

**Q.2 Write a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title: (20)**

On top of nuclear war, in the coming decades humankind will face a new existential threat that hardly registered on the political radars in 1964; ecological collapse. Human beings are destabilizing the global biosphere on multiple fronts. We are taking more and more resources out of the environment, while pumping back into it enormous quantities of waste and poison, thereby changing the composition of the soil, the water and the atmosphere.

We are hardly even aware of the myriad ways in which we disrupt the delicate ecological balance that had been shaped over millions of years. Consider, for example, the use of phosphorus as a fertilizer. In small quantities, it is an essential nutrient for the growth of plants but in excessive amounts it becomes toxic.

As a result of such activities, habitats are degraded, animals and plants are becoming extinct, and the entire ecosystem might be destroyed. For thousands of years *Homo sapiens* behaved as an ecological serial killer; now it is morphing into an ecological mass murderer. If we continue with our present course, it will cause not just the annihilation of a large percentage of all life forms, but it might sap the foundation of human civilization. Unlike nuclear war - which is a future potential - climate change is present reality.

Where does nationalism fit into this alarming picture? Is there a national answer to the ecological menace? Can any nation, however powerful, stop global warming by itself? Individual countries can certainly adopt a variety of green policies, many of which make a good economic as well as environmental sense. There are many things that governments, corporations and individuals can do to avoid climate change. But, to be effective, they must be done on global level. When it comes to global level countries are not just sovereign. They are at the mercy of actions taken by people at the other side of the planet. Nationalist isolation is probably even more dangerous in the context of climate change than the nuclear war.

**Q.3 Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions given at the end: (20)**



Precise: Human activities and national policies: A threat of global warming

Ecological collapse, will be the new threat to humankind unlike nuclear war. Human beings <sup>are</sup> destabilizing global biosphere. Moreover, they <sup>are</sup> getting more resources out of environment and pumping back into it huge quantities of waste. They also disrupt the delicate ecological balance. Resultantly, such activities, habitats <sup>are</sup> degraded, animals and plants <sup>are</sup> becoming extinct. Therefore, neither nationalism nor powerful state can stop global warming separately. However, individual countries can adopt the green policies. Government, cooperation and individuals can <sup>also</sup> stop global warming. When it comes to the global level countries, they <sup>are</sup> not just sovereign. Even they <sup>are</sup> at the mercy of actions taken by people. Hence, nationalist isolation is more dangerous in context of global warming.