

Serial No.

384

D-PVFS-L-RCP

**ESSAY, PRECIS WRITING AND
COMPREHENSION**

Time Allowed : Two Hours

Maximum Marks : 150

INSTRUCTIONS

Question No. 1 is printed both in Hindi and English.

Answer to Question No. 1 should be written either only in English or only in Hindi.

Candidates must ensure that the medium of writing the Essay component is the same as indicated in the Attendance List and on the cover of the Answer Book in the space provided for the purpose.

Question Nos. 2 and 3 are printed in English only.

Answers to Question Nos. 2 and 3 must be written in English only.

Candidates should attempt all questions.

The number of marks carried by each question is indicated at the end of the question.

ध्यान दें : अनुदेशों का हिन्दी रूपान्तर इस प्रश्न-पत्र के पिछले पृष्ठ पर छपा है ।

1. Write an essay, in about **600** words, on any **ONE** of the four topics given below :—

- (a) Ways of improving the face of the Indian Police forces in the society.
- (b) Tolerance in international relations : a strength or a weakness ?
- (c) Climatic change is the result of human misdeeds.
- (d) The major causes of crime in today's world are not poverty and ignorance.

60

निम्नलिखित चार विषयों में से किसी भी एक विषय पर लगभग **600** शब्दों में निबंध लिखिए :—

- (क) समाज में भारतीय पुलिस बलों की छवि सुधारने के लिए उपाय।
- (ख) अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सम्बंधों में सहिष्णुता : शक्ति या दुर्बलता ?
- (ग) जलवायु परिवर्तन मानवीय अपराधों का परिणाम है।
- (घ) आज के संसार में अपराध के प्रमुख कारण निर्धनता और अज्ञान नहीं हैं।

60

2. Write a precis of each of the following passages (A) and (B) in your own words, reducing each to about one-third of its original length and suggesting an appropriate title for it. Write these (A) and (B) precis on the special precis sheets provided for the purpose separately, and then carefully fasten these sheets inside the answer-book.

Note : No marks shall be awarded if the precis is not written on the special precis sheets provided.

- (A) Everything almost depends upon first impressions; and these depend upon two things, dress and address, which everyone may command with

proper attention. These are the small coins in the intercourse of life which are continually in demand, and perhaps you will find at the year's end, or towards the close of life, that the daily insults, coldness or contempt, to which you have been exposed by a neglect of such superficial recommendations, are hardly atoned for by the few proofs of esteem or admiration which your integrity or talents have been able to expose in the course of it. When we habitually disregard those things which we knew would ensure the favourable opinion of others, it shows we defy that opinion, or consider ourselves above it, which no one ever did with impunity. An inattention to your own person implies a disrespect to others and may often be traced on less to a want of good nature than of good sense. If there is a tendency to vanity and affectation on this side of the question, there is an equal alloy of pride and obstinacy on the opposite one. Slovenliness may be an effort of resolution, but a graceful carriage requires an early habit, and in most cases, the aid of the dancing master. I would not have you, from not knowing how to enter a room properly, stumble at the very threshold in the good grace of those on whom, it is possible, the fate of your future life may depend.

(252 words)

- (B) You hear every day greater number of foolish people speaking about liberty as an honourable thing. So far from being that, it is, on the whole, and in the broadest sense, dishonourable and an attribute of the lower creatures. No human being, howsoever great and powerful, was ever so free as a fish. There is always something that he must

or must not do, while the fish may do whatever it likes. All the Kingdoms of the world put together were not half so large as the sea, and all the rail roads and wheels that ever were, or will be invented, are not so easy as fins. You will find, on fairly thinking of it, that it is his restraint which is honourable to man, not his liberty, and what is more, it is restraint which is honourable even in the lower animals. A butterfly is more free than a bee, but you honour the bee more just because it is subject to certain laws which fit it for orderly function in bee society. And throughout the world, of the two abstract things, liberty and restraint, restraint is always the more honourable.

It is true that in these matters you never can reason finally from the abstractions, for both, liberty and restraint, are good when they are nobly chosen; but of the two, it is restraint which characterises the higher creatures and betters the lower creatures. The power and glory of all creatures and all matters consist in their obedience, not in their liberty.

(255 words)

$20 \times 2 = 40$

3. Study the following passage carefully and then answer the questions that follow, accurately and precisely :—
From the very outset, philosophy came forward as a science, as the only science. The highest and the most certain knowledge was the aim which inspired its disciples. The fact that the question could be raised as to whether it was a science at all can only be understood in the light of the development of the specifically modern sciences, which came to fruition in the nineteenth century, mostly without the aid of, often in opposition, and finally in a spirit of indifference to

philosophy. When the demand was now made that philosophy should be a science, something different was meant from what was meant in earlier ages, namely, that it should be exactly like these modern sciences and equal them in the effectiveness of its results. If it could not do so, then it was said to have lost all purpose and might be allowed to disappear.

Some decades ago, it was a widely held view that science closed its innings when all the sciences split up into separate disciplines and left the bosom of this original universal science. After people had become aware of the true bases of the indubitable and universal validity of science, philosophy was said to have been found wanting in the light of these criteria. Its thinking was empty because its assertions were not subject to proof : it lacked the foundation of experience; its illusions were misleading; it sapped the forces which should have been employed in genuine research, diverting them to empty talk about universals.

Such was the picture of philosophy seen in the light of science as methodical, indubitable and universally valid knowledge. Could philosophy as a science hold its own against this attack ? There were two reactions. First, it was accepted that the attack was justified. The representatives of philosophy, therefore, withdrew to more limited problems. If philosophy is finished because it has given up all its themes to the sciences, there still remains the history of philosophy, first as a factor in the history of the sciences themselves, then as a phenomenon of intellectual history in general, as the history of the errors and anticipations, of the processes of liberation in the course of which it had made itself superfluous. The history of philosophy has finally, to

keep alive the knowledge of the philosophical classics which, although devoid of any scientific significance, are, nevertheless, worth reading for their style and general atmosphere.

Others followed the modern scientific outlook by rejecting philosophy as known hitherto, and tried to refound philosophy as a strictly scientific discipline. They, therefore, took up the problems common to all the sciences and which must, therefore, be reserved for philosophy. To regain its reputation, philosophy now made itself the handmaid of the sciences, imitating them and showing a humble willingness to serve them. The result of this first reaction appears to be held today that philosophy is just one science among others, one department promoted, like all the rest, by specialists, with its narrow circle of experts, congresses and journals.

Opposed to this view there was a second reaction. The attack on the existence of philosophy was countered by the total rejection of philosophy's claim to be a science. Philosophy, it was declared, was in fact not a science at all. It was a soaring emotion or longed for death observed with a wakeful eye. Some, indeed, went even further and claimed that it was beside the point for philosophy to bother about sciences since it had already recognised the futility of all scientific truth. The modern sciences were leading men up the wrong path, specially by reason of the disastrous effect of nationalism on the soul and on life in general. Philosophy, these men argued, was not a science but was precisely on that account in touch with the real truth.

Both the reactions seem to imply the end of philosophy. For whether submissive to or disowning science, in both

cases it ceases to be philosophy. In the last decades the apparent triumph of the sciences over philosophy has created a situation in which an attempt is being made to rediscover the true nature of philosophy from many different points of view.

Questions :

(Answer in your own language.)

- (i) What is the significance of the nineteenth century with regard to the development of modern sciences ?
- (ii) Why was the demand made that philosophy should be exactly like all other modern sciences ?
- (iii) What qualities of science were found to be missing in philosophy ?
- (iv) When there is supposed to be no scientific significance of the 'philosophical classics', why should these be read at all ?
- (v) What generated the view that philosophy is just one science like any other ?
- (vi) How did the people with modern scientific outlook try to establish once again philosophy as a strictly scientific discipline ?
- (vii) How did the people who rejected the idea of philosophy being just one science like other sciences counter that view ?
- (viii) What was the argument to establish that philosophy was not a science ?
- (ix) What has invited people to discover afresh the true nature of philosophy in recent times ?
- (x) Initially, what inspired the people to study philosophy as the truest form of science ?

5×10=50

Serial No.

D-PVFS-L-RCP

निबन्ध, सारलेखन और अर्थग्रहण

अनुमत्य समय : दो घण्टे

अधिकतम अंक : 150

अनुदेश

प्रश्न संख्या 1 हिन्दी तथा अंग्रेजी दोनों में छपा है।

प्रश्न संख्या 1 का उत्तर केवल अंग्रेजी में या केवल हिन्दी में लिखा जाना चाहिए।

परीक्षा देने वालों को सुनिश्चित कर लेना चाहिए कि निबन्ध घटक के लेखन का माध्यम वही है, जो कि उनकी उपस्थिति सूची में दर्ज है और उत्तर पुस्तिका में इस बात के लिए व्यवस्थित स्थान में लिखा है।

प्रश्न संख्या 2 तथा 3 केवल अंग्रेजी में छपे हैं।

प्रश्न संख्या 2 तथा 3 के उत्तर केवल अंग्रेजी में लिखना अनिवार्य है।

उम्मीदवारों को सभी प्रश्नों के उत्तर देने चाहिए।

प्रत्येक प्रश्न के अधिकतम अंक प्रश्न के अन्त में दिए गए हैं।

Note : English version of the Instructions is printed on the front cover of this question paper.