

# ADVANCED READING

## PASSAGE 1

In reaction to a rigid, overrefined classical curriculum, some educational philosophers have swung sharply to an espousal of "life experience" as the sole source of learning. Using their narrow interpretation of John Dewey's theories for support and spouting such phrases as "Teach the child, not the subject," they demand an end to rigorous study and insist that only through doing can learning take place. While not all adherents to this philosophy would totally eliminate the study of great books, the gradual subordination of literature in the school curriculum reflects their influence.

What is the purpose of literature? Why read if life alone is to be our teacher? James Joyce tells us that the artist reveals the human condition by re-creating life out of life; Aristotle, that art presents universal truths because its form is taken from nature. Thus, consciously or otherwise, great writers extend our understanding of ourselves and our world. We can soar with them to the heights of aspiration or plummet with them to the depths of despair. How much wider is the understanding we gain from reading than from viewing life through the keyhole of our individual experience.

This function of literature, the enlarging of our life sphere, is of major importance in itself. Additionally, however, literature suggests solutions to social problems. The overweening ambitions of political leaders—and their sneering contempt for the law—did not appear for the first time in the writings of Bernstein and Woodward. The problems and behavior of the guilt-ridden did not await the appearance of the bearded psychoanalysts of the nineteenth century.

Federal Judge Learned Hand wrote, "I venture to believe that it is as important to a judge called upon to pass on a question of constitutional law, to have at least a bowing acquaintance with Thucydides, Gibbon, and Carlyle, with Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton, with Montaigne and Rabelais, with Plato, Bacon, Hume, and Kant, as with the books which have been specifically written on the subject. For in such matters everything turns upon the spirit in which he approaches the questions before him."

How do we overcome our dissenter? We must start with the field of agreement: the belief that education should serve to improve the individual and society. We must persuade our dissenters that the voices of human experience stretch our human faculties and open us to learning. We must convince them of the unity of life and art. We must prove to them that far from being separate, literature is that part of life that illumines life.

## PASSAGE 2

Methods for typing blood were developed around the turn of the century, about the same time that fingerprints were first used for identification. Only in the last decade or two, however, have scientists begun to believe that genetic markers in blood and other bodily fluids may someday prove as useful in crime detection as fingerprints.

The standard ABO blood typing has long been used as a form of negative identification. Added sophistication came with the discovery of additional subgroups of genetic markers in blood and with the discovery that genetic markers are present not only in blood but also in other bodily fluids, such as perspiration and saliva.

These discoveries were of little use in crime detection, however, because of the circumstances in which police scientists must work. Rather than a plentiful sample of blood freshly drawn from a patient, the crime laboratory is likely to receive only a tiny fleck of dried blood of unknown age from an unknown "donor" on a shirt or a scrap of rag that has spent hours or days exposed to air, high temperature, and other contaminants.

British scientists found a method for identifying genetic markers more precisely in small samples. In this process, called electrophoresis, a sample is placed on a tray containing a gel through which an electrical current is then passed. A trained analyst reads the resulting patterns in the gel to determine the presence of various chemical markers.

Electrophoresis made it possible to identify several thousand subgroups of blood types rather than the twelve known before. However, the equipment and special training required were expensive. In addition, the process could lead to the destruction of evidence. For example, repeated tests of a blood-flecked shirt—one for each marker—led to increasing deterioration of the evidence and the cost of a week or more of laboratory time.

It remained for another British researcher, Brian Wrexall, to demonstrate that simultaneous analyses, using an inexpensive electrophoresis apparatus, could test for ten different genetic markers within a 24-hour period. This development made the study of blood and other fluid samples an even more valuable tool for crime detection.

### **PASSAGE 3**

The delegates to the Constitutional Convention were realists. They knew that the greatest battles would take place after the convention, once the Constitution had already been drafted and signed. The delegates had overstepped their bounds. Instead of amending the Articles of Confederation by which the American states had previously been governed, they had proposed an entirely new government. Under these circumstances, the convention was understandably reluctant to submit its work to the Congress for approval.

Instead, the delegates decided to pursue what amounted to a revolutionary course. They declared that ratification of the new Constitution by nine states would be sufficient to establish the new government. In other words, the Constitution was being submitted directly to the people. Not even the Congress, which had called the convention, would be asked to approve its work.

The leaders of the convention shrewdly wished to bypass the state legislatures, which were attached to states' rights and which required in most cases the agreement of two houses. For speedy ratification of the Constitution, the single-chambered, specially elected state ratifying conventions offered the greatest promise of agreement.

Battle lines were quickly drawn. The Federalists, as the supporters of the Constitution were called, had one solid advantage: they came with a concrete proposal. Their opponents, the Antifederalists, came with none. Since the Antifederalists were opposing something with nothing, their objections, though sincere, were basically negative. They stood for a policy of drift while the Federalists were providing clear leadership.

Furthermore, although the Antifederalists claimed to be the democratic group, their opposition to the Constitution did not necessarily spring from a more democratic view of government. Many of the Antifederalists were as distrustful of the common people as their opponents. In New York, for example, Governor George Clinton criticized the people for their fickleness and their tendency to "vibrate from one extreme to another." Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts, who refused to sign the Constitution, asserted that "the evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy," and John F. Mercer of Maryland professed little faith in his neighbours as voters when he said that "the people cannot know and judge the character of candidates."