

Q-2 Title: ~~Differing Views on International law~~
~~as a limitation on sovereignty of states~~

Behavior of individuals is governed by Municipal law while behavior of states is governed by International Law. However, International law lacks a central authority for its implementation because states are not subject to international law. Although international law is based on the consent of states, it is not above states. Therefore, some lawyers do not accept it as a law because it lacks power of sanction. Sovereignty of a state and international law are opposite to each other. For instance, either states are sovereign without international law or they are not sovereign in the presence of international law. This contradiction is resolved by saying that international law holds significance because of the states' consent. Thus, accepting international law is exercising sovereignty. For instance, the case of Wimbledon highlights that World Court did not violate state's sovereignty. Hence, its legality is debatable. For some, it is not a law, while for others, it can bring peace on earth if properly drafted by world leaders and

it is too third of original passage

lawyers. Neither of the views does justice to the international law.

Q-4 Correction:

(b) I am one of those persons who cannot describe what they feel.

(c) Of novel and poetry, the latter is more important.

(d) Reading poetry gives greater delight than reading prose.

(f) The professor and orator is dead.

(h) You do not need to rebuke him.

OR You need not rebuke him.

Q-5 Punctuation:

One day, a friend visited Hodja and said, "Hodja, I want to borrow your donkey." "I am sorry", replied Hodja "but I have already lent it to someone else." As soon as he said this, the donkey brayed. "But Hodja, I can hear the donkey! It is in the stable!" Shutting the doors in his friend's face, Hodja told him with dignity, "A man who believes the word

of a donkey above my word does n't deserve to be lent anything!"

Q-5 Prepositions:

(ii) Nowadays, Majid studies ~~for~~ the whole day.

(iii) Throw this pen ~~into~~ the dustbin.

(iv) He went ~~to~~ the desert.

(vi) The bird flew ~~over~~ my head.

(viii) In the examination, you have to answer all the questions ~~in~~ an hour.

Q-6 Idioms

Big Fish: Ali is a big fish of a pharma industry.

To burn one's bridges: Osama Bin Ladin burned all his bridges ~~in~~ attacking on America.

For Good: Ali goes to ~~gym~~ for good.


To cut the Gordian knot: Salma's CSS preparation would cut the Gordian knot this time.

At the top of tree: Sir Ali Asghar is at the top of tree in NAO's teaching staff.

Q-7

Translation:

Rise and fall is every nation's story. However, it requires resilience and national unity. After the second world war, Japan was under the toughest test of time. The two nuclear blasts had already destroyed two cities. However, for Japanese, the greatest incident was the insult of their king. The humiliating behaviour of General Mac Arthur that he used for the king fueled the spark of revenge in Japanese. Although not in the battleground, Japan continued to attempt in diplomatic and proverbial manner to defeat America in every other sector. At last, this nation, in a few decades, succeeded in achieving their lost position, again. This story has a great lesson for Pakistan.



Q-3

After reading this selection, do you have

(i)

a clear idea of what 'ad hominem' means?

After reading the selection, one gets a clear idea of what 'ad hominem' means. According to it, it is a logical fallacy used by lawyers or other people who cannot shake the argument, they abuse the person using this logical fallacy.

For example, Lincoln won the case from his opponent asserting that 'he does not even know which side of shirt ought to be in front.' Hence, ad hominem is a logical fallacy in which a person's personality is attacked rather than argument.

(ii)

How did Lincoln succeed in convincing the jury?

Lincoln succeeded in convincing the jury using a logical fallacy called 'ad hominem'. Instead of giving arguments in his case, he attacked the pretension of knowledge and his opponent's dress to demean him and win the case. It is said that his ad hominem has won the case for him. Thus, Lincoln

used ad hominem to win the case.

iv

(iii) How was Lincoln tactic 'non-malicious'?

In view of the result, does it matter whether the tactic was malicious or not?

Lincoln's tactic was 'non-malicious' in a sense that he used logical fallacy called ad hominem to win the case. The use of ad hominem did not appear malicious at that time. As far as the result was concerned, the case was won by Lincoln. Therefore, it does not matter whether his tactic was malicious or not, because jury's decision is final in court of law.

(iv) What risk did Lincoln take by using ad hominem? If you had been an opposing lawyer, how might you have countered Lincoln's move?

Lincoln took the risk by using ad hominem because the same could have been used against him during the case. Lincoln's move could have been countered by bringing him to

arguments regarding the case and exposing his use of ad hominem. Thus, winning would not have so easy for Lincoln if his ad hominem had been challenged, countered, and exposed properly by his opponent:

(v) Words	Meanings
Fallacy	Error in logic
Gleam	Brightness
Plaintiff	Police officer
Cripple	Division
Vicious	Severe, unethical

try to write in complete sentences please