



National Officers Academy

Final Mock Exams CSS-2026

January 2026

ENGLISH (PRECIS AND COMPOSITION)

TIME ALLOWED: THREE HOURS PART-I(MCQS): MAXIMUM 30 MINUTES	PART-I (MCQS) PART-II	MAXIMUM MARKS = 20 MAXIMUM MARKS = 80
---	--------------------------	--

NOTE:

- i. Part-II is to be attempted on the separate **Answer Book**.
- ii. Attempt **ALL** questions from **PART-II**.
- iii. All the parts (if any) of each Question must be attempted at one place instead of at different places.
- iv. Write Q. No. in the **Answer Book** in accordance with Q. No. in the Q. Paper.

PART-II

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

(15+5=20)

The modern worship of expertise has created a strange contradiction in our intellectual life. As knowledge becomes more and more specialized, we find ourselves less and less able to deal with the basic problems that face humanity. We turn to economists when we want to know about human welfare, to scientists when we seek answers about meaning and purpose, to technologists when we need to organize our societies, forgetting all the while that being an expert in one field does not make a person wise about life as a whole. The specialist, because of the very nature of his work, cannot help but develop a narrow vision of reality. He sees the world through the particular lens of his own discipline. To an economist, human beings are simply rational creatures trying to get the maximum benefit at the minimum cost. A biologist looks at the same people and sees them merely as carriers of genes trying to reproduce. A psychologist views them as collections of unconscious impulses and learned patterns of behavior. Each of these ways of looking at human life reveals something true, but each also hides something important, and yet we have got into the bad habit of treating these partial truths as if they were the whole story. This breaking up of knowledge into fragments has left us unable to handle problems that do not fit neatly into one category or another. Consider climate change, for example; it is at the same time a scientific problem, an economic problem, a political problem, a moral problem, and a cultural problem, but our institutions force us to tackle it piece by piece, with scientists, economists, and politicians all talking in languages that the others cannot understand. The medieval thinker, for all his ignorance, had something we have lost: a unified view of the world in which all the different kinds of knowledge fitted together into one coherent picture. Our intellectual world today looks like a broken mirror, with each piece showing a distorted reflection of part of the truth, and no way to put the pieces back together into a clear image.

What is more, the great authority we give to experts has weakened our trust in common sense and ordinary human judgment. We ask experts to tell us how to bring up our children, how to manage our relationships, how to be happy, as if these basic human activities needed technical training rather than the wisdom that comes from actually living life. This dependence makes us childish, turning us from active citizens who can think for ourselves into passive consumers who simply accept whatever expert opinion we are given. Getting back to wholeness in our thinking does not mean rejecting specialized knowledge, that would be foolish, but it does mean putting such knowledge in its proper place beneath a broader understanding of human life and values. We need people who can move freely between different fields of knowledge, bringing together ideas from various areas into sensible views on complicated questions. We need schools and universities that teach students to think broadly as well as deeply, to make connections across subjects rather than just digging deeper into one narrow specialty. Most importantly, we need to regain faith in the power of ordinary intelligence, shaped by culture and sharpened by thought, to make good decisions about the things that matter to everyone. Until we manage to put knowledge back together again, we shall go on being a civilization of experts who know more and more about less and less, brilliant at the details but blind to the larger picture.

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

(20)

There exists a fundamental misconception in the popular imagination regarding the relationship between tradition and progress, a misconception that has poisoned our discourse and impoverished our civilization. We have been taught to view these two forces as locked in eternal opposition, with tradition representing the dead

hand of the past seeking to stifle innovation, and progress representing the dynamic energy of the future breaking free from obsolete constraints. This simplistic dichotomy has led us into a dangerous intellectual trap. For what is tradition but the accumulated wisdom of generations who faced problems not fundamentally different from our own? And what is progress but change, which may lead forward or backward, upward or downward, toward enlightenment or toward barbarism? The equation of novelty with improvement is one of the most pernicious delusions of the modern mind. Yet to question this equation is to invite accusations of nostalgia, conservatism, or worse. Those who suggest that our ancestors might have understood certain truths better than we do, or that some old practices contained wisdom we have thoughtlessly discarded, are dismissed as romantics yearning for a past that never existed. But this dismissal itself reveals a profound historical ignorance. Every great renaissance in human history has involved not a rejection of the past but a creative reappropriation of it. The scholars of the European Renaissance looked backward to classical antiquity even as they moved forward into modernity. The great religious reformers grounded their revolutionary visions in ancient texts. Even scientific revolutions often involve the recovery of neglected insights from earlier thinkers. The pattern repeats itself: genuine progress requires roots. A tree does not grow taller by cutting itself off from its roots; neither does a civilization. What we call tradition is not a static repository of dead customs but a living conversation across generations, a dialogue in which the present interrogates the past and the past challenges the present. When we sever this conversation, declaring ourselves emancipated from history, we do not become free; we become rootless, untethered, vulnerable to every passing fad and ideological wind. The modern world is full of people frantically seeking meaning, purpose, and identity in exotic spiritualities, therapeutic techniques, and political movements, never suspecting that what they seek might be found in traditions they have been taught to despise. This is not to argue for blind adherence to tradition or against genuine innovation. Rather, it is to insist that the relationship between past and future is more subtle and complex than our crude categories allow. Some traditions embody hard-won wisdom and deserve preservation; others enshrine injustice and demand abolition. Some innovations represent genuine advances; others are merely fashions that will prove ephemeral. The difficult task, the task that requires real intelligence and judgment, is to distinguish between them, and this task becomes impossible when we approach it armed with nothing but simplistic slogans about tradition versus progress.

Questions:

- Q1. What fundamental error does the author identify in the popular understanding of tradition and progress, and why is this error considered dangerous? (4)
- Q2. How does the author use historical examples to challenge the notion that progress requires abandoning the past? (4)
- Q3. What does the writer mean by describing tradition as "a living conversation across generations" rather than "a static repository of dead customs"? (4)
- Q4. According to the passage, what paradox exists in the modern search for meaning, and what does this reveal about contemporary society? (4)
- Q5. The author argues that distinguishing between valuable traditions and harmful ones requires "real intelligence and judgment." Do you agree that such distinction is possible, or are we inevitably biased by our own contemporary perspectives? Justify your position. (4)

Q. 4 Correct any FIVE of the following sentences.

(10)

- i. The committee who were appointed to investigate the matter they submitted their report last week.
- ii. He has been living in this city since ten years and knows every corner of it.
- iii. Scarcely had I reached the station than the train departed from the platform.
- iv. Each of the students are required to submit their assignments before the deadline.
- v. He not only distributed sweets among the children but also among the elderly persons.
- vi. The number of unemployed graduates are increasing every year in the country.
- vii. The committee have been deliberating on the proposal since morning but has not yet arrived at any consensus.

Q. 5. A. Punctuate the following passage:

(5)

the minister addressing the gathering said my fellow citizens we stand today at a critical juncture in our nations history we must ask ourselves are we prepared to face the challenges ahead or shall we succumb to despondency and inaction dr ahmed the renowned economist had warned us last year that unless immediate reforms are undertaken the economy will collapse however his advice was not heeded now we find ourselves in precisely the predicament he had predicted therefore i urge you all to support the governments new economic policy which though painful in the short term will yield beneficial results in the long run lets not he continued repeat the mistakes of the past lets move forward with determination and courage

B. Re-write the following sentences (ONLY FIVE) after filling in the blanks with appropriate**Prepositions.**

(5)

- i. The judge acquitted him _____ the charge of theft.
- ii. We must abide _____ the rules of the institution.
- iii. He is deficient _____ common sense despite his education.
- iv. The principal presided _____ the function yesterday.
- v. The new policy is prejudicial _____ the interests of small farmers and landless labourers.
- vi. His conduct is not commensurate _____ his position and responsibilities in the organization.
- vii. The minister expressed his disapproval _____ the manner in which the enquiry was conducted.
- viii. The judge dispensed _____ the formalities and proceeded directly to the main issue.

Q.6. A. Use only FIVE pairs of words in sentences clearly illustrating their meanings.

(10)

- i. Venal, Venial
- ii. Deprecate, Depreciate
- iii. Mendacious, Mendacity
- iv. Prescribe, Proscribe
- v. Ingenuous, Ingenious
- vi. Appraise, Apprise
- vii. Councillor, Counsellor
- viii. Eminent, Imminent

Q.7. Translate the following into English, keeping in view the idiomatic/figurative expression.

(10)

ادب کی بھی معاشرے کا بھی ہوتا ہے جو اس کی اخلاقی اور روحانی حالت کی عکاسی کرتا ہے۔ جب کسی قوم کا ادب زوال پذیر ہونے لگے تو سمجھ لینا چاہیے کہ وہ قوم اپنے انجام سے دوچار ہونے والی ہے۔ افسوس کہ آج کا ادب بازاری بن گیا ہے اور اسے مافیہ نے اپنے چنگل میں لے لیا ہے۔ جو لکھاری پیسے کی خاطر اپنا قلم بیج دیتا ہے وہ دراصل اپنی ضمیر کو بھی فروخت کر دیتا ہے۔ حقیقی ادیب وہ ہے جو حق کی آواز بلند کرے اور باطل کے خلاف قلم اٹھائے، چاہے اسے کتنی بھی قربانیاں کیوں نہ دینی پڑیں۔ لیکن آج کے دور میں ایسے باحوصلہ قلمکار ناپید ہیں۔ اکثر ادیب اقتدار کی چوکھت پر سر جھکاتے نظر آتے ہیں اور اپنی تحریروں سے طاقتور طبقات کو خوش کرنے کی سعی لا حاصل میں مصروف ہیں۔

یہ ادب کے ساتھ خیانت اور قوم کے ساتھ غداری ہے۔