

PRECIS EXERCISE 2

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

The attention we give to terrorism often seems disproportionate to its real importance. Terrorism incidents make superb copy for journalists, but kill and maim fewer people than road accidents. Nor is terrorism politically effective. Empires rise and fall according to the real determinants of politics—namely overwhelming force or strong popular support—not according to a bit of mayhem caused by isolated fanatics whom one would take seriously enough to vote for it. Indeed, the very variety of incidents that might be described as "terrorism" has been such as to lead critics to suggest that no single subject for investigation exists at all. Might we not regard terrorism as a kind of minor blotch on the skin of an industrial civilization whose very heart is filled with violent dreams and aspirations. Who would call in the dermatologist when the heart itself is sick.

But popular opinion takes terrorism very seriously indeed and popular opinion is probably right. For the significance of terrorism lies not only in the grotesque nastiness of terroristic outrages but also in the moral claims they imply. Terrorism is the most dramatic exemplification of the moral fault of blind willfulness. Terrorism is a solipsistic denial of the obligation of self-control we all must recognize when we live in civilized communities.

Certainly, the sovereign high road to misunderstanding terrorism is the pseudo-scientific project of attempting to discover its causes. Terrorists themselves talk of the

frustrations which have supposedly necessitated their actions but to transform these facile justifications into scientific hypotheses is to succumb to the terrorists own fantasies. To kill and maim people is a choice people make, and glib invocations of necessity are baseless. Other people living in the same situation see no such necessity at all. Hence there are no "causes" of terrorism; only decision to terrorize. It is a moral phenomenon and only a moral discussion can be adequate to it. (CSS 1980)

DATE: 1/1

The attention has been given to 'terrorism' is different. It just gives content to journalists, kills less people than road accidents and not politically effective. Some incidents showed as terrorism but not investigated. Popular opinion gives importance to terrorism, as a moral fault ^{and} not treat it as a terroristic outrage. It opposes self-control which is required in civilized communities. Misunderstanding arises while discovering its cause. Terrorists themselves give justification of frustration which triggered their actions. However, other people living in same society situation have no such necessity. So, it is a choice. There is no cause behind it rather a decision to terrorize.

Topic :

Terrorism is a Moral Fault

PRECIS EXERCISE 3

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

"I was a firm believer in democracy, whereas he (D.H. Lawrence) had developed the whole philosophy of Fascism before the politicians had thought of it. "I don't believe", he wrote, "in democratic control. I think the working man is fit to elect governors or overseers for his immediate circumstances, but for no more. You must utterly revise the electorate. The working man shall elect superiors for the things that concern him immediately, nor more. From the other classes, as they rise, shall be elected the higher governors. The thing must culminate in one real head, as every organic thing must— no foolish republics with no foolish presidents, but an elected king, something like Julius Caesar." He, of course, in his imagination, supposed that when a dictatorship was established, he would be the Julius Caesar. This was the part of the dream-like quality of all his thinking. He never let himself bump into reality. He would go into long tirades about how one must proclaim "the truth" to the multitude, and he seemed to have no doubt that multitude would listen. Would he put his political philosophy into a book? No in our corrupt society the written word is always a lie. Would he go in Hyde Park and proclaim "the Truth" from a soap box? No: that would be far too dangerous (odd streaks of prudence emerged in him from time to time). Well, I said, what would you do? At this point he would change the subject.

Gradually I discovered that he had no real wish to make the world better, but only to indulge in eloquent Soliloquy about how bad it was. If anybody heard the soliloquies so much the better, but they were designed at most to produce a little faithful band of disciples who could sit in the deserts of New Mexico and feel holy. All this was conveyed to me in the language of a Fascist dictator as what I must preach, the "must" having thirteen under linings."

(CSS 1978)

PRECIS EXERCISE 4

DATE: 1/1

The writer of the passage believed in democracy and highlighted that Lawrence discussed fascism even before politicians. Lawrence was not in favour of democracy. He limited working men to elect superiors for their limited circumstances. He was against foolish republics and admired that all things must be culminate in single head. This is because he imagined himself as Julius Ceaser an elected king. He tried to preach reality to public to make them faithful. The writer discovered that his speeches were only to challenge the flaws but never to make world better.

Topic:

Lawrence as Julius Ceaser