

PART-II

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

(20)

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 appearing not intolerable until it has secured such a stranglehold upon the lives of its addicts that they no longer have the power to escape from its grip when its deadliness has become 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 long since been dedicated proves himself a Moloch by devouring an ever larger share of the increasing fruits of man's industry and intelligence in the process of taking an ever larger toll of life and happiness; and, 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.

being miserable is not miserable.

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

(5 x 4 = 20)

Knowledge is acquired when we succeed in fitting a new experience in the system of concepts based upon our old experiences. Understanding comes when we liberate ourselves from the old and so make possible a direct, unmediated contact with the new, the mystery, moment by moment, of our existence. The new is the given on every level of experience – given perceptions, given emotions and thoughts, given states of unstructured awareness, given relationships with things and persons. The old is our home-made system of ideas and word patterns. It is the stock of finished articles fabricated out of the given mystery by memory and analytical reasoning, by habit, and automatic associations of accepted notions. Knowledge is primarily a knowledge of these finished articles. Understanding is primarily direct awareness of the raw material.

 Knowledge is always in terms of concepts and can be passed on by means of words or other symbols. Understanding is not conceptual and therefore cannot be passed on. It is an immediate experience, and immediate experience can only be talked about (very inadequately), never shared. Nobody can actually feel another's pain or grief, another's love or joy, or hunger. And similarly no body can experience another's understanding of a given event or situation. There can, of course, be knowledge of such an understanding, and this knowledge may be passed on in speech or writing, or by means of other symbols. Such communicable knowledge is useful as a reminder that there have been specific understandings in the past, and that understanding is at all times possible. But we must always remember that knowledge of understanding is not the same thing as the understanding which is the raw material of that knowledge. It is as different from understanding as the doctor's prescription for penicillin is different from penicillin.

Questions:

- (i) How is knowledge different from understanding?
- (ii) Explain why understanding cannot be passed on.
- (iii) Is the knowledge of understanding possible? If it is, how may it be passed on?
- (iv) How does the author explain that knowledge of understanding is not the same thing as the understanding?
- (v) How far do you agree with the author in his definitions of knowledge and understanding? Give reasons for your answer.

Q2: Precis:

Title: • War and destruction of Civilizations

War is the major cause of destruction of civilizations. It appears in an abhorrent way, when it badly inflicted its victims. The sufferings of war might seem to be exceeded than that of its benefits. In this era, states have been living in the fear of wars without any exception of defeat. War reveals itself when war-making society begins to exploit physical nature to increase its economic value; organizes its man-political for political gains.

At this point, war becomes a cancer and proves fatal to its victims. In the past, societies have been made some endeavours to save ~~society~~ its citizens when the

relations between war and civilization has been pointed. Salvation could not be sought, but individuals have some option in the forms of direct and indirect actions to acquire their aims. A refusal to war against the institution of war, shows self-sacrificing nature whereas the acclimation of governments helps in removing the stimuli of wars. The second method is more achieving than the first one.

Q3: Comprehension

Q3: Knowledge is different from understanding because it is only attainable when an individual adjusts himself in a new experience in the system of concept on the basis of his old experience. In it, new experiences and old experiences go side by side. The success in a new experience is totally based upon old experience, whereas understanding comes when an individual

gets freedom from old experience.

Q2: Understanding cannot be passed on because it is an experience of ~~an~~ individuals. Experiences can ~~be~~ only be discussed. They have no adequate existence. So, they cannot be passed and never shared.

Q3: Yes, the knowledge of understanding is possible. It has many ways to pass and share. It may be passed through speech, writing and symbols. These communicable methods help to share the knowledge of understanding.

Q4: The knowledge of understanding is not the same as understanding because understanding is the raw material of that knowledge. The raw material never takes the position of products.

Q5: The author vividly described the difference between knowledge and understanding. Despite, he

proved their distinction with proper enunciation and elaboration. Therefore, the reader is profoundly agreed with the writer's definition of knowledge and understanding.