

Q#02

Title:

Nizar: A Prominent Palestinian Filmmaker

Precis

Nizar Hassan is a Palestinian filmmaker. He produced his first film, "Independence", in which he explores Israel's absurd notion of independence. In the film, Israel's mistaken invasion of a nation's motherland as their "independence." As the world's attention was fixated on Israel's plans of further encroachment, Nizar produced another film, "My Grandfather's Path." It is cautioned to carefully pick the enemies lest one ends up following in their footsteps. Similarly, those opposing Zionist settlers should be careful of that trap. Or, face the fate of sacrificing their aspirations in exchange for anger over Israeli vulgarity of unstoppable territorial robbery. The author warns of this trap and recommends the world of cinema and literature as a potential escape. Nizar's "My Grandfather's Path" is essentially that escape.

(word count) Passage: 344

Precis: 120



FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION - 2021 FOR RECRUITMENT TO  
POSTS IN BS-17 UNDER THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
ENGLISH (PRECIS & COMPOSITION)

Roll Number

TIME ALLOWED: THREE HOURS	PART-I (MCQS)	MAXIMUM MARKS = 20
PART-II (MCQS): MAXIMUM 30 MINUTES	PART-II	MAXIMUM MARKS = 80

- NOTE: (i) Part-II is to be attempted on the separate Answer Book.  
(ii) Attempt ALL questions from PART-II.  
(iii) All the parts (if any) of each Question must be attempted at one place instead of at different places.  
(iv) Write Q. No. in the Answer Book in accordance with Q. No. in the Q. Paper.  
(v) No Page Space be left blank between the answers. All the blank pages of Answer Book must be crossed.  
(vi) Extra attempt of any question or any part of the question will not be considered.

**PART-II**

Q. 2. Write a précis of the following and suggest a suitable title:

(20)

Nizar Hassan was born in 1960 and raised in the village of Mashhad, near Nazareth, where he has lived with his family. He studied anthropology at Haifa University and after graduating worked in TV. Starting in 1990, he turned to cinema. In 1994, he produced *Independence*, in which he pokes his Palestinian interlocutors about what they think of the bizarre Israeli notion of their "independence". They have stolen another people's homeland and call the act "independence". Hassan dwells on that absurdity.

As the world's attention was captured by the news of Israel planning to "annex" yet a bit more of Palestine and add it to what they have already stolen, I received an email from Nizar Hassan, the pre-eminent Palestinian documentary filmmaker. He wrote to me about his latest film, *My Grandfather's Path*, and included a link to the director's cut. It was a blessing. They say choose your enemies carefully for you would end up like them. The same goes for those opposing Zionist settler colonialists. If you are too incensed and angered by their daily dose of claptrap, the vulgarity of their armed robbery of Palestine, you would soon become like them and forget yourself and what beautiful ideas, ideals, and aspirations once animated your highest dreams. Never fall into that trap. For decades, aspects of Palestinian and world cinema, art, poetry, fiction, and drama have done for me precisely that—saved me from that trap. They have constantly reminded me what all our politics are about—a moment of poetic salvation from it all.

Nizar Hassan's new documentary is one such work—in a moment of dejection over Israel's encroachment on Palestinian rights and the world's complicity, it has put Palestine in perspective. The film is mercifully long, beautifully paced and patient, a masterfully crafted work of art—a Palestinian's epic ode to his homeland. A shorter version of *My Grandfather's Path* has been broadcast on Al Jazeera Arabic in three parts, but it must be seen in its entirety, in one go. It is a pilgrimage that must not be interrupted.

Q. 3. Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions given at the end.

(20)

In its response to 9/11, America has shown itself to be not only a hyperpower but increasingly assertive and ready to use its dominance as a hyperpower. After declaring a War on Terrorism, America has led two conventional wars, in Afghanistan and Iraq, demonstrating its overwhelmingly awesome military might. But these campaigns reveal something more: America's willingness to have recourse to arms as appropriate and legitimate means to secure its interests and bolster its security. It has set forth a new doctrine: the right of pre-emptive strike when it considers its security, and therefore its national interests, to be at risk. The essence of this doctrine is the real meaning of hyperpower.

Prime Minister Tony Blair has consistently argued that the only option in the face of hyperpower is to offer wise counsel. But increasingly this is a course that governments and people across the world have refused. The mobilisation for war against Iraq split the United Nations and provoked the largest anti-war demonstrations the world has ever seen. And through it all, America maintained its determination to wage war alone if necessary and not to be counselled by the concerns of supposedly allied governments when they faithfully represented the wishes of their electorates. Rather than engaging in debate, the American government expressed its exasperation. The influential new breed of neoconservative radio and television hosts went much further. They acted as ringmasters for outpourings of public scorn that saw French fries renamed "freedom fries" and moves to boycott French and German produce across America. If one sound-bite can capture a mood, then perhaps it would be Fox News' Bill O'Reilly. At the height of the tension over a second Security Council resolution to legitimate war in Iraq, Mr O'Reilly told his viewers that the bottom line was security, the security of his family, and in that matter, "There's no moral equivalence between the US and Belgium". It is, in effect, the ethos of hyperpower articulated and manifest in the public domain of 24-hour talk. And America's willingness to prosecute war has raised innumerable questions about how it engages with other countries. Afghanistan has seen the removal of the Taliban. But there are no official statistics on the number of innocent civilians dead and injured to achieve that security objective. The people of Afghanistan have witnessed a descent into the chaos that preceded the arrival of the Taliban, a country administered not by a new era of democracy under the tutelage of the hyperpower, but merely by the return of the warlords. Beyond Kabul, much of the country remains too insecure for any meaningful efforts at reconstruction and there is enormous difficulty in bringing relief aid to the rural population.