

C.P.F. - 2010

NO.

105710

C.P.F. (AC) Exam, 2010

A-DQG-K-FQD

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.

Questions No. 2 and 3 are printed in English only.

Answers to Questions No. 2 and 3 must be written in English only.

Candidates should attempt all questions.

The number of marks carried by each question is indicated against each.

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 :

60

- (a) 'Soft-skills' training for our security forces.
- (b) International cooperation on terror issues — a myth or reality ?
- (c) Pluralism in practice in our society.
- (d) The 'development vs. displacement' debate.

नीचे दिए गए चार विषयों में से किसी एक पर लगभग 600 शब्दों में निबन्ध लिखिए :

60

- (क) हमारे सुरक्षा बलों के लिए 'मृदु-कौशल' प्रशिक्षण ।
- (ख) आतंक के मुद्दों पर अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सहयोग — एक मिथक या वास्तविकता ?
- (ग) हमारे समाज में आचरण में बहुलवाद ।
- (घ) 'विकास बनाम विस्थापन' बहस ।

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 separately on the special precis sheets provided for the purpose, and then carefully fasten these sheets inside the answer book. 20×2=40

Note : Marks may not be awarded if the precis is not written on the special precis sheets provided.

(A) Our society is built with money for mortar : money is present in every joint of circumstance, since in society it is by that alone that men continue to live and only through that they can reach or affect one another. Money gives us food, shelter and privacy; it permits us to be clean in person, opens for us the doors of the theatre, gains us books for study or pleasure, enables us to help others in distress and puts us above necessity so that we can choose the best of life. If we have scruples, it gives us an opportunity to be honest; if we have any bright designs here, it is what will smooth the way to their accomplishment. Penury is the worst slavery and will soon lead to death. But money is only a means; it presupposes a man to use it. The rich man can go where he pleases, but perhaps pleases himself nowhere. He can buy a library or visit the whole world, but has neither patience to read nor intelligence to see. The table may be loaded and the

appetite wanting. He may have gained the world and lost himself; and with all his wealth around him in a great house, he may live as blank a life as any tattered scare-crow. Therefore, it is always a sound policy to cultivate an interest than to amass wealth, for the money will soon be spent, or perhaps you may feel no joy in spending it, but interest remains imperishable and ever new.

(256 words)

- (B) Military leaders have frequently been tempted to aspire to political leadership and have frequently succumbed to temptation. Yet the whole training and experience of the soldier makes him less rather than more fitted to be a politician. The soldier is trained to take action down certain well-defined lines, and has in his hand a military machine which responds immediately and with precision to his touch; the government machine is much less precise and exact than the military, and is not rapid in action even in highly skilled political hands. The politician is trained in weighing up the conflicting interests of his supporters and usually has to compromise; in war if a commander compromises on essentials, he fails. Furthermore, the time factor forces the commander in the field to adopt the best expedient in time available, which

is usually short. The politician, on the other hand, is seldom forced to give an immediate decision; rather he delays in order to find the right and accurate answer, and he avoids any temporary expedient. The one has to seize time by the forelock and adopt the best expedient; the other can procrastinate in order to ensure that what he does is absolutely right. In fact, the qualities required by a soldier and by a politician are almost at opposite poles, and few men in history have possessed both kinds of qualities. There have not been many soldiers who have also made good politicians, nor many politicians who have proved to be great soldiers.

(250 words)

3. Study the following passage carefully and then answer the questions that follow, accurately and precisely :

The age-old issues of 'pure' versus 'applied' knowledge can be stated as follows : should the scientist shut himself up in the ivory tower of pure theory, or should he plunge into the contemporary scene, either by enlisting his abilities in the service of industry or through personal participation in the turmoils of political and social action.

For the public at large, freedom is a valued prize, but for the scientist it represents an indispensable prerequisite for the progress of his labours; and a vital aspect of this freedom is his right to determine for himself the precise character of his personal vocation. He must be free to choose between the role of a pure scientist and that of industrial investigator, or scientist combined with politician, artist or philosopher. Nevertheless, liberty, like any other right, is at once limited and enriched by duty, and the scope of these obligations will be further outlined in the course of the following remark. Moreover, among the various roles which the scientist can occupy, some may legitimately be allotted a higher status than others. Thus, although one is seldom confronted with the choice, it may fairly be said that heroism is generally preferable to mere indifference.

Many scientists would favour an attitude of strict neutrality, which certain French thinkers in particular consider to be a logical extension of the principle of impartiality in scientific investigation. They would contend that scientific work should engage all the energies of those who devote themselves to it, and that

scientists have no right to curtail the time devoted to science, in the interest of other activities. The benefits which humanity has derived from the direct and indirect results of scientific investigation far surpass any possible achievement on the part of a single individual who devotes himself to public causes. It is better to exert oneself in furthering the progress of researches which will lighten the labour of millions than to improve the world through the work of one individual. The leisure hours of the scientist cannot be squandered without prejudicing the working of the sub-conscious mind, whose never-ceasing activity is reflected in the complete inability of great minds to concentrate on the petty details of their day-to-day existence. Truth demands a single-minded devotion; without it the calm serenity required for scientific work is fatally diminished, while the output of the investigator becomes superficial and the results of his labour are distorted by preoccupation with irrelevant issues.

In opposition to this doctrine of strict detachment we have the view that the scientist should apply his gifts to the issues of the day. Here we are told that the

scientist who remains isolated in his laboratory has lost all contact with reality and is engaging in the construction of systems which are bound to remain entirely fictitious. Why spend one's time in contemplating remote spheres or in historical reflections on the dim and distant past, while ignoring the whole range of reality in which we live and the whole framework of contemporary political issues ?

The scientist has, according to this view, no right to choose the subject of his researches entirely according to his own aesthetic likings; he owes everything to the community around him, where a multitude of less fortunate beings are engaged in raising from their meagre resources the means to support him in his studies and to pay for his laboratories and his leisure hours. He should be working for the good of mankind and devoting his leisure to becoming better informed on the issues which vitally concern his fellowmen. He should be their guide and their protagonist against injustice and the great scourges of mankind : pain, sickness, ignorance, war and poverty. And when the creations of science threaten to be the means of

destruction — as in the case of the nuclear bomb, or bacteriological warfare, or poison gas — the scientist must face the burden of his responsibility and not be content to evade it by the mere plea that these developments were not of his volition. Both these opposing views neglect one essential fact that the scientist is not in any position to ask himself whether he would enter the critical issues of his day.

Questions :

(Answer in your own words.)

5×10=50

- (i) What is the real meaning of freedom for a scientist ?
- (ii) What is meant by the statement, “liberty ... is at once limited and enriched by duty” ?
- (iii) What do some French thinkers argue with regard to scientists’ freedom in the field of scientific research ?
- (iv) Why do great scientists not think about their individual affairs of a routine type ?
- (v) What, according to the scientists favouring an attitude of strict neutrality, kills the calm of mind which is needed for work in the field of science ?

- (vi) What is the opinion of the people who do not accept the principle of strict detachment of the scientist ?
Why ?
- (vii) Why is there opposition to the study of the astronomical mysteries and the vague and remote periods of ancient history ?
- (viii) What, according to the second group of thinkers, should be the guiding principle for the scientists in choosing subjects of their research ?
- (ix) How are the fields of 'pure' and 'applied' sciences different ?
- (x) Against which afflictions and evils should the 'applied scientist' help human beings in their struggle ?