

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

**(20 Marks)**

John Lock reflects the new situation in England more than ever when he goes on to argue that the reason men come together to live in society, with laws, is for the preservation of their property. Since men are driven into society, it follows that the power of that society 'can never be suffered to extend further than the common good'. And this common good can only be determined by standing laws, statutes, that all are aware of and agree to, and not by extemporary degrees of, say, an absolute sovereign. Moreover, these laws must be administered 'by indifferent and upright judges'. Only in this way can the people (and rulers) know where they are. In an important amendment to the idea of absolute monarchy, Lock said that the king can never suspend the law. Finally Lock gave voice to the main anxiety of the rising commercial classes in England (a fear of something which they saw happening in France, in state intervention in trade), that no power can take from a man his property without his consent. 'A soldier may be commanded by a superior in all things, save the disposal of his property'. In the same way a man has property in his own person, meaning that a man's labor is his property too. The most important consequence of this, Lock says is that people can be taxed only with their consent. (We recognize this now in the doctrine 'No taxation without representation'.)

## Precis

Title: John Locke's Suggestion for Protection of Private Property.

According to John Lock, People agreed to live together under the umbrella of Laws in order to have their Private Property Protected. The People and rulers will only know their Standing in a Society if these Laws are implemented by unbiased Judges. This ensures that no Power can take the Labor and Private Property of an individual without his Consent. But, his Property can be taxed with his Consent.



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

There has existed throughout the history of mankind a strange, albeit, an ironic relationship between the past and the future. The people who just eulogize their past without critical analysis and seek to recreate a utopian past almost invariably do not succeed, while those who view the past realistically, comprehensively and critically are able to draw on the past in useful, meaningful and lasting ways. They learn lessons from the history and apply those lessons for better future. Such people have in their the past realistically, try to comprehend the values, aesthetics, and traits which invested an earlier civilization its grandeur or caused it to decline. They preserve its remains, and enshrine relevant and enriching images and events of the past in their memories both collectively and individually. They attempt to adopt the values and traits which led earlier people rise, and shun the reasons and mistakes that precipitated their downward journeys. In sharp contrast to them, people and governments with an uncertain sense of the future manifest deeply skewed and subjective relationships to their history. They eschew lived history, shut out its lessons, shun critical inquiries into the past, neglect its remains but, at the same time, invent at their own imagined and to plan past-always shining, splendid and glorious. As a matter of fact, they are never able to benefit from their past. They study history, but learn nothing from history forecasts.

## Title: Lessons from History

There has always been a connection between the past and the future. People who learn from the past mistakes and inculcate good qualities and traits of ancient civilization always succeed in their future endeavors. Whereas, those who live in delusions about their past being perfect and splendid and show reluctance to learn from their past mistakes generally do not achieve success.