

## Translation

عام لوگوں کا خیال ہے کہ ملک کے قانون اور فرد کی آزادی ایک دوسرے کی ضد (یعنی  $x$  ہے) ہے۔ یہ سچ ہے۔ بظاہر یہ بات غلط معلوم نہیں ہوتی۔ ہر قانون شہریوں پر پابندی عائد کرتا ہے۔ اگر قوانین کی تعداد زیادہ ہو تو مجموعی پابندیاں بھی زیادہ ہوتی ہیں۔ زیادہ پابندیوں سے فرد کی آزادی ان کے ہونے کے دباؤ رہ جاتی ہے۔ اس کے برعکس، قوانین کی تعداد کم ہو تو شہریوں کی آزادی کا دائرہ وسیع ہوتا ہے۔

## Translation:

It is generally believed

The general perspective is that the <sup>laws</sup> Constitution of the country and the freedom of an individual are opposite to each other. Apparently, this perspective does not seem wrong. Every constitution/law <sup>imposes</sup> limitation on the citizens. <sup>more</sup> The number of laws is more the collective limitations will be. Freedom of an individual is suppressed under the more limitations. ~~Opposite to this~~ Contrarily, if there is less

numbers of laws then the <sup>extent</sup> circle of  
freedom of citizens ~~will be~~ is expanded.

You are allowed to submit only one question in one pdf. The remaining questions may be submitted in separate pdfs.

Precise:

## Freedom and Education: A Balance Act

There are 3 main school of thoughts about freedom in Education. One argues with absolute freedom, one with authoritative control while one argues with controlled freedom. But Rousseau is not agree with complete freedom as he considers it an individualistic approach. He emphasizes that education should offer suitable environment for development with citing importance of social co-operation. Moving on, a large population in a small area can only be emerge when education is inclusive. Education from a social stand-point view must equip in development faculties which children cannot acquire by themselves because when teachers allow freedom to people it ultimately gives positive edge.

Total words: 312

Precise words: 104-

## CSS - 2023

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

On the question of freedom in education there are at present three main schools of thought, deriving partly from differences as to ends and partly from differences in psychological theory. There are those who say that children should be completely free, however bad they may be; there are those who say they should be completely subject to authority, however good they may be; and there are those who say they should be free, but despite freedom they should be always good. This last party is larger than it has any logical right to be children, like adults, will not all be virtuous if they are all free. The belief that liberty will ensure moral perfection is a relic of Rousseauism and would not survive a study of animals and babies. Those who hold this belief think that education should have no positive purpose but should merely offer an environment suitable for spontaneous development. I cannot agree with this school, which seems to me too individualistic, and unduly indifferent to the importance of knowledge. We live in communities which require co-operation, and it would be utopian to expect all the necessary co-operation to result from spontaneous impulse. The existence of a large population in a limited area is only possible owing to science and technique; education must, therefore, hand on the necessary minimum of these. The educators who allow most freedom are men whose success depends upon a degree of benevolence, self-control, and trained intelligence which can hardly be generated where every impulse is left unchecked; their merits, therefore, are not likely to be perpetuated if their methods are undiluted. Education, viewed from a social standpoint, must be something more positive than a mere opportunity for growth. It must, of course, provide this, but it must also provide a mental and moral equipment which children cannot acquire entirely for themselves.