

## PASSAGE 4

Man is forever changing the face of nature. He has been doing so since he first appeared on the earth. Yet, all that man has done is not always to the ultimate advantage of the earth or himself. Man has, in fact, destroyed more than necessary.

In his struggle to live and extract the most out of life, man has destroyed many species of wildlife; directly by sheer physical destruction, and indirectly by the destruction or alteration of habitats. Some species may be able to withstand disruptions to their habitat while others may not be able to cope.

Take the simple act of farming. When a farmer tills a rough ground, he makes it unsuitable for the survival of certain species. Every change in land brings about a change in the types of plants and animals found on that land.

When man builds a new town, this means the total destruction of vast areas of farmland or woodland. Here, you have the complete destruction of entire habitats and it is inevitable.

It follows therefore, that every form of human activity unavoidably upsets or changes the wildlife complex of the area. Man has destroyed many forms of wildlife for no reasonable purpose. They have also made many great blunders in land use, habitat destruction and the extermination of many forms of wildlife.

Man's attitude towards animals depends on the degree to which his own survival is affected. He sets aside protection for animals that he hunts for sport and wages a war on any other creature that may pose a danger or inconvenience to him. This creates many problems and man has made irreversible, serious errors in his destruction of predators. He has destroyed animals and birds which are useful to farmers as pest controllers. The tragedy that emerges is that all the killing of predators did not in any way increase the number of game birds.

Broadly speaking, man wages war against the creatures which he considers harmful, even when his warfare makes little or no difference to the numbers of those he encourages. There is a delicate predator and prey equilibrium involving also the vegetation of any area, which man can upset by thoughtless intervention.

Therefore, there is a need for the implementation of checks and balances. The continued existence of these animals depends entirely on man and his attitude towards his own future.

Human nature is changing continuously since he was born. He played a key role in destroying wildlife and their habitats either directly or indirectly. Only few species were survive while most of them became extinct. A farmer also makes the land infertile and unable to live on it. A builder do the same for construction purposes. Every form of human activity disrupts the wildlife habitats without having specific reasons. The animals which are used for hunting and was, are provided with special care and protection. Man destroyed many useful animals. He kills animals which he considers as a danger. He also upsets the vegetation of an area. There must be system of check and balance to protect the animals which are endangered by the humans and it completely depends on them.

main idea is picked but there is no coherence in the content  
need improvement basic grammar  
not satisfactory  
write total words too  
5/20

(134 words)

Title:-

Protection of wildlife species  
from human activities.

title is written at the top  
nit the end  
and it is not written like  
a sentence  
max 2 3 words allowed

## Translation paragraph (CSS 2023)

An old man told that there is a ~~high~~ mountain across the forest, where that ~~flower~~ <sup>or</sup> ~~grows~~ <sup>grows</sup>, whose fragrance brings ~~their~~ <sup>the</sup> last vision back. But the mountain is very high and there are numerous rocks on it, ~~bushy~~ <sup>pointy</sup> bushes and large stones which obstruct the path. Many people came and went to ~~reach~~ on mountain but none of them could reach the flower. Perhaps, there is pain and trouble in the world due to this and man is in search of light.

6 / 10

## PASSAGE 2

As a matter of fact the rank and file of doctors (the common doctors) is no more scientific than their tailors: or if you prefer to put it the reverse way, their tailors are no less scientific than they. Doctoring is an art, not a science: any layman (common person who is not an expert) who is interested in science sufficiently to take in (understand and remember) one of the scientific journals and follow the literature of the scientific movement, knows more about it than those doctors (probably a large majority) who are not interested in research, and practice only to earn bread. Doctoring is not even the art of keeping people in health. No doctor seems able to advise you what to eat better than his grandmother or the nearest quack or one claiming to have medical knowledge falsely. It is the art of curing the illness. It does happen exceptionally that a practising doctor makes a contribution to science (my play *The Doctor's Dilemma* describes a very notable one): but it happens much oftener that he draws disastrous (very bad and harmful) conclusions from his clinical experience because he has no conception of scientific method, and believes, like any rustic (simple villager), that the handling evidence and statistics

needs no expertness. (Are Doctors Men of Science?) by G. B. Shaw. (218 words)

### Questions

1. How doctors are not true experts? (3)
2. How does the writer equate (place on the same footing) a common doctor with a grandmother or a quake? (3)
3. Why does or why can't a doctor draw useful conclusions from his clinical experience? (3)
4. What in your opinion is a common doctor? (3)
5. Suggest a suitable title for the passage. (3)
6. Write a précis of the passage in about one-third of its length in your own language as far as possible. (5)

(1)

How doctors are not true experts?

Doctors are not research experts. They are only practitioners, who earn money through their profession. Scientific researchers are specialized person having great interest in the research methods and they possess excess knowledge.

2)

Place on the same footing

The writer is equating a common doctor with a grandmother or a quake in <sup>such</sup> a way that the doctors are not sincere to their patients. They cure their diseases but do not keep the people in good health. That's why writer is saying that a person's grandmother or a quake can advise in a better way.

3)

Conclusions from clinical experience

The doctor ~~doesn't~~ ~~be~~ ~~able~~ ~~to~~ ~~draw~~  
is unable

conclusions from his clinical experiences because ~~has~~ he has less interest in it and ~~also~~ he has less ~~knowledge~~ about research methods and ways. He only ~~only~~ earn money by curing diseases.

sentences are too long  
need improvement in  
basic grammar

4)

### Common doctor

In my opinion, a common doctor is like a layman, who only visits hospitals and clinics, sees their patients, treats their illnesses and goes back to home. He has very less interest in searching scientifically. He considers himself as a practitioner only.

need improvement  
8/20

5)

### Title

The suitable title for this passage, is "importance of scientific research" ~~or~~ "the art of doctoring".