

ENGLISH EXPRESSION*Time allowed: Three hours**Answer THREE questions*

1. Drawing upon your reading as well as your own experience, write an essay of about 400-500 words on one of the topics set out below.

- (a) Do you expect that any of the books you have read this year will influence your life and work?
 - (b) Do we find greater satisfaction in fulfilling our own lives, or in living for causes outside ourselves?
 - (c) Dedication can be found as easily among ordinary people in everyday occupations as among the world-shakers.
 - (d) The world is rightly unkind to people who oppose or disturb existing standards of thought or behaviour.
 - (e) A dedicated person is not necessarily a good person.
- [45 marks]

2. Read the following passage; then evaluate the validity of the arguments by answering the questions set out below it:

1. It is not surprising that contradictory claims should be supported by hopelessly incoherent arguments. Just look at what is said by those who are responsible for the industrial disruption that is damaging Australia's prosperity today.

2. When there is poverty and unemployment, unionists assert the right to work. Now, with full employment and comparative affluence, they claim the opposite—the right to strike. We may answer first, that these so-called 'rights' are in fact no more than political slogans without legal force; and second, that the claim to a 'right to strike' is one that must in the long run defeat itself, and may fairly be called illogical. In countries where the workers' militant leaders have actually come to power, the workers themselves are no longer free even to choose their jobs, let alone to strike. In Russia and China there are severe penalties for even proposing strikes.

3. In a free society like Australia, anyone who is dissatisfied with his job can leave it and offer his services elsewhere. In good times, there is a demand for good workers; and competition among employers, who value such workers, will inevitably increase the reward for energy and competence: higher wages and better conditions. Then, nobody will have any reason or inclination to strike. In hard times, with unemployment and distress, competition among workers, who value security, will similarly diminish the likelihood of strikes.

4. Our employers compete for good workers, and workers compete for good jobs. It is true that they do so under the general supervision of an Arbitration Court, but everything really depends on the informal voluntary arrangements made between employers and employees in the interests of both parties. This system benefits both parties as well as the public; it gives the greatest measure of freedom that is consistent with the maintenance of social order.

5. Whenever strikes occur, there is industrial anarchy and social strife; and it logically follows that, if no strikes occur, there will be industrial order and social peace.

6. Consequently, employers are entitled to urge the enforcement of laws to restrain those whose unreasonable demands conflict with the interests of society as a whole. They argue, correctly, that the right to strike gives workers a one-way licence to break their legal obligations, and that this should be penalized. A law that carries no penalty for breaking it would be as absurd as the notice: 'Smoking Prohibited (but no penalty if you do)'.

7. As well as disrupting industry, strikes harm the very people who expect to benefit from them. Conveniently forgetting the alleged 'right to work', strikers spread unemployment far beyond the area of the original dispute: the striking transport workers put the wharf labourers out of work. Their own families and their fellow workers in other industries suffer more damage than the opponent the strikers most want to hurt: 'the boss'. It's a dog-fight in which the bystanders—the innocent, long-suffering public—are mostly severely bitten.

8. A policy or a course of action that is defended by defective arguments cannot fail to be wrong. Strikes, therefore, are never justified.

- (a) What way of preventing industrial disorder does the writer recommend?
- (b) Do you think the claims by unionists that the writer outlines in paragraph (2) are as illogical or as contradictory as he asserts?
- (c) Comment on the argument advanced in paragraph (4) in relation to that advanced in paragraph (6).
- (d) Comment on the arguments advanced in paragraph (5) and in paragraph (8).
- (e) Comment on any other arguments in the passage if you wish to. (There is no need to say anything more if you think that your previous answers have covered the important points.) —[30 marks]

3. (1) Read the following passage carefully and then answer the questions which follow.

'The way to get along,' I was told when I entered Congress, 'is to go along.'

Going along means more than just good fellowship—it includes the use of compromise, the sense of things possible. We should not be too hasty in condemning all compromise as bad morals. For politics and legislation are not matters for inflexible principles or unattainable ideals. Politics, as John Morley has acutely observed, 'is a field where action is one long second best, and where the choice constantly lies between two blunders'; and legislation, under the democratic way of life and the Federal system of Government, requires compromise between the desires of each individual and group and those around them. Henry Clay, who should have known, said compromise was the cement that held the Union together:

"All legislation . . . is founded upon the principle of mutual concession . . . Let him who elevates himself above humanity, above its weaknesses, its infirmities, its wants, its necessities, say, if he pleases, 'I never will compromise'; but let no one who is not above the frailties of our common nature disdain compromise."

It is compromise that prevents each set of reformers—the wets and the drys, the one-worlders and the isolationists, the vivisectionists and the anti-vivisectionists—from crushing the group on the extreme opposite end of the political spectrum. The fanatics and extremists and even those conscientiously devoted to hard and fast principles are always disappointed at the failure of their Government to rush to implement all of their principles and to denounce those of their opponents. But the legislator has some responsibility to conciliate those opposing forces within his state and party and to represent them in the larger clash of interests on the national level; and he alone knows that there are few if any issues where all the truth and all the right and all the angels are on one side.

Some of my colleagues who are criticized today for lack of forthright principles—or who are looked upon with scornful eyes as compromising 'politicians'—are simply engaged in the fine art of conciliating, balancing and interpreting the forces and factions of public opinion, an art essential to keeping our nation united and enabling our Government to function. Their consciences may direct them from time to time to take a more rigid stand for principle—but their intellects tell them that a fair or poor bill is better than no bill at all, and that only through the give-and-take of compromise will any bill receive the successive approval of the Senate, the House, the President and the nation.

But the question is how we will compromise and with whom. For it is easy to seize upon unnecessary concessions, not as means of legitimately resolving conflicts but as methods of 'going along'.

JOHN F. KENNEDY, *Profiles in Courage*.

(The answers to A, B, C, and D should be brief; one or two sentences should be enough for each.)

- A. What do you think was meant by the advice given to Kennedy when he entered Congress?
- B. What similarity does Kennedy find between "fanatics and extremists" and "those conscientiously devoted to hard and fast principles"?
- C. What distinction is suggested between "compromising 'politicians'" (line 42) and conciliators?

Matriculation

STATE LIB

7 AUG

OF VICT