

Q.7. Translate the following into English by keeping in view any figurative /idiomatic expression.

(10)

عروج و زوال ہر قوم کی داستان ہے مگر اس کے لیے احساس زیاں اور قومی حمیت ضروری ہیں۔ دوسری جنگ عظیم کے بعد جاپان پر سخت آزمائش کی گھڑی تھی۔ ایٹم بم کی تباہی نے دو شہر پہلے ہی اجاڑ دیے تھے۔ مگر جاپانیوں کے لیے اس سے بھی بڑا المیہ ایک بادشاہ کی تذلیل تھی۔ جنرل میک آرتھر کا بتک آمیز رویہ جو اس نے بادشاہ کے ساتھ اپنایا تھا، نے جاپانیوں کے اندر بدلے کی چنگاری کو ہوا دی۔ میدان جنگ میں نہ صحیح، جاپان نے ہر دوسرے شعبے میں امریکا کو مات دینا شروع کر دی، بالآخر چند ہی دہائیوں میں یہی قوم اپنا کھویا ہوا مقام دوبارہ حاصل کرنے میں کامیاب ہو گئی۔ اس داستان میں پاکستان کے لیے بہت بڑا سبق ہے۔

## Translation

Rise and fall is the story of every nation. But sense of responsibility and national integration/unity are necessary for it.

After second world war, Japan was in great trouble or in deep water. Atomic blast destruction had already devastated the two cities. But the humiliation of a King was a greater dilemma for Japanese than it.

Disrespectful attitude of General Meik Arthur towards King blew the fire of revenge in Japanese. Japan started defeating America in every field except battle field. resultantly nation succeeded in regaining her lost esteem/position within few decades. This story has a big lesson for Pakistan.

**Q. 3 Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow.**

**(20)**

The classic example of fallacy is a scene in a British court of law. As the attorney for the defense takes the floor, his partner hands him a note: "No case. Abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

If you can't shake the argument, abuse the person who advances it, and so discredit it through the back door. Go from facing the issue, which jurists call *ad rem*, to the man, *ad hominem*.

A story is told about Lincoln as a young lawyer. In one of his first jury cases, he showed his political shrewdness by an adroit and quite non-malicious use of *ad hominem*. His opponent was an experienced trial lawyer, who also had most of the fine legal points on his side. The day was warm and Lincoln slumped in his chair as the case went against him. When the orator took off his coat and vest, however, Lincoln sat up with a gleam in his eye. His opponent was wearing one of the new city-slicker shirts of the 1840's, which buttoned up the back.

Lincoln knew the reaction of frontiersmen, who made up the jury. When his turn came, his plea was brief: "Gentlemen of the jury, because I have justice on my side, I am sure you will not be influenced by this gentleman's pretended knowledge of the law. Why, he doesn't even know which side of his shirt ought to be in front!"

Lincoln's *ad hominem* is said to have won the case.

This fallacy, like over-generalizing, has been around for a long time. The Sophists must have used it freely, and I suspect it goes back to the dawn of the race.

The health of President Eisenhower was an important consideration in the nominations of 1956. Was he well enough to serve out another four years in the toughest job in the world? Similarly with Franklin Roosevelt in 1944. But when the enemies of Roosevelt charged that a given government policy was wrong because it originated with "that cripple in the White House," they were practicing a particularly vicious kind of *ad hominem*.

**QUESTIONS:**

Q1. After reading this selection, do you have a clear idea of what 'ad hominem' means?

Q2. How did Lincoln succeed in convincing the jury?

Q3. How was Lincoln's tactic 'non-malicious'? In view of the result, does it matter whether the tactic was malicious or not?

Q4. What risk did Lincoln take by using *ad hominem*? If you had been an opposing lawyer, how might you have countered Lincoln's move?

Q5. Write the meanings of the following words: a) fallacy b) gleam c) plaintiff d) cripple e) vicious.

# Comprehension

A=1= Ad hominem means to prove someone wrong without any solid arguments. Furthermore, if a person is unable to defend himself, then use abusive language against his opponent and find out his opponent's weak point rather than any fact or reality-based arguments to counter his opponent.

2= Lincoln succeeded in convincing the jury with the use of ad hominem technique. He convinced jury by saying that if my opponent lawyer had no idea regarding the front and back side of his shirt then how could his arguments can be considered right and worthwhile. In this way, he convinced the jury.

A=3= The tactic of Lincoln was non-malicious because he just wanted to get win the case rather than harming anyone. ~~or humiliating~~ He tried to convince the jury by pointing out his opponent's foolishness to prove him incredible and irresponsible lawyer. While, in view of results, it does not matter whether the tactic used to prove opponent was malicious or not.

Date: / / 20

By using ad hominem, Lincoln took a greater risk. As his tactic could even give him setback by losing the case if he failed to convince the jury with ad hominem. He might defeat himself. If I was the opponent of Lincoln then I might counter him by proving him wrong and saying that you don't know the style of wearing shirt as it was an old-styled shirt that buttoned up the back. I might prove him ignorant and claimed that if he lacked knowledge about petty things then how would he understand the complexities of case due to lack of knowledge.

As Fallacy means using illogical arguments  
Glean refers to detectiveness, curiosity.  
Plaintiff means opponent while cripple  
refers to fragile, stumbling and vicious  
means bad intentions and wrongful  
intentions.