

Name:

Index No.:

Class:

**ST. ANDREW'S JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS**

GENERAL PAPER

8005/2

Paper 2

2008

Candidates answer on the Question Paper
No Additional Materials are required.

1 hour 30 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Write your name in the space provided.

Write in dark blue or black pen in the spaces provided on the Question Paper.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue or correction fluid.

Answer all questions.

The number of marks is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.

The insert contains the passage for comprehension.

(Note that 15 marks out of 50 will be awarded for your use of language).

This booklet consists of 6 printed pages.

For Examiner's Use	
Content	
Language	
Total	

NOTE: When a question asks for an answer IN YOUR OWN WORDS AS FAR AS POSSIBLE and you select the appropriate material from the passage for your answer, you must still use your own words to express it. Little credit can be given to answers which only copy words or phrases from the passage.

- Write your summary in **no more** than 120 words, not counting the opening words which are printed below. **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....[8m]

- 2 Explain how the traditions of (a) family and (b) politics (line 27) might be threatened by immortality.

.....
.....
.....
.....[2m]

- 3 'Would we come to see these poems as the *curious remnants* of an antique world rather than *urgent expressions* of the deepest truths of our predicament' (lines 33-34)?

What do the italicized words say about the difference in our attitude towards poems in the present and the future?

.....
.....
.....[2m]

4. In paragraph 5, why would medical immortals consider the new life extension technologies nothing but good news? **Use your own words as far as possible.**

.....
.....
.....[2m]

5. Explain the irony of romantic love in the following sentence.

'... but if falling in love actually meant a commitment for 1,000 or more years, then 'forever' starts to take on a new meaning' (lines 44-46).

.....
.....
.....[2m]

6. In paragraph 6, why does the author's repeat the word 'so'?
.....
.....[1m]
7. What are the two similarities between medically immortal selves and wealthier mortal selves in paragraph 6? **Use your own words as far as possible.**
.....
.....
.....[2m]
8. What does the phrase 'tediously familiar' (line 65) suggest about the impact of science and technology on our way of life?
.....
.....
.....[2m]
9. Why does the author put quotation marks around 'threats' (line 71)?
.....
.....[1m]
10. Give the meaning of the following words as they are used in the passage. You may write your answer in one word or a short phrase.
- basis (line 15)
- revolution (line 35)
- fleeting (line 57)
- paradise (line 67)
- pacifist (line 68)[5m]

**ST. ANDREW'S JUNIOR COLLEGE
JC2 PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS**

GENERAL PAPER

8005/2

Paper 2

2008

INSERT

1 hour 30 minutes

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

This insert contains the passages for Paper 2.

This insert consists of 3 printed pages.

IMMORTALITY

Bryan Appleyard writes...

- 1 Developments in a number of scientific disciplines suggest that we may soon be able to increase life expectancies from the 70- to 80-year range already seen in the richest countries to well over 100 and, perhaps, to over 1,000. We shall, in one sense, have made ourselves immortal.
- 2 We shall not be immortal in the sense that we cannot die; plainly we could still be killed in a car accident or by a cosmic event such as an asteroid striking the Earth. However, we could not be killed by disease or age, our bodies would be immune to infection, dysfunction or the ravages of time. We would be medically immortal. In fact, some say this will happen quickly within, perhaps, 30 years with the first clear signs that we are on the right track appearing within the next decade. Others think that we are at least a century or two away from attaining medical immortality. While some consider it completely unattainable, the majority of scientists and thinkers in this area now consider life extension and medical immortality possible, and even likely.
- 3 Not long ago, most would have said it was out of the question, that death at or well before the absolute maximum age of something like 122 was inevitable. The basis of this shift from unattainable to feasible is not generally understood. It involves a radical transformation in our conception of human biology. This transformation may prove as momentous as the discoveries of Newton, Darwin or Einstein, requiring mammoth capabilities of Man. However, besides these changes to our traditional ways of thinking, there are also conventional beliefs that run from Buddha to Mohammed and from Plato to Wittgenstein that will face similar challenges. Our relatively brief lives and our routine proximity to the deaths of ourselves and others are the foundations of everything we have ever thought or believed. Neither religion nor philosophy necessarily promises immortality, but each offers ways of coming to terms with or giving meaning to death and, therefore, life. If death is to be postponed indefinitely, then both religion and philosophy face fundamental crises.
- 4 In truth, many other traditions of family, politics, art, commerce and culture are also at stake. It is difficult to think of any aspect of human life that would not face similar crises. What, for example, would be the meaning of the greatest works of the human imagination to a medical immortal? Shakespeare's poems may be said to be about the brevity of life and the painful transience of human love and beauty. Yet, if we lived for 1,000 years or more in a condition of youthful health and vitality, would we come to see these poems as the curious remnants of an antique world rather than urgent expressions of the deepest truths of our predicament? Would any art of the past survive this revolution with its dignity intact? Would there be any art of the future?
- 5 However, most medical mortals think that, since they suffer from no illusions, fantasies or sensitivities, new life extension technologies are nothing but good news, simple additions to the portfolio of benefits delivered by modern technology. Yet, the truth is that their worlds are also threatened. For example, the language of relationships is the vernacular of our contemporary, secular life. What would our precious relationships look like to medical immortals? Love itself would have to be redefined. Currently, the meaning of romantic love depends on the promise that it will last forever and 'forever' now means no more than about 50 years, the average span of the human life from falling in love to death. But if falling in love actually meant a commitment for 1,000 or more years, then 'forever' starts to take on a new meaning. Love is suddenly relativised, its significance thrown into doubt.

- 6 There remains, of course, the love of self and with it, life extension and the cultivation of the self. Yet, how much cultivation of the self can we take? There will only ever be so many gadgets to buy, so many days we can spend at the gym or beauty parlour - though these may well be unnecessary activities in the new world order - so much sex we can have, so many cars we can drive. Perhaps medically immortal selves will seek alternative spiritual or intellectual diversions, just as the wealthier mortal selves, disillusioned with getting and spending, already do in increasing numbers. 50
- 7 Maybe these will see us through the long centuries of life. Or maybe none of these things will matter as we shall not be just one self in the future but many. The human brain already struggles to cope with the memories of 80 years, what would it do with those of more than 1,000 years? The average 50-year-old can only fleetingly put himself in the mind and imagination of his 10-year-old self, would a 500-year-old even be able to see it as the same self? Perhaps medical immortals will simply have to resign themselves to amnesia, to becoming serial, forgetful selves. 55 60
- 8 Would medical immortals go to war? Would they form nations? Would they be democrats? Would they go shopping? Would they destroy the environment? The promise of extreme longevity is either a bane or boon. This is our supreme challenge — to make that choice. Unfortunately, arguments about the impact of medical science upon ways of life, like those of science and technology are tediously familiar. To the church, Galileo threatened orthodoxy; to the Romantics, the Industrial Revolution threatened the rural paradise and the authenticity of craft; to the religious, Darwinism threatened the faith; to the pacifist, nuclear power offered only more terrible wars; to the environmentalist, economic growth threatened global destruction; to the conservative, biotechnological enhancement threatened a destruction of human nature. Medical immortality may be as ambivalent as all other ‘threats’ of science and technology, but surely few would reject the chance of having much longer lives. 65 70
- 9 Death, I was sure, gave meaning to life, at least the only meaning we could imagine but I have since found that my curiosity began to get the better of this philosophically pure position. Lying on my deathbed, would I refuse the treatment that would take me back to my late twenties and perfect health? This, surely, is the one offer nobody could refuse. 75