved by other societies in other times and places. Money means so many things to us—spiritual as well as temporal—that we are at a loss to know how to hold its majesty at bay….*

 *Henry Adams in his autobiography remarks that although the Americans weren’t much good as materialists they had been “so deflected by the pursuit of money” that they could turn “in no other direction.” The natural distrust of the contemplative temperament arises less from the innate Philistinism than from a suspicion of anything that cannot be counted, stuffed, framed or mounted over the fireplace in the den. Men remain free to rise or fall in the world, and if they fail it must be because they willed it so. The visible signs of wealth testify to an inward state of grace, and without at least some of these talismans posted in one’s house or on one’s person an American loses all hope of demonstrating to himself the theorem of his happiness. Seeing is believing, and if an American success is to count for anything in the world it must be clothed in the raiment of property. As often as not it isn’t the money itself that means anything; it is the use of money as the currency of the soul.*

*Against the faith in money, other men in other times and places have raised up countervailing faiths in family, honor, religion, intellect and social class. The merchant princes of medieval Europe would have looked upon the American devotion as sterile stupidity; the ancient Greek would have regarded it as a form of insanity. Even now, in the last decades of a century commonly defined as American, a good many societies both in Europe and Asia manage to balance the desire for wealth against the other claims of the human spirit. An Englishman of modest means can remain more or less content with the distinction of an aristocratic name or the consolation of a flourishing garden; the Germans show to obscure university professors the deference accorded by Americans only to celebrity; the Soviets honor the holding of political power; in France a rich man is a rich man, to whom everybody grants the substantial powers that his riches command but to whom nobody grants the respect due to a member of the National Academy. But in the United States a rich man is perceived as being necessarily both good and wise, which is an absurdity that would be seen as such not only by a Frenchman but also by a Russian. Not that the Americans are greedier than the French, or less intellectual than the Germans, or more venal than the Russians, but to what other tribunal can an anxious and supposedly egalitarian people submit their definitions of the good, the true and the beautiful if not to the judgment of the bottom line?*

**Source G**

“Wealth” written by Andrew Carnegie,1 published in North American Review, CCCXCI, June 1889. Available at <http://facweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/carnegie.htm>.

The following is excerpted from the article by Andrew Carnegie.

*The problem of our age is the proper administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The Indians are today where civilized man then was. When visiting the Sioux, I was led to the wigwam of the chief. It was just like the others in external appearance, and even within the difference was trifling between it and those of the poorest of his braves. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us today measures the change which has come with civilization.*

*This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race, that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas. 2 The “good old times” were not good old times. Neither master nor servant was as well situated then as today. A relapse to old conditions would be disastrous to both—not the least so to him who serves—and would sweep away civilization with it. But whether the change be for good or ill, it is upon us, beyond our power to alter, and therefore to be accepted and made the best of. It is waste of time to criticize the inevitable.*

*1Late nineteenth-century American capitalist and philanthropist*

*2Patron of the arts in ancient Rome*