

**PART-II**

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

**(15+5=20)**

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender without resort to those forces. It makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all of the Allied air forces in the Second World War. It makes no sense in an age when the deadly poisons produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by the wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn. Today the expenditure of billions of dollars every year on weapons acquired for the purpose of making sure we never need to use them is essential to keeping the peace. But surely the acquisition of such idle stockpiles, which can only destroy and never create, is not the only, much less the most efficient, means of assuring peace. I speak of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end of rational men. I realize that the pursuit of peace is not as dramatic as the pursuit of war, and frequently the words of the pursuer fall on deaf ears. But we have no more urgent task. Some say that it is useless to speak of world peace or world law or world disarmament, and that it will be useless until the leaders of those nations, perceived to be hostile by us, adopt a more enlightened attitude. I hope they do. I believe we can help them do it. But I also believe that we must re-examine our own attitude, as individuals and as a nation, for our attitude is as essential as theirs. And every graduate of this school, every thoughtful citizen who despairs of war and wishes to bring peace, should begin by looking inward, by examining his own attitude toward the possibilities of peace. First, let us examine our attitude toward peace itself. Too many of us think it is impossible. Too many think it unreal. But that is a dangerous, defeatist belief. It leads to the conclusion that war is inevitable, that mankind is doomed, that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. Our problems are man-made. So let us persevere. Peace need not be impracticable, and war need not be inevitable. By defining our goal more clearly, by making it seem more manageable and less remote, we can help all peoples to see it, to draw hope from it, and to move irresistibly toward it.

**Q. 3 Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions that follow**

**(20)**

Precis:-

title is too long

~~Title:-~~

Rejection of the Traditional  
way of Maintaining Peace

The writer ~~has~~ criticizes the traditional method of maintaining peace. As the world is moving towards the new face of war, almost billion of dollars are spend upon

DATE:   /  /  

the formation of nuclear armaments and the leaders call them nuclear deterrence; a new way of establishing peace. However, one cannot deny the fact that <sup>a single</sup> nuclear weapons ~~are~~ is ten times dangerous as the collective weapons used in the world war II. Similarly, the residuals of nuclear weapons can not only be devastating for our environment, but also for the generations yet unborn. Further, he says that maintaining peace is a task of rational men. Most people say that disarmament is not the solution, but a big change can be made if citizens starts looking at their own attitudes and try to maintain peace within themselves. In this way, a collective good can be resulted and a new hope with a fine goal can be emerged. Hence, peace is practicable by harmony and empathy for mankind, and thus war can be made evitable.

main idea is picked and discussed

over all content is fine

be precis and to the point

sentence structure and basics are fine

8/20

Total words = 429

Accepted = 160.