

1998-1 Text 3

1- Science has long had an uneasy relationship with other aspects of culture.

Think of Gallileo's 17th-century trial for his rebelling belief before the Catholic Church or poet William Blake's harsh remarks against the mechanistic worldview of Isaac Newton.

The schism between science and the humanities has, if anything, deepened in this century.

2- Until recently, the scientific community was so powerful that it could afford to ignore its critics - but no longer.

As funding for science has declined, scientists have attacked "anti-science" in several books, notably *Higher Superstition*, by Paul R. Gross, a biologist at the University of Virginia, and Norman Levitt, a mathematician at Rutgers University; and *The Demon-Haunted World*, by Carl Sagan of Cornell University.

3- Defenders of science have also voiced their concerns at meetings such as "The Flight from Science and Reason," held in New York City in 1995, and "Science in the Age of (Mis) information," which assembled last June near Buffalo.

4- Antiscience clearly means different things to different people.

Gross and Levitt find fault primarily with sociologists, philosophers and other academics who have questioned science's objectivity.

Sagan is more concerned with those who believe in ghosts, creationism and other phenomena that contradict the scientific worldview.

5- A survey of news stories in 1996 reveals that the anti-science tag has been attached to many other groups as well, from authorities who advocated the elimination of the last remaining stocks of smallpox virus to Republicans who advocated decreased funding for basic research.

6- Few would dispute that the term applies to the Unabomber, whose manifesto, published in 1995, scorns science and longs for return to a pre-technological utopia.

But surely that does not mean environmentalists concerned about uncontrolled industrial growth are anti-science, as an essay in *US News & World Report* last May seemed to suggest.

7- The environmentalists, inevitably, respond to such critics.

The true enemies of science, argues Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University, a pioneer of environmental studies, are those who question the evidence supporting global warming, the depletion of the ozone layer and other consequences of industrial growth.

8- Indeed, some observers fear that the anti-science epithet is in danger of becoming meaningless.

“The term ‘anti-science’ can lump together too many, quite different things,” notes Harvard University philosopher Gerald Holton in his 1993 work *Science and Anti-Science*.

“They have in common only one thing that they tend to annoy or threaten those who regard themselves as more enlightened.”

19. The word “schism” (Line 4, Paragraph 1) in the context probably means _____.

[A] confrontation

[B] dissatisfaction

[C] separation

[D] contempt

20. Paragraphs 2 and 3 are written to _____.

- [A] discuss the cause of the decline of science's power
- [B] show the author's sympathy with scientists
- [C] explain the way in which science develops
- [D] exemplify the division of science and the humanities

21. Which of the following is true according to the passage?

- [A] Environmentalists were blamed for anti-science in an essay.
- [B] Politicians are not subject to the labeling of anti-science.
- [C] The "more enlightened" tend to tag others as anti-science.
- [D] Tagging environmentalists as "anti-science" is justifiable.

22. The author's attitude toward the issue of "science vs. anti-science" is _____.

- [A] impartial
- [B] subjective
- [C] biased
- [D] puzzling