

**Q. 2 Make a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title.**

**(15+5=20)**

Just as the most important norms governing the behaviour of individuals are embodied in domestic, or as the lawyers call it 'municipal' law, so some norms governing the behaviour of states are embodied in international law. Even so, the identity of name does not indicate an identity of nature. International law operates in quite a different social context, without the foundations of an overwhelming social consensus and of a central authority which endows its rules with sanction. States differ from individuals in that they are not subject to law; international law is not a law above states but one between them. This is a situation so anomalous for a legal system that some professional lawyers altogether deny the legal character of international law, claiming that it lacks the distinctive characteristic of effective sanctions. Sovereign states and an international legal system of the same type as domestic legal systems are logically incompatible. Either the states are truly sovereign and recognize no superior, in which case there can be no legal rules binding them; or, if such rules exist, then states are not truly sovereign. The contradiction is resolved by the theory of consent which claims that the binding character of international legal norms is founded upon their acceptance by states, explicit or implied. Thus being bound by international law becomes a form of exercising sovereignty. In the classical definition of sovereignty in the Wimbledon case, the World Court emphatically declined '...to see in the conclusion of any Treaty by which a State undertakes to perform or refrain from performing a particular act an abandonment of sovereignty'.

Since international law is based upon such an uneasy compromise, it is not surprising that the evaluation of its significance ranges so widely. Some regard it a sham, while others claim that, if only given a chance by politicians, lawyers would draft a comprehensive code which would ensure peace upon earth. Neither view does full justice to the true nature of international law which tries to reconcile sovereign states and international order and is the expression both of state-sovereignty and of its limitations.

## Précis (Mock-8)

### ~~Title~~ International Law: A states' Governing Body

International Law describes behaviour of states just like social Law describes behaviour of individuals. However, it operates differently without being a central authority which imposes its rules with sanction. International Law is a law between states. And for this cause, some lawyers oppose its existence as a legal body because according to them states are either fully sovereign or not at all. Theory of consent resolved this contradiction, that this binding character is founded upon mutual acceptance of the states. Hence, <sup>confining/</sup> bounding to its laws is a form of exercising sovereignty. Importance of International Law spreads so widely irrespective of its uneasy situation where one group is against it and other supports its efforts to unite sovereignty and international orders.

main idea is picked and discussed  
over all basic grammar needs improvement  
rest is satisfactory  
give suggested titles too  
8/20

Total word count = 360

Precis word count = 120