

Scoring Guide for 2002 AP English Language and Composition Exam, Question 3

***General Directions:** This scoring guide will be useful for most of the essays that you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific essay, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Your score should reflect your judgment of the essay's quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 40 minutes to read and write. Therefore, the essay is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards that are appropriate for out-of-class writing assignments. Instead, evaluate the essay as a draft, making certain that you reward students for what they do well. All essays, even those scored 8 and 9, may contain occasional flaws in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. These lapses should enter into your holistic evaluation of an essay's overall quality. In no case should you score an essay with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.*

9. Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for 8 papers and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their argument or demonstrate particularly impressive control of language.

8. Essays earning a score of 8 successfully establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim. Their arguments contain appropriate evidence and are well developed and cogent. The writing is effective but not flawless.

7. Essays earning a score of 7 fit the description of 6 essays but are distinguished by more complete or purposeful argumentation or by a more mature prose style.

6. Essays earning a score of 6 adequately establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim. Their arguments are generally sound and provide sufficient evidence, but they are less developed or less cogent than essays earning higher scores. The writing is generally clear but may contain lapses in diction or syntax.

5. Essays earning a score of 5 establish and support their position in relation to Kundera's claim, but their arguments may be inconsistent or unevenly developed. The writing usually conveys the writer's ideas but may contain lapses in diction or syntax.

4. Essays earning a score of 4 respond to the prompt inadequately. They may have difficulty establishing a position in relation to Kundera's claim, may use unconvincing evidence, or maybe insufficiently developed. The writing generally conveys the writer's ideas but may suggest immature control.

3. Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for the score of 4 but are less successful in developing their position or less consistent in their control of language.

2. Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in developing their position in relation to Kundera's claim. These essays may fail to present an argument, respond with unrelated ideas or inappropriate evidence, or substitute a simpler task such as summary. They may seriously misread the passage or make unsubstantiated claims. The writing often demonstrates consistent weaknesses.

1. Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for the score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their argument, or weak in their control of language.

0 Indicates an on-topic response that receives no credit, such as one that merely repeats the prompt. Indicates a blank response or one that is completely off topic.

A Useful Guide to Holistic Scoring

1. Read quickly for an impression of the whole paper and score immediately; do reread or analyze.
2. Read the entire paper; the writing sometimes improves dramatically as the writer continues, and it sometimes falls apart after the opening paragraph.
3. Read supportively; try to reward what is done well, rather than search for small errors or omissions.
4. Take everything in the paper into account: content, organization, diction, sentence structure, spelling—everything.
5. Do not judge a paper for its length; some short papers are good, and some long papers are poor.
7. Remember that the use of a literary example does not make a paper inherently better than a paper that uses examples from personal experience, history, or science.
8. Use the full scale; in the papers to be scored, there will be "1" and "9" papers.
9. Remember that each score category represents a range (a high "3": a solid "3," and a low "3," for example). There are many rooms in the house of "3."
10. Remember that each paper is essentially a first draft written under stressful test conditions in a limited amount of time.
11. Remember that an unfinished (but developed) paper should not be severely penalized for lacking a conclusion.
12. Remember that the "9" paper need not be a polished or perfect essay.
13. Remember that any paper that addresses the topic is considered on topic and should be scored. A paper should not be penalized for a tangential/unusual approach to the topic. It should be scored on its own merits and on the logic of its argument developed in response to the topic as the writer interprets it.
14. Remember that the standards are set by consensus and that individual Readers are expected to accept and follow those standards, leaving their individual or local scoring standards outside the reading room door.

**2002 AP® ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION
FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS**

Question 3

(Suggested time—40 minutes. This question counts one-third of the total essay section score.)

*Carefully read the following passage from *Testaments Betrayed*, by the Czech writer Milan Kundera. Then write an essay in which you support, qualify, or dispute Kundera's claim. Support your argument with appropriate evidence.*

I wrote about this in *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*: Jan Prochazka, an important figure of the Prague Spring, came under heavy surveillance after the Russian invasion of 1968. At the time, he saw a good deal of another great opposition figure, Professor Vaclav Cemy, with whom he liked to drink and talk. All their conversations were secretly recorded, and I suspect the two friends knew it and didn't give a damn. But one day in 1970 or 1971, with the intent to discredit Prochazka, the police began to broadcast these conversations as a radio serial. For the police it was an audacious, unprecedented act. And, surprisingly: it nearly succeeded; instantly Prochazka was discredited: because in private, a person says all sorts of things, slurs friends, uses coarse language, acts silly, tells dirty jokes, repeats himself, makes a companion laugh by shocking him with outrageous talk, floats heretical ideas he'd never admit in public, and so forth. Of course, we all act like Prochazka, in private we bad-mouth our friends and use coarse language; that we act different in private than in public is everyone's most conspicuous experience, it is the very ground of the life of the individual; curiously, this obvious fact remains unconscious, unacknowledged, forever obscured by lyrical dreams of the transparent glass house, it is rarely understood to be the value one must defend beyond all others. Thus only gradually did people realize (though their rage was all the greater) that the real scandal was not Prochazka's daring talk but the rape of his life; they realized (as if by electric shock) that private and public are two essentially different worlds and that respect for that difference is the indispensable condition, the sine qua non, for a man to live free; that the curtain separating these two worlds is not to be tampered with, and that curtain-rippers are criminals. (1995)

OO

The division between the private and public life & the individual is an important barrier that should not be tampered with. As Milan Kundera asserts “private and public life are two essentially different worlds and that difference is the indispensable condition...for a man to live free”. The consequences of personal life being brought under the scrutiny of the public eye or even the consideration of personal matters in public decisions can be costly for everybody, not necessarily just the individuals involved.

An excellent example of private lives that should not have been considered related to public life is that of former Presidents Clinton, Kennedy and Roosevelt. Although all three of these Presidents are considered to have done an exceptional job while in office (their public life) all three of these presidents also indulged in extra-marital relationships. Another example is Martin Luther King, who indulged himself privately as well. If these four great leaders had all been judged purely on a personal, private level, each one could be made out to be quite a bad person, however history had recorded them as being the most influential (in a good way) men of their times.

The difference between personal and public life can also be seen in the example of something simple --- names. When in the classroom, a student is required to maintain formally to a certain extent by referring to a teacher as Mr. & Mrs. This is the public life of the teacher. However, if a student were to become good friends with the teacher’s child, than Mr. or Mrs. So and so might ask that the student refer to them on a first name basis when coming over their house. This would be totally appropriate however once back in the classroom it would not be.

The consequences of tearing the “curtain” down between the private and professional or public life of a person can be very harmful to all those involved. This could be seen as the exposure of Clinton to the public brought about a lengthy impeachment trial that halted any important legislation that needed to be passed, just as calling a teacher by a first name in a classroom would be totally inappropriate. This goes to show that Milan Kundera was accurate in his analysis of Jan Prochazka’s exposure. The private life of a person should remain private.

MMM

People use masks to hide what they are going through privately. When one is in public, manners are evident and one tries to impress others. When one lets someone into their private world, it is different. The person can relax and be themselves and don’t feel that they have any obligation to impress another. I agree with Kundera’s claim that the private and public worlds are very different and one should not try to reveal both in another’s person’s life.

People make mistakes. It is that simple. When a person does something privately it shouldn’t be a public issue. One example of this happened very recently with our former president Clinton and his intern. They had a private sexual relationship. The media found out and made something that was supposed to be private into public knowledge. The media didn’t have to know about his mistake. It destroyed his credibility, just like it did to Prochazka. Now instead of being known as a president who did wonders for the United States, he will be remembered as the president who had a scandalous affair with someone.

That was his private business and the media should not have brought this out into the open. In private we may talk about people but since it is private we expect people not to know. Private life should stay private .

Everybody has made mistakes and have private things in their closet. No one should know that the private things are skeletons. One doesn't even have the right to reveal another's private issues even if they reveal theirs. The only person allowed to reveal personal info is the person himself. One needs to keep those two worlds separated.

I

Milan Kundera claims that we all act like Prochazka. He says "in private we bad-mouth our friends and use coarse language; that we act different in private than in public is everyone's most conspicuous experience." This we all know to be true which is why Kundera states that private and public are two different worlds. Kundera is alluding to the fact that we act completely different when in public than in private. Kundera says that the two worlds should remain separate. Kundera thinks that people should have a right to have their private life separate from their public one. They have the right to say whatever they want when they are in private. Kundera thinks that people should not tamper with other people's private lives, such as was done to Prochazka. Kundera thinks that is what is the real crime rather than what Prochazka said.

CCC

The time many of us cherish most is that private time with family and friends where we can share our inner-most thoughts, feelings, complaints, joy and sorrow. That time for us is "private time" in which things are said that could be damaging if a person said in public. Not only is the broadcast of Prochazka's tapes outrageous but it is the "rape of his life", the undressing of a person in public, something that none of us would wish upon our family or friends.

Very similarly, I encountered a situation which resembles that of Prochazka's, which I will regret forever. My best friend confided in me that he truly loves a girl in our class and would do anything to go out with her. He trusted me with this information and believed I was someone to confide in. Needless to say, I broke his trust and told a friend who, in turn, told the girl. He felt as naked as Prochazka did when his tapes were released to the public. Kundera's claim that "curtain-rippers are criminals" could not be more true. That day I felt like a criminal, I stole my best friend's inner-most thoughts and feelings and sold them to the highest bidder. This is an experience that significantly changed me and one that I will never forget.

Not only is it clear that Kundera's claim is irrefutable, but our law makers passed laws keeping the same principle in mind. In our country today, we have laws that protect speech with religious clergy and attorney-client privilege. These two laws are based on the belief that people must be able to share their inner-most thoughts, feelings and actions, without the possibility of self-incriminating. If one sins, it is important that they are able to tell someone about it without their sin being made public. If you were to strip all humans down, we are all the same, flesh and bones with many imperfections, why should we publicize others imperfections, yet mask our own? This to me is the all time hypocrisy. One person who was publicly humiliated and torn apart in front of an infatuated, rumor-spreading media was former president Bill Clinton. Granted we can all say that in the eyes of society, what Mr. Clinton did by having an affair was wrong, but if we are to expose Mr. Clinton why not expose the millions of other Americans and people throughout the world who are unfaithful to their spouses. I was bitterly disturbed and outraged by Mr. Clinton's actions, yet I was even more outraged at the American media. Just because someone happens to be in the public eye, doesn't give the world a right to scrutinize his or her private life. If Mr. Clinton was incapable of carrying out his duties as president, remove him; however if we simply do not approve of his private life, we should all take a good hard look in the mirror before we have the temerity to publicly

criticize other's life.

Czech writer Milan Kundera is undoubtedly right when he states his belief that the "real scandal was not Prochazka's daring to talk but the rape of his life." We all must take into account that we are all humans with faults, from the President of the United States to the man who lives down the block. Those who have the right to criticize others person's lives are only those who have no faults themselves and if people accepted this belief, there would never be another criticism of a person's personal life again.

KK

The writer Milan Kundera makes the claim that public and private are two different lives, and anyone who pulls the curtain between the two is a criminal. I agree. It's sad that just two years after this passage was written the same case came up on a much larger scale. The Clinton Scandal. It was not the business of the republicans or the people of the United States to know if Clinton had a sexual relationship with anyone. This is why ones sexual organs are sometimes referred to as private parts, not public parts, and it's not just that it's everything one doesn't freely tell people. The author says "It is the very ground of the life of the individual. Once you lose that you have nothing. The example given in the writing is a perfect example of the previous statement. It describes two friends' conversations being broadcasted on the radio. Not only were their private lives lost, but they were discredited publicly & lost public respect. If I'm the president & I want to tell you about my kids' drinking problems I will, but to go behind my back & tell everyone without my permission is unethical and you truly are a criminal.

V

I agree with the statements made by Milan Kundera that we act differently in private than we do in public and that "the curtain separating these two worlds is not to be tampered with."

I have a friend who, while in public and faced with people she doesn't know or trust, will say almost nothing, refuse to even smile, and consequently seem to be either rude or without personality. However, when she's with a close friend or two, she's talkative, smart and funny. She acts differently while not in public. So do I.

There are certain thoughts and ideas that people examine while by themselves or in the company of close friends. They can be completely truthful and even agree with some points of a topic that, as a whole, they don't agree with. The public is more likely to misinterpret these things than a close friend and confidant would.

Furthermore, infinite knowledge of a person's private life is not healthy to either party. When Princess Diana was killed after being pursued by the media, it was questioned whether or not the public even had the right to know all of her private affairs. Diana even fled in order to keep that aspect of herself out of the public eye.

I believe that a person's mind is much like his or her body—that there are certain parts that people find necessary to keep covered up, hidden, and out of view. People, in my opinion are as uncomfortable having every bit of their minds exposed, as they would be if every bit of their body is exposed.

Moreover, it would be the natural reaction of people to be as disgusted at what they saw in an exposed mind or private life of a person compared to the shock and disgust they

would experience should they spot someone parading around in public stark naked. There are some things that just are not meant to be seen.

I have, since the fifth grade, kept a journal, which I write in often, and, should anyone find it, read it and thus see the way I look at my entire world, I would be devastated. One's own thoughts are not meant to be stolen, nor is what one does in private meant to be known, unless it effects others.

The scandal with Bill Clinton started out as a private matter, which really, the public had little or no right to know. Clinton lied to the American public to keep the curtain between his public and private life intact. Although I do not agree with his actions (both adultery & lying) I cannot, without seeming hypocritical, blame him for trying to keep his private affairs private.

A person really does live in two worlds, and the private world is much less perfect than what is seen to those who know a person only in public. The private life is truer, full of raw emotion and uninhibited thought. The public world is full of pretense and people who restrict themselves in order to appear to be acceptable.

I honestly believe that a person in public is much different from that same person in private. I believe that it has always been this way --- that it is meant to be this way and, as Milan Kundera said, "curtain-rippers are criminals".

LLL

In *Testament Betrayed* Milan Kundera accurately emphasizes the need for separation between the public and private lives of man. Exploitation of a man such as Prochazka in his most private, most vulnerable, most candid state is an outrage; Kundera considers this exploitation a "rape of his life" that is not to be condoned. The "indispensable condition", the fundamental decency, is to respect the disparity between public and private, to leave the separating curtain alone rather than tear it away and enact a heinous "crime." Celebrities and those with a wealth of fame are the usual victims of an invasion of privacy by the press, some of whose invasions resulted in devastating tragedies. In politics, mudslinging is the ultimate invasion of one's past and private life, and makes the leaders of America out to be treacherous fools. However, in some instances, an invasion of privacy actually helps a person in gaining fame and fortune.

Television shows such as *Extra*, *E!*, and *Access Hollywood* and tabloids epitomize the antithesis of what Kundera idealizes in the world; they completely invade the private lives of celebrities, often to discredit and mock them. The life of *Home Alone* child star McCauley Caulkin was fully chronicled in the tabloids and his dealings with his money-stealing parents and early marriage publicized his painfully tumultuous private life. John F. Kennedy, Jr. similarly tried to avoid the press and resented their invasion of his private life, overly publicizing his marriage. Princess Diana, a heroine in her English homeland, was a tragic victim of the paparazzi invasion; her attempt to flee from a car of news reporters resulted in her sudden death. The invasion of privacy also humiliates celebrities, as in the case of pop singer George Michael's bathroom incident and the charges against legendary Michael Jackson as a child molester.

In the game of politics, private lives are exploited and publicized to the benefit of the opposition, reducing the candidate's standings as a man desirable to public opinion. Affairs with women were publicized, as in the case of president John F. Kennedy, and sometimes even ruined careers, as in the career of Aaron Burr. In the movie *Primary Colors*, the inappropriate personal behavior of the presidential candidate, played by John Travolta, nearly obliterated his chances at the Presidency. The surfacing of such treachery

affects the victim's family as well. George W. Bush's two daughters reduce the image of the President as a good father, and thus reduce the image of him as a President.

One effect of the invasion of privacy that Kundera overlooked was the resulting fame of the common man; this polar result occurs in a beneficial way for "victims" who were not already wielding a wealth of fame. The Monica Lewinsky case regarding president Clinton's affair with the White House Intern brought about an immediate fame, which she capitalized upon to elevate her standings in society. She had never appeared on television, she had never been recognized by strangers, she had never been on the front cover of Time, and she attained all of the preceding when the Clinton-Lewinsky catastrophe hit.

DDD

I strongly support Kundera's claim. I think that a person's private life is sacred. Prochazka should have been treated with respect for his human rights. If he was going to be discredited, it should have been done in a much different manner. An individual is far more different in privacy than in public. In public you have a reputation to uphold. However in privacy you can show your true colors.

NN

Milan Kundera writes about the rights of privacy which has long been a subject of debate even through today. While I agree that there should be a separation between public and private life, I would not go so far as to call those who wish to know both sides of a person criminals. There are many news stories in today's world about scandals that would expose a person's private life. For example, there have been many reports of Catholic priests who have charges against them for being pedophiles. This would qualify as part of their private lives; however if it is kept to themselves, more people could be hurt. I agree with Kundera when he says that many people do not understand that there is a difference between private and personal lives. This is especially true when there are stories of the paparazzi chasing down celebrities in order to obtain photographs.

The Clinton scandal is another example of a difference of opinion. As a president, Clinton was committed to be the political leader of the United States. However, many think that the role of the president includes being the moral leader as well. If a person intends to be the moral leader there should not be anything to hide in the personal life. Symbolically, Clinton rejected the job of moral leader when he chose to be dishonest about his personal life. In the examples given by Kundera, neither gentlemen had agreed to be the moral leader; therefore their lives should have remained private.

In modern times, there is the general theme that all people wear masks. This is shown in the text as well. It is a pretty well known fact that people act differently around their friends than they do around their parents, etc. This has become more or less a modern day fact of life for both adults and children, and even in today's situations there should be a set boundary between a public and private life.

It has become more difficult to maintain that boundary for celebrities and famous political officials because of the increased role in the media. This is a similarity to the passage because the scandal in the 60's was started by a radio broadcast.

Kundera's passage holds true in many aspects of today's society, but cannot be the absolute truth in the way that it was meant to be when it was written. This is a result from the changing morality that is occurring in today's society.