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Part 1

Directions (1–24): Closely read each of the three passages below. After each passage, there are several multiple-choice questions. Select the best suggested answer to each question and record your answer on the separate answer sheet provided for you. You may use the margins to take notes as you read.

Reading Comprehension Passage A

A White Heron

In this excerpt from a short story, nine-year-old Sylvia has grown to appreciate nature while living with her grandmother in a forest in Maine.

The woods were already filled with shadows one June evening, just before eight o’clock, though a bright sunset still glimmered faintly among the trunks of the trees. A little girl was driving home her cow, a plodding, dilatory, provoking creature in her behavior, but a valued companion for all that. They were going away from whatever light there was, and striking deep into the woods, but their feet were familiar with the path, and it was no matter whether their eyes could see it or not. …

Suddenly this little woods-girl is horror-stricken to hear a clear whistle not very far away. Not a bird’s-whistle, which would have a sort of friendliness, but a boy’s whistle, determined, and somewhat aggressive. Sylvia left the cow to whatever sad fate might await her, and stepped discreetly aside into the brushes, but she was just too late. The enemy had discovered her, and called out in a very cheerful and persuasive tone, “Halloa, little girl, how far is it to the road?” and trembling Sylvia answered almost inaudibly, “A good ways.”…

“I have been hunting for some birds,” the stranger said kindly, “and I have lost my way, and need a friend very much. Don’t be afraid,” he added gallantly. “Speak up and tell me what your name is, and whether you think I can spend the night at your house, and go out gunning early in the morning.”

Sylvia was more alarmed than before. Would not her grandmother consider her much to blame? But who could have foreseen such an accident as this? It did not seem to be her fault, and she hung her head as if the stem of it were broken, but managed to answer “Sylvy,” with much effort when her companion again asked her name.

Mrs. Tilley was standing in the doorway when the trio came into view. The cow gave a loud moo by way of explanation. …

The young man stood his gun beside the door, and dropped a lumpy game-bag beside it; then he bade Mrs. Tilley good-evening, and repeated his wayfarer’s story, and asked if he could have a night’s lodging.

“Put me anywhere you like,” he said. “I must be off early in the morning, before day; but I am very hungry, indeed. You can give me some milk at any rate, that’s plain.”

“Dear sakes, yes,” responded the hostess, whose long slumbering hospitality seemed to be easily awakened. “You might fare better if you went out to the main road a mile or so, but you’re welcome to what we’ve got. I’ll milk right off, and you make yourself at home. You can sleep on husks or feathers,” she proffered1 graciously. “I raised them all myself. There’s good pasturing for geese just below here towards the ma’sh.”2 Now step round and

---

1. proffered — offered
2. ma’sh — marsh
set a plate for the gentleman, Sylvy!” And Sylvia promptly stepped. She was glad to have something to do, and she was hungry herself. …

Soon it would be berry-time, and Sylvia was a great help at picking. The cow was a good milker, though a plaguy\(^3\) thing to keep track of, the hostess gossiped frankly, adding presently that she had buried four children, so Sylvia’s mother, and a son (who might be dead) in California were all the children she had left. “Dan, my boy, was a great hand to go gunning,” she explained sadly. “I never wanted for pa’tridges or gray squer’ls while he was to home. He’s been a great wand’rer, I expect, and he’s no hand to write letters. There, I don’t blame him, I’d ha’ seen the world myself if it had been so I could.”

“Sylvy takes after him,” the grandmother continued affectionately, after a minute’s pause. “There ain’t a foot o’ ground she don’t know her way over, and the wild creatures counts her one o’ themselves. Squer’ls she’ll tame to come an’ feed right out o’ her hands, and all sorts o’ birds. Last winter she got the jaybirds to bangeing\(^4\) here, and I believe she’d a’ scanted herself of her own meals to have plenty to throw out amongst ’em, if I had n’t kep’ watch. Anything but crows, I tell her, I’m willin’ to help support—though Dan he had a tamed one o’ them that did seem to have reason same as folks. It was round here a good spell after he went away. Dan an’ his father they did n’t hitch,—but he never held up his head ag’in after Dan had dared him an’ gone off.”

The guest did not notice this hint of family sorrows in his eager interest in something else.

“So Sylvy knows all about birds, does she?” he exclaimed, as he looked round at the little girl who sat, very demure\(^5\) but increasingly sleepy, in the moonlight. “I am making a collection of birds myself. I have been at it ever since I was a boy.” (Mrs. Tilley smiled.) “There are two or three very rare ones I have been hunting for these five years. I mean to get them on my own ground if they can be found.”

“Do you cage ’em up?” asked Mrs. Tilley doubtfully, in response to this enthusiastic announcement.

“Oh no, they’re stuffed and preserved, dozens and dozens of them,” said the ornithologist,\(^6\) “and I have shot or snared every one myself. I caught a glimpse of a white heron a few miles from here on Saturday, and I have followed it in this direction. They have never been found in this district at all. The little white heron, it is,” and he turned again to look at Sylvia with the hope of discovering that the rare bird was one of her acquaintances.

But Sylvia was watching a hop-toad in the narrow footpath. …

Sylvia’s heart gave a wild beat; she knew that strange white bird, and had once stolen softly near where it stood in some bright green swamp grass, away over at the other side of the woods. There was an open place where the sunshine always seemed strangely yellow and hot, where tall, nodding rushes grew, and her grandmother had warned her that she might sink in the soft black mud underneath and never be heard of more. Not far beyond were the salt marshes just this side the sea itself, which Sylvia wondered and dreamed much about, but never had seen, whose great voice could sometimes be heard above the noise of the woods on stormy nights.

“I can’t think of anything I should like so much as to find that heron’s nest,” the handsome stranger was saying. “I would give ten dollars to anybody who could show it to

\(^3\) plaguy — bothersome

\(^4\) bangeing — loitering

\(^5\) demure — reserved

\(^6\) ornithologist — a person who studies birds
me,” he added desperately, “and I mean to spend my whole vacation hunting for it if need be. Perhaps it was only migrating, or had been chased out of its own region by some bird of prey.”

Mrs. Tilley gave amazed attention to all this, but Sylvia still watched the toad, not divining,7 as she might have done at some calmer time, that the creature wished to get to its hole under the door-step, and was much hindered by the unusual spectators at that hour of the evening. No amount of thought, that night, could decide how many wished-for treasures the ten dollars, so lightly spoken of, would buy. …

No, she must keep silence! What is it that suddenly forbids her and makes her dumb? Has she been nine years growing and now, when the great world for the first time puts out a hand to her, must she thrust it aside for a bird’s sake? The murmur of the pine’s green branches is in her ears, she remembers how the white heron came flying through the golden air and how they watched the sea and the morning together, and Sylvia cannot speak; she cannot tell the heron’s secret and give its life away. …

—Sarah Orne Jewett
excerpted from “A White Heron”

A White Heron and Other Stories, 1886
Houghton, Mifflin and Company

7divining — understanding
1 The word “dilatory” as used in line 3 most nearly means  
(1) competitive (3) dawdling  
(2) pleasing (4) intelligent  

2 The stranger’s statement “I have been hunting for some birds” (line 13) foreshadows Sylvia’s  
(1) emotional growth (3) act of betrayal  
(2) inner struggle (4) change of heart  

3 The statement “You can give me some milk at any rate, that’s plain” (line 27) suggests that the young man is  
(1) nervous (3) judgmental  
(2) assertive (4) careful  

4 The figurative language in lines 28 and 29 reveals that  
(1) lodging in the town was inconvenient  
(2) Mrs. Tilley and Sylvia were not fond of visitors  
(3) life on the farm was monotonous  
(4) Mrs. Tilley and Sylvia did not have guests often  

5 The grandmother characterizes Sylvia in lines 42 through 47 as having a  
(1) fear of loneliness  
(2) need for security  
(3) kinship with nature  
(4) disregard for authority  

6 The details in lines 51 and 52 show that the guest is  
(1) misunderstood by his hosts  
(2) amused by Mrs. Tilley’s stories  
(3) sensitive to Sylvia’s feelings  
(4) preoccupied with his own ideas  

7 Lines 58 through 61 serve to  
(1) provide the solution  
(2) highlight the setting  
(3) reinforce a deception  
(4) emphasize a conflict  

8 Lines 86 through 89 reveal a central idea by depicting Sylvia’s  
(1) certainty about her own beliefs  
(2) gratitude for her personal freedom  
(3) concern about her poor decisions  
(4) sense of her own helplessness  

9 Which statement best demonstrates a difference between the young man’s and Sylvia’s values?  
(1) “I have lost my way, and need a friend very much” (lines 13 and 14)  
(2) “I must be off early in the morning, before day” (line 26)  
(3) “I have followed it [the white heron] in this direction” (line 62)  
(4) “I would give ten dollars to anybody who could show it to me” (lines 75 and 76)
Reading Comprehension Passage B

Brand New Ancients

In the old days
the myths were the stories we used to explain ourselves.
But how can we explain the way we hate ourselves,
the things we’ve made ourselves into,
the way we break ourselves in two,
the way we overcomplicate ourselves?

But we are still mythical.
We are still permanently trapped somewhere between the
heroic and the pitiful.

We are still godly;
that’s what makes us so monstrous.
But it feels like we’ve forgotten we’re much more than the
sum of all
the things that belong to us.

The empty skies rise
over the benches where the old men sit—
they are desolate
and friendless
and the young men spit;
inside they’re delicate, but outside they’re reckless and

I reckon
that these are our heroes,
these are our legends.

That face on the street you walk past without looking at,
or that face on the street that walks past you without
looking back

or the man in the supermarket trying to keep his kids out of
his trolley,
or the woman by the postbox fighting with her brolly,
every single person has a purpose in them burning.

Look again, and allow yourself to see
them.

Millions of characters,
each with their own epic narratives
singing it’s hard to be an angel
until you’ve been a demon.

1trolley — grocery cart
2brolly — umbrella
The sky is so perfect it looks like a painting
but the air is so thick that we feel like we’re fainting.
Still
the myths in this city have always said the same thing—
about how all we need is a place to belong;
how all we need is to know what’s right from what’s wrong and
how we all need is to struggle to find out for ourselves
which side we are on.

We all need to love
and be loved
and keep going. …

—Kae Tempest
excerpted from Brand New Ancients, 2013
Bloomsbury

10 In the first stanza, the narrator refers to myths to explain humans’
(1) need to analyze themselves
(2) tendency to ignore their problems
(3) inclination to overindulge themselves
(4) desire to organize their lives

11 The statement “We are still godly;/that’s what makes us so monstrous” (lines 10 and 11) suggests
(1) human reluctance to learn from the past
(2) the contradictions within human nature
(3) human attachment to material possessions
(4) the limitations of human imagination

12 As used in line 30, the word “burning” most nearly means
(1) presenting a danger
(2) difficult to ignore
(3) necessary to control
(4) lasting a short time

13 Which lines best reflect a central idea of the poem?
(1) “how can we explain the way we hate ourselves” (line 3)
(2) “The empty skies rise/over the benches where the old men sit” (lines 15 and 16)
(3) “Millions of characters, each with their own epic narratives” (lines 32 and 33)
(4) “the air is so thick that we feel like we’re fainting” (line 37)

14 Throughout the poem, the narrator develops a central idea primarily through the use of
(1) understatement
(2) historical anecdotes
(3) contrasting images
(4) personification
Reading Comprehension Passage C

Inside Google’s Moonshot Factory

A snake-robot designer, a balloon scientist, a liquid-crystals technologist, an extradimensional physicist, a psychology geek, an electronic-materials wrangler, and a journalist walk into a room. The journalist turns to the assembled crowd and asks: Should we build houses on the ocean?

The setting is X, the so-called moonshot factory at Alphabet, the parent company of Google. And the scene is not the beginning of some elaborate joke. The people in this room have a particular talent: They dream up far-out answers to crucial problems. The dearth of housing in crowded and productive coastal cities is a crucial problem. Oceanic residences are, well, far-out. At the group’s invitation, I was proposing my own moonshot idea, despite deep fear that the group would mock it.

Like a think-tank panel with the instincts of an improv troupe, the group sprang into an interrogative frenzy. “What are the specific economic benefits of increasing housing supply?” the liquid-crystals guy asked. “Isn’t the real problem that transportation infrastructure is so expensive?” the balloon scientist said. “How sure are we that living in densely built cities makes us happier?” the extradimensional physicist wondered. Over the course of an hour, the conversation turned to the ergonomics of Tokyo’s high-speed trains and then to Americans’ cultural preference for suburbs. Members of the team discussed commonsense solutions to urban density, such as more money for transit, and eccentric ideas, such as acoustic technology to make apartments soundproof and self-driving housing units that could park on top of one another in a city center. At one point, teleportation enjoyed a brief hearing. …

These ideas might sound too random to contain a unifying principle. But they do. Each X idea adheres to a simple three-part formula. First, it must address a huge problem; second, it must propose a radical solution; third, it must employ a relatively feasible technology. In other words, any idea can be a moonshot—unless it’s frivolous, small-bore, or impossible.

The purpose of X is not to solve Google’s problems; thousands of people are already doing that. Nor is its mission philanthropic. Instead X exists, ultimately, to create world-changing companies that could eventually become the next Google. The enterprise considers more than 100 ideas each year, in areas ranging from clean energy to artificial intelligence. But only a tiny percentage become “projects,” with full-time staff working on them. It’s too soon to know whether many (or any) of these shots will reach the moon: X was formed in 2010, and its projects take years; critics note a shortage of revenue to date. But several projects—most notably Waymo, its self-driving-car company, recently valued at $70 billion by one Wall Street firm—look like they may. …

Creativity is an old practice but a new science. It was only in 1950 that J. P. Guilford, a renowned psychologist at the University of Southern California, introduced the discipline of creativity research in a major speech to the American Psychological Association. “I

---

1dearth — lack
2think-tank — a group of experts who study a problem
3improv troupe — a theatrical group that makes up their scenes in the moment
4small-bore — trivial
5philanthropic — charitable
discuss the subject of creativity with considerable hesitation,” he began, “for it represents an area in which psychologists generally, whether they be angels or not, have feared to tread.” It was an auspicious6 time to investigate the subject of human ingenuity, particularly on the West Coast. In the next decade, the apricot farmland south of San Francisco took its first big steps toward becoming Silicon Valley.7

Yet in the past 60 years, something strange has happened. As the academic study of creativity has bloomed, several key indicators of the country’s creative power have turned downward, some steeply. Entrepreneurship may have grown as a status symbol, but America’s start-up rate has been falling for decades. The label innovation may have spread like ragweed to cover every minuscule8 tweak of a soda can or a toothpaste flavor, but the rate of productivity growth has been mostly declining since the 1970s. Even Silicon Valley itself, an economic powerhouse, has come under fierce criticism for devoting its considerable talents to trivial problems, like making juice or hailing a freelancer to pick up your laundry.

Breakthrough technology results from two distinct activities that generally require different environments—invention and innovation. Invention is typically the work of scientists and researchers in laboratories, like the transistor,9 developed at Bell Laboratories in the 1940s. Innovation is an invention put to commercial use, like the transistor radio, sold by Texas Instruments in the 1950s. Seldom do the two activities occur successfully under the same roof. They tend to thrive in opposite conditions; while competition and consumer choice encourage innovation, invention has historically prospered in labs that are insulated from the pressure to generate profit.

The United States’ worst deficit today is not of incremental innovation but of breakthrough invention. Research-and-development spending has declined by two-thirds as a share of the federal budget since the 1960s. The great corporate research labs of the mid-20th century, such as Bell Labs and Xerox Palo Alto Research Center (PARC), have shrunk and reined in their ambitions. America’s withdrawal from moonshots started with the decline in federal investment in basic science. Allowing well-funded and diverse teams to try to solve big problems is what gave us the nuclear age, the transistor, the computer, and the internet. Today, the U.S. is neglecting to plant the seeds of this kind of ambitious research, while complaining about the harvest.

No one at X would claim that it is on the verge of unleashing the next platform technology, like electricity or the internet—an invention that could lift an entire economy. Nor is the company’s specialty the kind of basic science that typically thrives at research universities. But what X is attempting is nonetheless audacious.10 It is investing in both invention and innovation. Its founders hope to demystify and routinize the entire process of making a technological breakthrough—to nurture each moonshot, from question to idea to discovery to product—and, in so doing, to write an operator’s manual for radical creativity. …

“There is still a huge misconception today that big leaps in technology come from companies racing to make money, but they do not,” says Jon Gertner, the author of The Idea Factory, a history of Bell Labs. “Companies are really good at combining existing

---

6 auspicious — favorable
7 Silicon Valley — home to many start-up and global technology companies
8 minuscule — very small
9 transistor — a miniature electronic component
10 audacious — bold
breakthroughs in ways that consumers like. But the breakthroughs come from patient and curious scientists, not the rush to market.” In this regard, X’s methodical approach to invention, while it might invite sneering from judgmental critics and profit-hungry investors, is one of its most admirable qualities. Its pace and its patience are of another era. …

Insisting on quick products and profits is the modern attitude of innovation that X continues to quietly resist. For better and worse, it is imbued\(^{11}\) with an appreciation for the long gestation period of new technology.

Technology is a tall tree, John Fernald [an economist] told me. But planting the seeds of invention and harvesting the fruit of commercial innovation are entirely distinct skills, often mastered by different organizations and separated by many years. “I don’t think of X as a planter or a harvester, actually,” Fernald said. “I think of X as building taller ladders. They reach where others cannot.” Several weeks later, I repeated the line to several X employees. “That’s perfect,” they said. “That’s so perfect.” Nobody knows for sure what, if anything, the employees at X are going to find up on those ladders. But they’re reaching. At least someone is.

—Derek Thompson

excerpted and adapted from “Inside Google’s Moonshot Factory”

*The Atlantic*, November 2017

\(^{11}\)imbued — filled

15 The first paragraph reveals the group’s

(1) varied backgrounds  (3) social skills
(2) potential conflicts  (4) ethical differences

16 X is probably referred to as a “moonshot factory” (line 5) to emphasize the idea that

(1) men will one day return to the Moon
(2) people will look beyond Earth for shelter
(3) inventions require an international effort
(4) solutions require unconventional thinking

17 Each idea presented by the X panel (lines 22 through 26) must be

(1) within guidelines
(2) without complications
(3) politically acceptable
(4) consumer oriented

18 The function of lines 27 through 29 is to

(1) clarify the reason for Google developing X
(2) justify the number of Google employees
(3) highlight the influence of Google’s popularity
(4) explain the necessity of Google’s expansion

19 Based on information in lines 29 through 35, a perceived problem associated with X is its

(1) inability to sustain employee motivation
(2) failure to produce an immediate profit
(3) unwillingness to create new policies
(4) reluctance to accept criticism

20 The “study of creativity” (lines 44 through 49) has

(1) led to an increase in technology companies
(2) led to changes in academic priorities
(3) encouraged competition among researchers of creativity
(4) had minimal impact on the growth of creativity
21 The phrase “write an operator’s manual for radical creativity” (lines 76 and 77) reveals that X wants their company to
(1) create fundamental divisions within other companies
(2) gain wealth by publishing their books
(3) prevent others from stealing their ideas
(4) model an innovative process for other companies

22 Lines 81 through 84 contribute to a central idea that most innovations at X result from
(1) accidental discovery
(2) consumer demands
(3) systematic inquiry
(4) financial support

23 The figurative language in lines 91 and 92 emphasizes X’s
(1) ambitious goal
(2) economic value
(3) cooperative atmosphere
(4) technical capability

24 Which quotation reflects a central idea of the text?
(1) “But only a tiny percentage become ‘projects,’ with full-time staff working on them” (lines 31 and 32)
(2) “No one at X would claim that it is on the verge of unleashing the next platform technology, like electricity or the internet” (lines 70 and 71)
(3) “Companies are really good at combining existing breakthroughs in ways that consumers like” (lines 80 and 81)
(4) “Insisting on quick products and profits is the modern attitude of innovation that X continues to quietly resist” (lines 85 and 86)
Part 2

Argument

Directions: Closely read each of the four texts provided on pages 13 through 20 and write a source-based argument on the topic below. You may use the margins to take notes as you read and scrap paper to plan your response. Write your argument beginning on page 1 of your essay booklet.

Topic: Should U.S. Congressional lawmakers have term limits?

Your Task: Carefully read each of the four texts provided. Then, using evidence from at least three of the texts, write a well-developed argument regarding whether or not U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits. Clearly establish your claim, distinguish your claim from alternate or opposing claims, and use specific, relevant, and sufficient evidence from at least three of the texts to develop your argument. Do not simply summarize each text.

Guidelines:

Be sure to:
• Establish your claim regarding whether or not U.S. Congressional lawmakers should have term limits
• Distinguish your claim from alternate or opposing claims
• Use specific, relevant, and sufficient evidence from at least three of the texts to develop your argument
• Identify each source that you reference by text number and line number(s) or graphic (for example: Text 1, line 4 or Text 2, graphic)
• Organize your ideas in a cohesive and coherent manner
• Maintain a formal style of writing
• Follow the conventions of standard written English

Texts:
Text 1 – Why No Term Limits for Congress? The Constitution
Text 2 – Darrell Berkheimer: How Term Limits Would Improve Congress
Text 3 – Why Term Limits?
Text 4 – Five Reasons to Oppose Congressional Term Limits
Text 1

Why No Term Limits for Congress? The Constitution

Whenever Congress makes people really mad (which seems to be most of the time lately) the call goes up for our national lawmakers to face term limits. I mean the president is limited to two terms, so term limits for members of Congress seem reasonable. There’s just one thing in the way: the U.S. Constitution.

Historical Precedence for Term Limits

…At the federal level, the Articles of Confederation, adopted in 1781, set term limits for delegates to the Continental Congress – the equivalent of the modern Congress – mandating that “no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years in any term of six years.”

There have been [recent] congressional term limits. In fact, U.S. Senators and Representatives from 23 states faced term limits from 1990 to 1995, when the U.S. Supreme Court declared the practice unconstitutional with its decision in the case of U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton.

In a 5-4 majority opinion written by Justice John Paul Stevens [1995], the Supreme Court ruled that the states could not impose congressional term limits because the Constitution simply did not grant them the power to do so.

In his majority opinion, Justice Stevens noted that allowing the states to impose term limits would result in “a patchwork of state qualifications” for members of the U.S. Congress, a situation he suggested would be inconsistent with “the uniformity and national character that the framers sought to ensure.” In a concurring opinion, Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote that state-specific term limits would jeopardize the “relationship between the people of the Nation and their National Government.” …

So, the only way to impose term limits on Congress is to amend the Constitution, which is exactly what two current members of Congress are trying to do, according to About U.S. Politics expert Tom Murse. …

The Pros and Cons of Congressional Term Limits

Even political scientists remain divided on the question of term limits for Congress. Some argue that the legislative process would benefit from “fresh blood” and ideas, while others view the wisdom gained from long experience as essential to the continuity of government.

The Pros of Term Limits

Limits Corruption: The power and influence gained by being a member of Congress for a long period of time tempt lawmakers to base their votes and policies on their own self-interest, instead of those of the people. Term limits would help prevent corruption and reduce the influence of special interests.

Congress – It’s Not a Job: Being a member of Congress should not become the office-holder’s career. People who choose to serve in Congress should do so for noble reasons and a true desire to serve the people, not just to have a perpetual well-paying job.

---

1Congress — the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate

2Articles of Confederation — the original 1781 constitution, which was replaced by the U.S. Constitution in 1789

3concurring — agreeing

4continuity — stability

5special interests — groups or individuals seeking to influence government policy
Bring in Some Fresh Ideas: Any organization – even Congress – thrives when fresh new ideas are offered and encouraged. The same people holding the same seat for years leads to stagnation. Basically, if you always do what you’ve always done, you’ll always get what you’ve always got. New people are more likely to think outside the box.

Reduce Fundraising Pressure: Both lawmakers and voters dislike the role money plays in the democratic system. Constantly facing reelection, members of Congress feel pressured to devote more time to raising campaign funds than to serving the people. While imposing term limits might not have much of an effect on the overall amount of money in politics, it would at least limit the amount of time elected officials will have to donate to fundraising.

The Cons of Term Limits

It’s Undemocratic: Term limits would actually limit the right of the people to choose their elected representatives. As evidenced by the number of incumbent lawmakers reelected in every midterm election, many Americans truly like their representative and want them to serve for as long as possible. The mere fact that a person has already served should not deny the voters a chance to return them to office.

Experience is Valuable: The longer you do a job, the better you get at it. Lawmakers who have earned the trust of the people and proven themselves to be honest and effective leaders should not have their service cut short by term limits. New members of Congress face a steep learning curve. Term limits would reduce the chances of new members growing into the job and becoming better at it.

Throwing Out the Baby With the Bathwater: Yes, term limits would help eliminate some of the corrupt, power-hungry and incompetent lawmakers, but it would also get rid of all the honest and effective ones.

Getting to Know Each Other: One of the keys to being a successful legislator is working well with fellow members. Trusts and friendships among members across party lines are essential to progress on controversial legislation. Such politically bipartisan friendships take time to develop. Term limits would reduce the chances for legislators to get to know each other and use those relationships to the advantage of both parties and, of course, the people.

—Robert Longley

excerpted and adapted from “Why No Term Limits for Congress? The Constitution”

www.thoughtco.com, July 3, 2017

---

6 stagnation — lack of progression

7 incumbent — currently in office
Darrell Berkheimer: How Term Limits Would Improve Congress

The ancient Greek and Roman democracies provided us with many lessons to learn — and sometimes re-learn. One we definitely failed to learn is the importance of governmental term limits, and for the very reason the Greeks and Romans enacted term limits: to control corruption. …

Many of our U.S. founders were educated in the classics and were familiar with the Greek and Roman practice of office rotation to limit corruption. Colonial debates reveal a desire to profit from the example of the ancient democracies, and several colonies experimented with term limits.

Both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson announced their favor of term limits. And a limit of three years for serving in Continental Congress was established by the Articles of Confederation, adopted in 1781. But term limits were omitted when the Constitution was adopted in 1789.

As the states were ratifying\(^1\) the Constitution (1787–88), several leading statesmen regarded the lack of mandatory limits to tenure\(^2\) as a dangerous defect, especially for the presidency and the Senate. Richard Henry Lee of Virginia viewed the absence of legal limits to tenure as “most highly and dangerously oligarchic.”\(^3\)

Concern about the development of professional politicians serving unlimited terms did not become an issue until the 20\(^{th}\) century — because rotation in office was a popular 19\(^{th}\)-century concept. Both citizens and office holders viewed rotating out of office as the normal thing to do after a couple terms.

That practice and attitude did not begin to decline until after the Civil War. The subsequent adoption of the primary system and civil service reforms also ushered in the idea of professionalism in office. By the turn of the 20\(^{th}\) century, continuing incumbency was accepted.

But now we can point to the extreme as the latest figures show we have had 110 Congress members who served 36 or more years. And seven served for more than 50 years (one for 59 years) before they either died or retired. …

In addition, statistics from the past 30 years show that incumbents in both the U.S. House and Senate have been re-elected 80 and 90 percent of the time.

Such little turnover and lengthy service raises the question: To get re-elected, are incumbents serving their home state and political party to the detriment of the needs of our nation? …

Enactment of term limits will destroy the current seniority system and force an infusion of fresh, and perhaps more conscientious, representatives into our Congress. …

\(^1\)ratifying — officially approve  
\(^2\)tenure — period in office  
\(^3\)oligarchic — characteristic of a government run by a few persons
We need to remind them that we elect them to Congress to vote for the benefit of the entire nation — not just the corporations and pressure groups that finance their election campaigns — and not only the constituents\(^4\) in their home state. …

—Darrell Berkheimer

excerpted from “Darrell Berkheimer: How Term Limits Would Improve Congress”

www.theunion.com, September 15, 2017

\(^4\) constituents — voters
Text 3

Why Term Limits?

Early in the 1990s a grassroots movement to limit the terms of elected officials in various public offices blossomed nationwide. Term-limit ballot initiatives passed in 19 states, usually by landslide margins. The U.S. Supreme Court threw out all state-imposed term limits on federal positions in 1995, but those for state and local offices were affirmed.

The Citizen-Legislator

...It was Benjamin Franklin who summed up the best case for term limits more than two centuries ago: “In free governments, the rulers are the servants, and the people their superiors....For the former to return among the latter does not degrade, but promote them.”

In other words, when politicians know they must return to ordinary society and live under the laws passed while they were in government, at least some of them will think more carefully about the long-term effects of the programs they support. Their end-all will not be re-election, because that option will not be available. ...

Opponents charge that limits are inherently antidemocratic, that people should be free to elect to office whomever they want and that voters inherently have the power to limit terms simply by voting incumbents out. But judging by the huge support that term limits have usually won at the ballot box—and still enjoy in most local polls—large numbers of citizens feel that a political system without limits is a stacked deck. Any system that allows incumbents to amass so much power and attention in office that challengers can rarely win is surely in need of a corrective.

Anti-Term-Limit Arguments

Term-limit advocates properly point out that we already fix all sorts of restrictions on who can and cannot hold office, no matter how popular they may be—from age and residency requirements to two four-year terms for the president. Indeed, it isn’t widely understood that term limits is an old concept. With regard to municipal offices, it dates back at least to 1851, when the Indiana state constitution imposed them for almost every elected county office. ...

Without long-term legislators, according to another anti-term-limit argument, “inexperienced” legislators won’t be able to control the permanent bureaucracy. That’s a red herring. Legislators ultimately control the purse and the power to control the bureaucrats any time they want to, and we must not overlook the unholy alliances built up between bureaucracies and long-term legislators. Surely, the “experience” of living as a private citizen under the rules and taxes one voted for as a legislator is just as valuable and instructive, if not more so, than the experience of cooking up those rules and taxes in the first place.

Term limits have been approved almost everywhere they’ve been on the ballot because concerned citizens see them as a positive structural reform, a necessary step to change the incentives of legislators so they would think more about the good of their states and country and less about their next campaign. Those citizens want to ensure a regular supply of fresh

---

1 grassroots — the basic local level of political activity
2 inherently — in essence
3 stacked deck — unfair advantage
4 red herring — something intended to mislead
blood and new ideas in legislative bodies. They want to open the system to more people from a variety of professions. They want to make public officials less responsive to organized, well-heeled lobbies⁵ and more interested in serving the welfare of society at large. …

—Lawrence W. Reed
excerpted from “Why Term Limits?”
https://fee.org, May 1, 2001

⁵well-heeled lobbies — wealthy groups or individuals seeking to influence government policy
Five Reasons to Oppose Congressional Term Limits

Congressional term limits have long been argued to be an easy mechanism for improving the effectiveness of Congress and government at large. More specifically, advocates suggest term limits would allow members to spend less time dialing for dollars and more time on policymaking, allow them to make unpopular but necessary decisions without fear of retaliation at the ballot box, and avoid the corruptive influence of special interests that many assume is an inevitable result of spending too much time in Washington, D.C. …

Much of the term-limit reasoning makes sense. However, it ignores the very real downsides that would result. Despite widespread support, instituting term limits would have numerous negative consequences for Congress.

Limiting the number of terms members can serve would:

1. **Take power away from voters:** Perhaps the most obvious consequence of establishing congressional term limits is that it would severely curtail the choices of voters. A fundamental principle in our system of government is that voters get to choose their representatives. Voter choices are restricted when a candidate is barred from being on the ballot.

2. **Severely decrease congressional capacity:** Policymaking is a profession in and of itself. Our system tasks lawmakers with creating solutions to pressing societal problems, often with no simple answers and huge likelihoods for unintended consequences. Crafting legislative proposals is a learned skill; as in other professions, experience matters. In fact, as expert analysis has shown with the recently passed Senate tax bill, policy crafted by even the most experienced of lawmakers is likely to have ambiguous provisions and loopholes that undermine the intended effects of the legislation. The public is not best served if inexperienced members are making policy choices with widespread, lasting effects.

   Being on the job allows members an opportunity to learn and navigate the labyrinth of rules, precedents and procedures unique to each chamber. Term limits would result in large swaths of lawmakers forfeiting their hard-earned experience while simultaneously requiring that freshman members make up for the training and legislative acumen that was just forced out of the door.

   Plus, even with term limits, freshman members would still likely defer to more experienced lawmakers—even those with just one or two terms of service—who are further along the congressional learning curve or who have amassed some level of institutional clout. Much as we see today, this deference would effectively consolidate power in members that have experience in the art of making laws. In other words, a new, though less-experienced, Washington “establishment” would still wield a disproportionate degree of power over policymaking. …

---

1. **curtail** — limit
2. **ambiguous** — unclear
3. **labyrinth** — a puzzle
4. **precedents** — accepted or established practices
5. **acumen** — insight or good judgment
6. **deference** — respect
3. **Limit incentives for gaining policy expertise:** Members who know their time in Congress is limited will face less pressure to develop expertise on specific issues simply because, in most cases, the knowledge accrued won’t be nearly as valuable in a few short years. 

   Thus, term limits would impose a tremendous brain drain on the institution. Fewer experienced policymakers in Congress results in increased influence of special interests that are ready and willing to fill the issue-specific information voids. Additionally, a decrease in the number of seasoned lawmakers would result in greater deference to the executive branch and its agencies that administer the laws on a daily basis, given their greater expertise and longer tenure.

4. **Automatically kick out effective lawmakers:** No matter how knowledgeable or effective a member may be in the arduous tasks of writing and advancing legislation, term limits would ensure that his or her talents will run up against a strict time horizon. In what other profession do we force the best employees into retirement with no consideration as to their abilities or effectiveness on the job? Doesn’t it make more sense to capitalize on their skills, talents and experience, rather than forcing them to the sidelines where they will do their constituents, the public and the institution far less good? Kicking out popular and competent lawmakers simply because their time runs out ultimately results in a bad return on the investment of time spent learning and mastering the ins and outs of policymaking in Congress.

5. **Do little to minimize corruptive behavior or slow the revolving door:** Because term limits have never existed on the federal level, political scientists have studied states’ and foreign governments’ experiences with term limits to project what effects the measure would have on Congress. These studies regularly find that many of the corruptive, ‘swampy,’ influences advocates contend would be curtailed by instituting term limits are, in fact, exacerbated by their implementation. 

   On the surface, the case for term limits is strong given their potential to curtail the forces of corruption that so many assume dictate the ways of Washington. But, precisely because the creation of successful public policies by even the most experienced of officials is so difficult and uncertain, we should not mandate that our most effective and seasoned lawmakers be forced out of the institution. Instead, as constituents, we should rely on the most effective mechanism available to remove unresponsive, ineffectual members of Congress: elections.

   —Casey Burgat

   excerpted from “Five Reasons to Oppose Congressional Term Limits”

   [www.brookings.edu](http://www.brookings.edu), January 18, 2018

---

7 accrued — accumulated
8 seasoned — experienced
9 effectual — effective
10 arduous — difficult
11 exacerbated — worsened
Part 3

Text-Analysis Response

Your Task: Closely read the text provided on pages 22 and 23 and write a well-developed, text-based response of two to three paragraphs. In your response, identify a central idea in the text and analyze how the author’s use of one writing strategy (literary element or literary technique or rhetorical device) develops this central idea. Use strong and thorough evidence from the text to support your analysis. Do not simply summarize the text. You may use the margins to take notes as you read and scrap paper to plan your response. Write your response in the spaces provided on pages 7 through 9 of your essay booklet.

Guidelines:

Be sure to:
• Identify a central idea in the text
• Analyze how the author’s use of one writing strategy (literary element or literary technique or rhetorical device) develops this central idea. Examples include: characterization, conflict, denotation/connotation, metaphor, simile, irony, language use, point-of-view, setting, structure, symbolism, theme, tone, etc.
• Use strong and thorough evidence from the text to support your analysis
• Organize your ideas in a cohesive and coherent manner
• Maintain a formal style of writing
• Follow the conventions of standard written English
Blue Winds Dancing

In the following excerpt, an American Indian college student leaves school to return to his home on a Chippewa Reservation in the early 1900s.

There is a moon out tonight. Moon and stars and clouds tipped with moonlight. And there is a fall wind blowing in my heart. Ever since this evening, when against a fading sky I saw geese wedge southward. They were going home . . . . Now I try to study, but against the pages I see them again, driving southward. Going home.

Across the valley there are heavy mountains holding up the night sky, and beyond the mountains there is home. Home, and peace, and the beat of drums, and blue winds dancing over snow fields. The Indian lodge will fill with my people, and our gods will come and sit among them. I should be there then. I should be at home.

But home is beyond the mountains, and I am here. Here where fall hides in the valleys, and winter never comes down from the mountains. Here where all the trees grow in rows; the palms stand stiffly by the roadsides, and in the groves the orange trees line in military rows, and endlessly bear fruit. Beautiful, yes; there is always beauty in order, in rows of growing things! But it is the beauty of captivity. A pine fighting for existence on a windy knoll\(^1\) is much more beautiful. …

That land which is my home! Beautiful, calm—where there is no hurry to get anywhere, no driving to keep up in a race that knows no ending and no goal. No classes where men talk and talk, and then stop now and then to hear their own words come back to them from the students. No constant peering into the maelstrom\(^2\) of one’s mind; no worries about grades and honors; no hysterical preparing for life until that life is half over; no anxiety about one’s place in the thing they call Society.

I hear again the ring of axes in deep woods, the crunch of snow beneath my feet. I feel again the smooth velvet of ghost-birch bark. I hear the rhythm of the drums. … I am tired. I am weary of trying to keep up this bluff of being civilized. Being civilized means trying to do everything you don’t want to, never doing anything you want to. It means dancing to the strings of custom and tradition; it means living in houses and never knowing or caring who is next door. These civilized white men want us to be like them—always dissatisfied, getting a hill and wanting a mountain. …

I am tired. I want to walk again among the ghost-birches. I want to see the leaves turn in autumn, the smoke rise from the lodgehouses, and to feel the blue winds. I want to hear the drums; I want to hear the drums and feel the blue whispering winds.

There is a train wailing into the night. The trains go across the mountains. It would be easy to catch a freight. They will say he has gone back to the blanket; I don’t care. The dance at Christmas. …

I find a fellow headed for Albuquerque, and talk road-talk with him. “It is hard to ride fruit cars. Bums break in. Better to wait for a cattle car going back to the Middle West, and ride that.” We catch the next east-bound [train] and walk the tops until we find a cattle car. Inside, we crouch near the forward wall, huddle, and try to sleep. I feel peaceful and content at last. I am going home. The cattle car rocks. I sleep.

---

\(^1\)knoll — small hill
\(^2\)maelstrom — turmoil
Morning and the desert. Noon and the Salton Sea [California], lying more lifeless than a mirage under a somber sun in a pale sky. Skeleton mountains rearing on the skyline, thrusting out of the desert floor, all rock and shadow and edges. Desert. Good country for an Indian reservation. …

Phoenix. Pima country. Mountains that look like cardboard sets on a forgotten stage. Tucson. Papago country. Giant cacti that look like petrified hitchhikers along the highways. Apache country. At El Paso my road-buddy decides to go on to Houston. I leave him, and head north to the mesa country. Las Cruces and the terrible Organ Mountains, jagged peaks that instill fear and wondering. Albuquerque. Pueblos along the Rio Grande. On the boardwalk there are some Indian women in colored sashes selling bits of pottery. The stone age offering its art to the twentieth century. They hold up a piece and fix the tourists with black eyes until, embarrassed, he buys or turns away. I feel suddenly angry that my people should have to do such things for a living. …

Northward again. Minnesota, and great white fields of snow; frozen lakes, and dawn running into dusk without noon. Long forests wearing white. Bitter cold, and one night the northern lights. I am nearing home.

I reach Woodruff at midnight. Suddenly I am afraid, now that I am but twenty miles from home. Afraid of what my father will say, afraid of being looked on as a stranger by my own people. I sit by a fire and think about myself and all other young Indians. We just don’t seem to fit anywhere—certainly not among the whites, and not among the older people. I think again about the learned sociology professor and his professing. So many things seem to be clear now that I am away from school and do not have to worry about some man’s opinion of my ideas. It is easy to think while looking at dancing flames.

Morning. I spend the day cleaning up, and buying some presents for my family with what is left of my money. Nothing much, but a gift is a gift, if a man buys it with his last quarter. I wait until evening, then start up the track toward home. …

Just as a light snow begins to fall I cross the reservation boundary; somehow it seems as though I have stepped into another world. Deep woods in a white-and-black winter night. A faint trail leading to the village.

The railroad on which I stand comes from a city sprawled by a lake—a city with a million people who walk around without seeing one another; a city sucking the life from all the country around; a city with stores and police and intellectuals and criminals and movies and apartment houses; a city with its politics and libraries and zoos.

Laughing, I go into the woods. As I cross a frozen lake I begin to hear the drums. Soft in the night the drums beat. It is like the pulse beat of the world. The white line of the lake ends at a black forest, and above the trees the blue winds are dancing. …

—Tom Whitecloud
excerpted and adapted from “Blue Winds Dancing”
Scribner’s Magazine, February 1938