Q.2. Make a précis of the following passage and suggest a suitable title (15+5)

In our time it is broadly true that political writing is bad writing. Where it is not true, it will generally be found that the writer is some kind of rebel, expressing his private opinions, and not a 'party line'. Orthodoxy, of whatever colour, seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style. The political dialects to be found in pamphlets, leading articles, manifestos, White Papers and the speeches of Under-Secretaries do, of course, vary from party to party, but they are all alike in that one almost never finds in them a fresh, vivid, home-made turn of speech. When one watches some tired hack on the platform mechanically repeating the familiar phrases – bestial atrocities, iron heel, blood-stained tyranny, free peoples of the world, stand shoulder to shoulder – one often has a curious feeling that one is not watching a live human being but some kind of dummy: a feeling which suddenly becomes stronger at moments when the light catches the speaker's spectacles and turns them into blank discs which seem to have no eyes behind them. And this is not altogether fanciful. A speaker who uses that kind of phraseology has gone some distance toward turning himself into a machine. The appropriate noises are coming out of his larynx, but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself. If the speech he is making is one that he is accustomed to make over and over again, he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying, as one is when one utters the responses in church. And this reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, is at any rate favourable to political conformity.

In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible. Things like the continuance of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenceless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called *pacification*. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called *transfer of population* or *rectification of frontiers*. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called *elimination of unreliable elements*. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them.

Title: Robotic Version of Political da writing. The Author States that he saw of political official usually pharase concious

	rebelious writers who represent
	their personal views and visions.
	As per the Author, the political
	writing of his exa was defensive.
a Variab	As per him, the political writing
	should be direct, question
	oriented that clears any every
7	ambiguity. Indirect pharases is
	only needed when one wants
110	to mention something without
28106	making visual picture of its minds.
1365	the transition of ideas and plan
330	Total words: 473
7	Precis words: 159
	wide the sap door record by
+	Service the do segon hop I
	rigg will Eszmand initiach !-
45.09.0	The straight of the straight o
ratio (*)	main idea is picked and discussed
201 - 1	no need to mention the author again
Malderton	and again rest is fine
The Mills	basic grammar and sentence struct
5 IT	needs improvement 8/20
A Marketin	Solt to it assumed with a
and Market (A	In a series of the first of Control of the series of the s