

Q.2. Make a précis of the hallowing text and suggest a suitable: title.

In studying the breakdowns of civilizations, the writer has subscribed to the conclusion – no new discovery! – that war has proved to have been the proximate cause of the breakdown of every civilization. Which is known for certain to have broken down, in so far as it has been possible to analyze the nature of these breakdowns and to account for their occurrence. Like other evils, war has an insidious way of a scaring not intolerable until it has secured such a stranglehold upon the eyes of its addicts that they no longer have the power to escape from its grip when its deadliness has become all too manifest. In the early stages of a civilization's growth, the cost of wars in suffering and destruction might seem to be exceeded by the benefits accruing from the winning of wealth and power and the cultivation of the military virtues; and, in this phase of history, states have often found themselves able to indulge in war with one another with something like impunity even for the defeated party. War does not begin to reveal its malignity till the war-making society has begun to increase its economic ability to exploit physical nature and its political ability to organize manpower; but, as soon as this happens, the god of war to which the growing society has since been dedicated proves himself a Moloch by devouring an ever larger share of the fruits of industry and intelligence in the process of taking an ever larger toll of life and happiness; when the society's growth in efficiency reaches a point at which it becomes capable of mobilizing a lethal quantum of its

energies and resources for military use, then War reveals itself as being a cancer which is bound to prove fatal to its victim unless he can cut it out and cast it from him since its malignant tissues have now learnt to grow faster than the healthy tissues on which they feed.

In the past, when this danger point in the history of the relations between war and civilization has been reached and recognized, serious efforts have sometimes been made to get rid of war in time to save society, and these endeavours have been apt to take one or other of two alternative directions. Salvation cannot, of course, be sought anywhere except in the working of the consciences of individual human beings; but individuals have a choice between trying to achieve their aims through direct action as private citizens and trying to achieve them through indirect action as citizens of states. A personal refusal to lend himself in any way to any war waged by his state for any purpose and in any circumstances is a line of attack against the institution of war that is likely to appeal to an ardent and self-sacrificing nature; by comparison, the alternative peace strategy of seeking to persuade and accustom governments to combine in jointly resisting aggression when it comes and in trying to remove its stimuli before hand may seem a circuitous and unheroic line of attack on the problem. Yet experience up to date indicates unmistakably, in the present writer's opinion, that the second of these two hard roads is by far the more promising.

Precis 2015

Title: The Destructive Nature of war

War is the ultimate cause of destruction of civilization. It is such a big disaster in people's lives without showing any kind of tolerance. In the developmental stages of civilization, the advantages gained through war in terms of wealth, authority and military might seemed to outweigh its destructive effects. Nations in past often involved in war with other nations. When society began to boost its economic and political potential, war has a great influence at this time. Because at the moment war destroys larger advancement of industry and intelligence. When societies enjoy ultimate growth, they become able to utilize all their resources for hard forces. Then war adopts cancer-like disease whose malignant tissues have to be removed before catastrophic disaster. After ~~also~~ realizing its negative relations between war and civilizations in the past, grave endeavors have been developed to evade from it. Salvation is only found in the person with consciences. He has

the choice to pursue his aim through direct or indirect actions. An individual's negation to engage in war, started by his state, could be taken as the antagonist of the war institution, which could invite self-sacrificing nature. However, peace efforts to achieve an aim could be considered unnatural way towards a problem. Nonetheless, after evaluating experiences till date, second option is far better.

Total words:- 641

Precis words: 216