

Sir John Lubbock said "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." This means that people judge things too fast, and don't look deeper to tell if something is truly bad or good. I agree with this because most people don't take the time to really get to know the things around them. Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare and Hamlet by William Shakespeare prove this.

Shakespeare uses characterization in his book Romeo and Juliet. Romeo and Juliet are characterized as star crossed lovers. Their families, the Montagues and Capulets, are enemies and have been for many generations. However, their forbidden love could not keep them away from each other. Romeo and Juliet would do anything for each other. When Juliet faked her own death, Romeo committed suicide by drinking poison. When Juliet woke up to find him dead, she stabbed a dagger in her heart so they could finally be together. If their families would have seen passed their differences, they would have seen the love between Romeo and Juliet, and how good they were for each other.

Shakespeare's book Hamlet shows symbolism. Claudius, Hamlet's step father as well as Uncle, symbolises the death of Hamlet's real father. Shortly after ~~the king~~ Hamlet's father,

dies, ~~the~~ his mother, Gertrude, marries Hamlet's Uncle. Hamlet is thought to start going crazy when all this happens. ~~When Claudius finds out~~
No body understands why Hamlet starts acting the way he does. ~~His actions are~~ what he did was the way he dealt with what was going on in his life. No one took the time to talk to Hamlet about his feelings or actions.
~~What they saw.~~ ~~They are~~ People, especially Claudius, only saw the bad and "crazy" in Hamlet. If they would have just talked to him or asked him about his feelings or thoughts, they would know why he acted the way he did. However, the people around him only judged what they saw and heard. They judged him without actually getting to know ~~him~~ ~~him~~ him and his feeling.
Romeo and Juliet by William Shakespeare and Hamlet by William Shakespeare show that Sir John Lubbock's quote "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise" is agreeable. You should get to know if something is really good or bad. Most people just "judge a book by it's cover," and don't give it a ~~chance~~ fair chance.

Anchor Level 3 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens that suggests some criteria for analysis (<i>This means that people judge things too fast, and don't look deeper to tell if something is truly bad or good</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>If their families would have seen passed their differences, they would have seen ... how good they were for each other</i>) and <i>Hamlet</i> (<i>They judged him without actually getting to know him and his feeling</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> (<i>However, their forbidden love could not keep them away from each other</i>) and <i>Hamlet</i> (<i>People, especially Claudius, only saw the bad and "crazy" in Hamlet</i>). The response relies primarily on plot summary.</p>
Organization	<p>Maintains a clear and appropriate focus (<i>Most people just "judge a book by it's cover," And don't give it a fair chance</i>). The response exhibits a logical sequence of ideas, first interpreting the lens, then presenting information from both works to support the interpretation and the use of literary elements, and concluding with a return to the lens and its interpretation. The response lacks internal consistency in that the focus of <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> is more on seeing past differences than judging others.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>Romeo and Juliet would do anything for each other</i>) that is sometimes imprecise (<i>passed</i> for "past" and <i>Sir John Lubbock's quote ... is agreeable</i>), with little awareness of audience or purpose. The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length, but with uneven success (<i>What he did was the way he dealt with what was going on in his life</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates partial control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>truly</i> and <i>symbolises</i>) and punctuation (<i>it's</i> for "its") that do not hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat stronger in organization and conventions.</p>	

"Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." can mean a few things. To me it means that things that we think are evil and bad are actually goods but we don't realize that. I disagree with the quote and 2 books that support this are The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald and The Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne.

In the book The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald, Tom & Gatsby both would be called in a way evil, but not good in disguise. Tom was a married man to Daisy. Even though he was married he cheated on her with Myrtle. Tom even hit Myrtle and made her bleed which shows that Tom isn't a very good person. There is also Gatsby who people don't know how he got his wealth. People think he is associated with a gang and that he ^{helped} set up the world series.

~~Another~~ Another book that supports my opinion is the Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne. The protagonist Chillingworth was the husband of Hester Prynne. ~~When~~ when Chillingworth found out she had an affair with ~~Chillingworth~~ Dimsdale he got mad and ~~disguised~~ ^{disguised} himself as a doctor. Chillingworth became Dimsdale doctor since he was sick. He tried to kill him with medicine. ~~So~~ So this proves that

Anchor Paper – Question 28 – Level 3 – B

evil isn't in disguise as good.
 Threw all these examples I've give
 you, you can conclude that I don't
 agree with the quote. This can be
 proven by the two books I have given.
 Evil is mostly evil.

Anchor Level 3 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens that suggests some criteria for analysis (<i>To me it means that things that we think are evil and bad are actually good in disguise but we don't realize that</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>Tom & Gatsby both would be called in a way evil, but not good in disguise</i>) and <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> (<i>So this proves that evil isn't in disguise as good</i>).
Development	Develops ideas briefly, using some evidence from <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>Tom even hit Myrtle and made her bleed which shows that Tom isn't a very good person</i>) and <i>The Scarlet Letter</i> (<i>Chillingworth became Dimmesdale doctor ... He tried to kill him with medicine</i>). The response relies primarily on plot summary.
Organization	Establishes an appropriate focus on the idea that <i>evil is mostly evil</i> . The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, presenting an introduction that disagrees with the lens, followed by separate paragraphs for each text, and a conclusion that reiterates disagreement with the lens.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>helped set up</i> and <i>he got mad</i>) that is sometimes imprecise (<i>Tom & Gatsby</i> and <i>Threw</i> for “Through”), with little awareness of audience and purpose (<i>you can conclude that I don't agree</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success (<i>There is also Gatsby who people don't know how he got his wealth</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in punctuation (<i>don't, married he, Dimmesdale doctor</i>), capitalization (<i>world series</i> and <i>the Scarlet Letter</i>), and grammar (<i>Gatsby who people don't know</i> and <i>I've give you</i>) that hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.	

In this critical lens, Macbeth and ^{The Great Gatsby} ~~Macbeth and Tom~~ are what I will use to support the statement "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise*....". Evil is very good disguising. I agree with that statement because evil isn't just something that we can notice immediately. People are out there who are plain out evil ~~is~~ deep down and might not even notice it.

In the novel Macbeth, it supports the ~~is~~ statement. In the novel, Macbeth is named the Thane of Cawdor. Macbeth ~~wanted~~ ~~he~~ wanted to have that power in being king. Macbeth and it ~~wasn't~~ wasn't as easy. He had to figure ~~out~~ out a plan to kill the king ~~at~~ first. While Macbeth was the Thane of Cawdor, trying to work ~~his~~ ~~his~~ himself to the to be king, Macbeth had to be nice and polite to the king of Scotland. Deep down ~~that~~ though Macbeth was pure evil but in a disguise. Because later in the novel Macbeth's inner evil comes out as the king of Scotland is murdered. As for another novel called ~~as present~~ ^{Gatsby} The Great [↑] it supports the statement on how evil is really good in ~~the~~ disguise. For example, Tom is evil in the inside ~~because~~ because he was ~~was~~ having an affair with another woman. Also, when he married Daisy, on their honeymoon he had another affair with the maid. This states how evil he is but in a way that no one cannot recognize so far ~~for~~. This explains how evil Tom is.

Anchor Level 3 – C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response:</p> <p>Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens that suggests some criteria for analysis (<i>Evil is very good disguising and evil isn't just something that we can notice immediately</i>). The response makes superficial connections between the criteria and <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>In the novel Macbeth, it supports the statement</i>) and <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>It supports the statement on how evil is really good in disguise</i>).</p>
Development	<p>Is largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to <i>Macbeth</i> (<i>Macbeth was pure evil and Macbeth's inner evil comes out</i>) and <i>The Great Gatsby</i> (<i>This states how evil he is but in a way that no one cannot recognize and This explains how evil Tom is</i>) are vague and repetitive.</p>
Organization	<p>Establishes, but fails to maintain, an appropriate focus on the idea that there are people <i>who are plain out evil</i>. The response exhibits a rudimentary structure, first introducing the lens and its interpretation and then presenting information from both <i>Macbeth</i> and <i>The Great Gatsby</i> in a single body paragraph, but fails to conclude the response.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary (<i>He had to figure out a plan and Macbeth had to be nice and polite</i>) that is sometimes imprecise (<i>to the to be king and no one cannot recognize</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success (<i>As for another novel called The Great Gatsby</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>Hower, Scotland, afaire</i>), punctuation (<i>statement "Much, though Macbeth, Macbeths inner evil</i>), paragraphing, and usage (<i>supports the statement on how and Tom is evil in the inside</i>) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3, although it is somewhat weaker in development.</p>	

"MUCH, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." said by Sir John Lubbock means that what people call good is evil, but you can't see the good right away. I agree with this quote. In "Death of a Salesman" and "The Crucible" there are situations in which there is evil.

In "The Crucible", John didn't want to sign the confession about being a witch because he didn't want people to think he's evil. In "Death of a Salesman", the dads were considered "evil" but they were just trying to raise the kids the right way. Being "evil" can either be a good thing, or a bad thing, it depends on the situation.

What people call good is evil, but you can't see the good right away. John Sir John Lubbock means this when he says... "MUCH, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." You won't always see the good.

Anchor Level 2 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a confused and incomplete interpretation of the critical lens (<i>what people call good is evil, but you cant see the good right away</i>). The response alludes to the critical lens, but does not use it to analyze <i>Death of a Salesman</i> or <i>The Crucible</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is incomplete and largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas about <i>Evil</i>, but references to both texts are vague (<i>John didnt want to sign the cofesion about being a witch because he didnt want people to think he’s evil and the Dads were considered “evil” but they were just trying to raise the kids the right way</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on the critical lens, repeating the lens and the interpretation in the concluding paragraph, but lacks organization, discussing both texts in one paragraph.</p>
Language Use	<p>Relies on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose (<i>you wont always see the good</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary sentence structure or length for effect, but with uneven success (<i>Being “evil” can either be a good thing, or a bad thing, it depends on the situation</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors in punctuation (<i>cant; “Death Of a Salesmen”; didnt; “evil” but; thing, it; wont</i>) that hinder comprehension.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in language use and conventions.</p>	

"Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." I think the lens is trying to say is that Evil is really good at running away. I do not agree with the critical lens because Evil is ~~not good~~ good at hiding. I think good is good at hiding.

In *Things They Carry By*, by Tim O'Brien the evil people ~~are~~ are good hiders which makes evil really good at hiding. To kill a mockingbird by Lisa. The two kids think whoever is in the scary house is evil. And then they try to find the person. So evil is good at hiding but at the end it turns out that good is good at hiding.

So in summary, "much, however, of what we call evil is really good ~~in disguise~~ in disguise..." But the truth is that good is really good at hiding. ~~So~~ And evil is not good at hiding.

Anchor Level 2 – B

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	The response: Provides a confused and incomplete interpretation of the critical lens (<i>I think the lens is trying to say is that Evil is really good A running away</i>). The response alludes to the critical lens, but does not use it to analyze <i>The Things They Carried</i> or <i>To Kill a Mockingbird</i> .
Development	Is incomplete and largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas, but references to the texts are vague (<i>the Evil people Are good hidders Which makes Evil really good at hiding and The two Kids think who ever is in the scary house is Evil</i>).
Organization	Suggests a focus on <i>hiding</i> , but it is somewhat contradictory (<i>Evil is not good At hiding and which makes Evil really good at hiding</i>). The response suggests some organization through the use of paragraphing.
Language Use	Uses language that is imprecise (<i>In thing's They carrie By: Tim O'Brien and then they try try to find the persol</i>). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect (<i>I Do not agree with the critical lens because Evil is not good At hiding I think good is good at hiding</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>disguse, carrie, persol</i>), punctuation (<i>By: lisa; So Evil; hiding but</i>), and capitalization (<i>Evil, Do, And</i>) that hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2, although it is somewhat stronger in conventions.	

SIR JOHN Lubbock once said "Much, however of what we call evil is really good in disguise. That what our eyes see us sinister is just good hiding itself. The work of literature that agrees with this critical lens. Twelve Angry Men and Macbeth show how men who look evil and do things for themselves are not influenced by other beings.

In Twelve Angry Men, Juror number eight is the only good, open minded one. The rest of the jury who are portrait us evil and not caring about if the boy is guilty or not. At the end the evil jury were just judging their own. Changing their decision.

In Macbeth, a warrior who fought for his loyalty of his country. Went from being good to evil. But with influence of evil. His shaped him to this sinister man who is actually good inside.

Not all men are evil but put out like it to get what they want in order to have power.

Anchor Level 2 – C

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	<p>The response: Provides a confused interpretation of the critical lens (<i>That what our eyes see as sinister is just good hiding itself</i>). The response alludes to the critical lens, but does not use it to analyze <i>Twelve Angry Men</i> or <i>Macbeth</i>.</p>
Development	<p>Is incomplete and largely undeveloped, hinting at ideas about <i>evil</i> and <i>influence</i>, but references to the texts are vague (<i>At the end the evil jury were just judging threw there own</i> and <i>His changed him to this sinister man who is auctually good inside</i>).</p>
Organization	<p>Suggests a focus on <i>men who look evil</i> and <i>are just influence by other being</i>. The response suggests some organization through the use of paragraphing.</p>
Language Use	<p>Uses language that is imprecise (<i>portrait</i> for “portrayed,” <i>threw</i> for “through,” <i>there</i> for “their”). The response reveals little awareness of how to use sentences to achieve an effect (<i>Went from being good to evil</i>).</p>
Conventions	<p>Demonstrates a lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors in spelling (<i>sinster</i>, <i>Tweleve</i>, <i>auctually</i>), punctuation (<i>Men. Jury; own. Changing; In Macbeth. A</i>), capitalization (<i>Critical</i> and <i>Eight</i>), and grammar (<i>Two work ... that agrees</i> and <i>by other being</i>) that make comprehension difficult.</p>
<p>Conclusion: Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2 in all qualities.</p>	

Plenty of times we walk around and say "That's a bad thing she's doing or he's saying." Plenty of times we say everything is evil when it doesn't benefit us. What's evil, if it can be good? A quote from a man called Sir John Lubbock which is so inspiring to realize how evil isn't evil. The quote is "Much, however, of what we call evil is good in disguise." Such powerful words that can bring more stories and relationships also a different view on life.

There are a lot of personal relations we can compare to the words of this man. When you laughing and have a good time you don't really realize who might be hurting on the other side of the grass. I've sat there and made conversation judging a woman's past by just judging on man's life. I called her woman because she brought to situation to great intentions to open my eyes and visualize the point of another. It took time till I was the split end on that strip of hair.

I was raised to be private along like many others. What my friends found evil was good to me. They made fun of open-mouthed people. We'd meant like people that were outspoken about their personal life. It's was good for me because it left me knowing what subjects I can't target around the person because I can imagine how they would react towards a statement. This statement is never really a ~~one~~ one answer to an open question.

These powerful words remind me and help me reflect on my life and others. You learn from mistakes. What makes you stronger is an open view with a total understanding on how life is brought upon you.

Anchor Level 1 – A

Quality	Commentary
Meaning	Provides a simple interpretation of the critical lens (<i>Plenty of times we say everything is evil when it doesn't benefit us</i>). The response reflects no analysis of the texts.
Development	Develops ideas briefly. The response discusses how <i>such powerful worlds that can bring more stories and relations also a different view on life</i> by relating it to personal experiences, but makes no reference to any text.
Organization	Establishes, but fails to maintain, an appropriate focus. The response shifts the focus from that which does not benefit us is evil to how <i>you learn from mistakes. What makes you stronger is an open view with a total understanding on how life is brought upon you</i> . The response suggests some organization through the use of paragraphs.
Language Use	Relies on basic vocabulary, with little awareness of audience and purpose. The response occasionally uses some imprecise and unsuitable language (<i>It took time 'till I was the split end on that strip of hair and to be private along like many others</i>). The response exhibits some attempt to vary structure and length, but with uneven success (<i>A quote from a man called Sir John Lubbock which is so inspiring to realize how evil isn't evil</i>).
Conventions	Demonstrates emerging control, exhibiting occasional errors in spelling (<i>alot</i> and <i>lifes</i>), capitalization (<i>lubbock</i> and <i>because It left</i>), and grammar (<i>doesn't benefits, laughing ... have ... hurting, It's was good</i>) that hinder comprehension.
Conclusion: Although the response fits some of the criteria for Level 3, it remains at Level 1 because it makes no reference to either text.	

"Much. However, of what we call evil, is really good in disguise" was once said by Sir John Lubbock. According to my intrepation of the quote always the bad things are good to keep it a secret ~~or just keep it a secret~~ or to not know about it is better. I agree with this quote because its never appreciable to hear the ~~ev~~ negative, ~~not~~

Anchor Level 1 – B

Quality	Commentary
	The response:
Meaning	Provides a confused interpretation of the critical lens (<i>According to my intrepation of the quote always the bad things are good to keep it a secret or to not know about it is better</i>). The response reflects no analysis of any texts.
Development	Is minimal, with no evidence of development. The response provides a confused personal interpretation of the critical lens, but does not apply it to specific works of literature.
Organization	Suggests a focus by restating, interpreting, and agreeing with the critical lens, but lacks organization, providing only an introductory paragraph.
Language Use	Is minimal, using language that is sometimes incoherent (<i>always the bad things are good to keep it a secret</i>).
Conventions	Is minimal, making assessment of conventions unreliable.
Conclusion: Although the response best fits the criteria for Levels 1 and 2, it remains at Level 1 because the response makes no reference to any text.	

Are things always the way they seem. The quote: "much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise", ~~emphasizes~~ emphasizes that an "bad" thing have an ulterior motive for good. It can be argued disagreeable because sometimes there are just truly evil circumstances.

The 1947 classic "A Street Car named Desire" ~~emphasizes~~ emphasizes the true evilness and ruthlessness of the main character Stanley Colwaski. Stanley's doings to his sister in law Blanche are plainly out of spite. In no means or way ~~is he~~ does he have an ulterior motive to be "disguised as good."

The thrilling play "The Crucible" vindicates this quote thoroughly, by providing a stable argument against it. The young girls in the play accuse ~~people~~ everyone that steps in their way of being a witch. The era the story takes place, witches were highly believed in a feared. Therefore, the punishment for being a witch is death. The young girls did absolutely no good by having these people killed. Pure evilness is the only excuse for these intolerable acts.

The two works of literature may have completely different story ~~plots~~ lines, but they have a viable connect. They display a theme spitefulness. They prove and justify the disagreeable opinion of the quote. None of the characters possess a reasoning that would secretly be for good use.

In life, not everything is picture perfect. It would be ideal if all evil was truly for good use, but we do not live in a fantasy land. We live in a world with crime, murder and other tragedy and they most definitely do not have an underlying source for pure good.

evil
~~Good~~ can be ^{good} evil, like in Hamlet killing his uncle is bad but getting his father's revenge was good. His uncle poisoned his father so he went and killed him. Hamlet got killed after the revenge he got out with a sword that had poison on it.

Another book is an article about Lance Armstrong he has cancer but he said it was the best thing that happened to him. He has a larger lung capacity which makes him less out of breath, and less aches and pains. He will most likely have a shorter life but it gave him some positive thing. He was shocked when he first found out.

Like John Lubbock said evil is really good in disguise I agree with this. It's not like that all the time tho. People could seem good but they're ~~not~~ truly evil.

Even the most malicious of actions are born from good intentions. This ~~statement~~^{concept} is expressed in ~~the~~ Sir John Lubbock's statement that "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." This point however, is disagreeable at best; most "evil" actions are in fact motivated by personal gain. This is evident in the ~~story~~^{debauched} scheming of Iago in Shakespeare's Othello, and ~~the excessive perjury of Jago~~^{the excessive perjury of Jago} Abigail Williams' ~~speech~~^{speech} in Arthur Miller's The Crucible.

Upon learning the news that he has been passed over for a promotion given to Othello, Iago is enraged. However, he does not fly into a blind anger, he begins to calculate a cold and manipulative plot to ruin Othello. ~~the~~ The characterization of Iago as a self-centered, vengeful, and envious individual sets the stage for the many attempts to ruin Othello's life. Where is the "good" in having the soul purpose of ruining the life of another? He attempts to ~~the~~ charge ~~on~~ Othello with ~~the~~ bewitching Desdemona, and kidnapping her to be his wife, ~~the~~ which is far from the truth. Iago lies frequently, and without remorse. As he continually plants seeds of doubt in Othello's mind ~~of~~^{of} Desdemona's ~~love~~^{fidelity} ~~and~~ ~~he~~ ~~manipulates~~ all of those around him into a ~~the~~ horrific plot. ~~And~~ And even more so, his treachery leads to the ~~the~~ murders of the puppets of his plot. The innocent are slain for his envy. Love is lost as Othello smothers Desdemona, knowing not ~~the~~ the truth

until it is too late. Leading others to murder for ~~his~~ his own revenge is ~~an~~ something key to Jago's character. Murder is hardly "good in disguise".

Another character who's complete lack of conscience is indicative that this quote is false is Abigail Williams. Following her affair with the respected John Proctor, Abigail refused to let things go. She held on to the brief moments she had shared with John, and her knowledge of him, and refused to agree that it was a mistake, that "didn't happen". Her envy of Elizabeth Proctor's marriage with John and generally attention seeking personality caused her to "cry ~~over~~ witch". If John wouldn't leave his wife, she'd have to take her own way to win him back. Among her many accusations ~~she~~ ^{that would} put dozens in jail, she accused Elizabeth Proctor. All those accused could choose between ^{the} perjury of admitting their craft, or denial, which would result in a hanging. As a result of her lust and jealousy, ~~19~~ ^{nineteen} people were hanged. ~~19~~ Nineteen people died, and many others had their lives ruined. There is no good in that.

The thought that evil is ~~really~~ ^{simply} a deluded form of good is preposterous. ~~More~~ More often than not, people are acting on their own accord. They behave for themselves, looking to fulfill their own goals and desires. ~~Those~~ Those lacking a moral compass will do anything to make it happen along the way.

Sometimes, people can do great things without even noticing it. Sir John Lubbock once said, "Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise..." In other words, good ^{acts} can be ^{thought} disguised as evil. This means someone can be acting in a way others think as evil, but is really acting in a way that is good. This quote is valid. Two works of literature that prove this are *Of Mice and Men*, by John Steinbeck, and *The Kite Runner*, by Khalid Husaini, because they both have characters that ~~are~~ act evil, but are really doing good. Two literary elements the authors use are characterization and setting.

In *Of Mice and Men* Lennie, who is characterized as being tall and strong, broke Curly's hand. This might seem evil, but it is all Curly's fault. Curly liked to prove he was tough by beating up stronger guys. Lennie didn't fight back until George told him to, and even then Lennie could've done a lot worse, but instead ended the fight quickly. At the end of the story, George shot Lennie. George only had good intentions though. Curly wanted to make Lennie's death as slow and painful as possible. Before George shot Lennie in the back of the head, he told him about the dream of the ranch. They

could have ran away again, but the same problem would've arise, and they would have to keep running their entire ~~the~~ lives.

In *The Kite Runner*, Amir went back to Afghanistan, the setting for most of the book, to find Sohrab. Amir found Sohrab as almost a slave to a Taliban officer, who did terrible things to him. When Amir and the officer got into a fight, Sohrab hit the officer in the eye. Sohrab did this to protect Amir and get revenge for what the officer did to him. Later, Amir and Sohrab made it to Pakistan. When Amir told Sohrab he might have to go back to the orphanage, Sohrab tried to commit suicide. This was a terrible act, but it showed how far Amir would go to save Sohrab and how much he cared for him. It also showed Amir he would need to come up with a new plan to get Sohrab to the US where he would be free.

The Kite Runner and *Of Mice and Men* prove the quote true because they both have characters who act evil, but only have good intentions. The way someone is acting may seem evil at the moment, but it may benefit humanity in the future.

Sir John Lubbock once said "much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." This quote could be interpreted in many different ways. One possible meaning of this quote could be that most of the things that we see as evil, are actually good, and we just don't see it yet. There are many works of literature that, in fact, disagree with Sir Lubbock's quote. These pieces of literature use specific literary elements in order to prove the quote false. Two works of literature that do this are the play *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller and the play *Othello* by William Shakespeare both use the literary elements of characterization and symbolism to prove Sir Lubbock's quote a fallacy.

In *The Crucible*, Miller creates a scenario in which the witch trials in Salem, Massachusetts could have occurred in the late 1600s. The story is filled with confusion, lying, and tricks from all different characters. One of the major characters of the play is a girl named Abigail. Abigail is a girl who can be characterized as a liar, lustful, and even evil from an outside perspective. After being caught dancing in the forest, Abigail started to accuse many in the town of being witches in order to save her own life. She caused many to be imprisoned and also caused the death of many others who were accused as well. Through her characterization of being evil and liar, Abigail is a character that can help to prove Lubbock's quote to be wrong. Symbolism in *The Crucible* can also prove it false as well. The poppet that Mary Warren gives to Elizabeth Proctor was meant to be a peace offering.

a sign of respect towards her. In the end, Abigail used this poppet to help convict Elizabeth, saying she stabbed her with a needle found in the poppet. This symbol of evil in the play does the exact opposite of Lubbock's quote, showing that something nice and good, turned out to be evil.

In Othello, Shakespeare also used characterization and symbolism effectively, to the point where it can prove this quote to be false. The characterization of Iago was a major part of the story. After not being named Othello's Lieutenant, Iago swore to get revenge on Othello. He did whatever he could to make Othello betray his wife. He could be characterized as an evil, devilish person throughout the whole play, never actually doing any good. His characterization is a great way to prove Lubbock wrong. Symbolism in Othello can also be used to do this. The handkerchief that Othello gives Desdemona was a sign of love and compassion. Iago turned this around, giving it away to trick Othello into thinking she was cheating on him. It became a new symbol, one of betrayal. This also proves Lubbock's quote wrong because it did the opposite, becoming something good and lovely, to something evil and horrible.

"Much, however, of what we call evil is really good in disguise." Sir John Lubbock's words state that not everything that seems evil has to be evil, but can end up being good. The play The Crucible by Arthur Miller &

Question 28 – Practice Paper – E

Othello by William Shakespear both use characterization & symbolism to prove this quote wrong. The strong use of these literary elements provide great amount of evidence to show how wrong Lubbock was.

Practice Paper A–Score Level 3

<i>Conclusion:</i> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 3 in all qualities.

Practice Paper B–Score Level 2

<i>Conclusion:</i> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 2 in all qualities.

Practice Paper C–Score Level 5

<i>Conclusion:</i> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 5 in all qualities.

Practice Paper D–Score Level 4

<i>Conclusion:</i> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.

Practice Paper E–Score Level 4

<i>Conclusion:</i> Overall, the response best fits the criteria for Level 4 in all qualities.

**Regents Comprehensive Examination in English
June 2014
Map to Core Curriculum**

The table below shows which core performance indicator or standard and key idea each item is aligned to. The numbers in the table represent the question numbers of the examination.

	Core Performance Indicators	Standard 1	Standard 2	Standard 3
Listening	4, 6	5, 7	1, 2	3, 8
Reading	9, 17	13, 14, 15, 24	10, 19, 23	11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25
Writing	26, 27, 28	26, 27, 28	26, 27, 28	26, 28

The *Chart for Determining the Final Examination Score for the June 2014 Regents Comprehensive Examination in English* will be posted on the Department's web site at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/> on Thursday, June 19, 2014. Conversion charts provided for previous administrations of the Regents Comprehensive Examination in English must NOT be used to determine students' final scores for this administration.

Online Submission of Teacher Evaluations of the Test to the Department

Suggestions and feedback from teachers provide an important contribution to the test development process. The Department provides an online evaluation form for State assessments. It contains spaces for teachers to respond to several specific questions and to make suggestions. Instructions for completing the evaluation form are as follows:

1. Go to <http://www.forms2.nysed.gov/emsc/osa/exameval/reexameval.cfm>.
2. Select the test title.
3. Complete the required demographic fields.
4. Complete each evaluation question and provide comments in the space provided.
5. Click the SUBMIT button at the bottom of the page to submit the completed form.