



Leaders Inn

Mock Exam 4, 2025

ENGLISH (PRECIS & COMPOSITION)

TIME ALLOWED: THREE HOURS

MAXIMUM MARKS: 100

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.
- v. No Page/Space be left blank between answers. All the blank pages of Answer Book must be crossed.
- vi. Extra attempt of any question or any part of the question will not be considered.

PART-II

Q. 2. Write a précis of the following and suggest a suitable title: (20)

For it obliges me to renounce my allegiance to the Darwinian theory of the Ascent of Man from the Lower Animals; since it now seems plain to me that that theory ought to be vacated in favor of a new and truer one, this new and truer one to be named the Descent of Man from the Higher Animals. In proceeding toward this unpleasant conclusion I have not guessed or speculated or conjectured, but have used what is commonly called the scientific method. That is to say, I have subjected every postulate that presented itself to the crucial test of actual experiment, and have adopted it or rejected it according to the result. Thus, I verified and established each step of my course in its turn before advancing to the next.

These experiments were made in the London Zoological Gardens, and covered many months of painstaking and fatiguing work. Before particularizing any of the experiments, I wish to state one or two things which seem to more properly belong in this place than further along. This in the interest of clearness. The massed experiments established to my satisfaction certain generalizations, to wit: 1. That the human race is of one distinct species. It exhibits slight variations -- in color, stature, mental caliber, and so on -- due to climate, environment, and so forth; but it is a species by itself, and not to be confounded with any other. 2. That the quadrupeds are a distinct family, also. This family exhibits variations -- in color, size, food preferences and so on; but it is a family by itself. 3. That the other families -- the birds, the fishes, the insects, the reptiles, etc. -- are more or less distinct, also. They are in the procession. They are links in the chain which stretches down from the higher animals to man at the bottom. Some of my experiments were quite curious. In the course of my reading I had come across a case where, many years ago, some hunters on our Great Plains organized a buffalo hunt for the entertainment of an English earl -- that, and to provide some fresh meat for his larder. They had charming sport. They killed seventy-two of those great animals; and ate part of one of them and left the seventy-one to rot. In order to determine the difference between an anaconda and an earl -- if any -- I caused seven young calves to be turned into the anaconda's cage.

The grateful reptile immediately crushed one of them and swallowed it, then lay back satisfied. It showed no further interest in the calves, and no disposition to harm them. I tried this experiment with other anacondas; always with the same result. The fact stood proven that the difference between an earl and an anaconda is that the earl is cruel and the anaconda isn't; and that the earl wantonly destroys what he has no use for, but the anaconda doesn't. This seemed to suggest that the anaconda was not descended from the earl. It also seemed to suggest that the earl was descended from the anaconda, and had lost a good deal in the transition. I was aware that many men who have accumulated more millions of money than they can ever use have shown a rabid hunger for more, and have not scrupled to cheat the ignorant and the helpless out of their poor servings in order to partially appease that appetite. I furnished a hundred different kinds of wild and tame animals the opportunity to accumulate vast stores of food, but none of them would do it. The squirrels and bees and certain birds made accumulations, but stopped when they had gathered a winter's supply, and could not be persuaded to add to it either honestly or by chicanery. In order to bolster up a tottering reputation the ant pretended to store up supplies, but I was not deceived. I know the ant. These experiments convinced me that there is this difference between man and the higher animals: he is avaricious and miserly, they are not. In the course of my experiments I convinced myself that among the animals man is the only one that harbors insults and injuries, broods over them, waits till a chance offers, then takes revenge. The passion of revenge is unknown to the higher animals. Roosters keep harems, but it is by consent of their concubines; therefore no wrong is done. Men keep harems, but it is by brute force, privileged by atrocious laws which the other sex were allowed no hand in making. In this matter man occupies a far lower place than the rooster. Cats are loose in their morals, but not consciously so. Man, in his descent from the cat, has brought the cat's looseness with him but has left the unconsciousness behind -- the saving grace which excuses the cat. The cat is innocent, man is not. Indecency, vulgarity, obscenity -- these are

1280 / 427

strictly confined to man; he invented them. Among the higher animals there is no trace of them. They hide nothing; they are not ashamed. Man, with his soiled mind, covers himself. He will not even enter a drawing room with his breast and back naked, so alive are he and his mates to indecent suggestion. Man is "The Animal that Laughs." But so does the monkey, as Mr. Darwin pointed out; and so does the Australian bird that is called the laughing jackass. No - - Man is the Animal that Blushes. He is the only one that does it -- or has occasion to. At the head of this article we see how "three monks were burnt to death" a few days ago, and a prior "put to death with atrocious cruelty." Do we inquire into the details? No; or we should find out that the prior was subjected to unprintable mutilations. Man -- when he is a North American Indian -- gouges out his prisoner's eyes; when he is King John, with a nephew to render untroublesome, he uses a red-hot iron; when he is a religious zealot dealing with heretics in the Middle Ages, he skins his captive alive and scatters salt on his back; in the first Richard's time he shuts up a multitude of Jew families in a tower and sets fire to it; in Columbus's time he captures a family of Spanish Jews and -- but that is not printable; in our day in England a man is fined ten shillings for beating his mother nearly to death with a chair, and another man is fined forty shillings for having four pheasant eggs in his possession without being able to satisfactorily explain how he got them. Of all the animals, man is the only one that is cruel. He is the only one that inflicts pain for the pleasure of doing it. It is a trait that is not known to the higher animals.

The cat plays with the frightened mouse; but she has this excuse, that she does not know that the mouse is suffering. The cat is moderate -- unhumanly moderate: she only scares the mouse, she does not hurt it; she doesn't dig out its eyes, or tear off its skin, or drive splinters under its nails -- man-fashion; when she is done playing with it she makes a sudden meal of it and puts it out of its trouble. Man is the Cruel Animal. He is alone in that distinction. The higher animals engage in individual fights, but never in organized masses. Man is the only animal that deals in that atrocity of atrocities, War. He is the only one that gathers his brethren about him and goes forth in cold blood and with calm pulse to exterminate his kind. He is the only animal that for sordid wages will march out, as the Hessians did in our Revolution, and as the boyish Prince Napoleon did in the Zulu war, and help to slaughter strangers of his own species who have done him no harm and with whom he has no quarrel. Man is the only animal that robs his helpless fellow of his country -- takes possession of it and drives him out of it or destroys him.

Q. 3. Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions given at the end. (20)

The objections to patriotic teaching are various. There is the objection which we have already considered that, unless the virulence of nationalism can be abated, civilisation cannot continue. There is the objection that it is hardly possible to teach civilised human ideals of conduct in an institution which also teaches people how to kill. There is the objection that the teaching of hatred, which is a necessary part of a nationalistic education, is in itself a bad thing. But over and above all these, there is the purely intellectual objection that the teaching of nationalism involves the teaching of false propositions. In every country of the world, children are taught that their country is the best, and in every country except one this proposition is false. Since the nations cannot agree as to which is the one where it is true, it would be better to give up the habit of emphasising the merits of one nation at the expense of every other. The idea that what is taught to children should, if possible, be true is, I know, very subversive, and in some of its applications even illegal. But I cannot resist the conviction that instruction is better when it teaches truth than when it teaches falsehood. History ought to be taught in exactly the same way in all countries of the world, and history text-books ought to be drawn up by the League of Nations, with an assistant from the United States, and another from Soviet Russia. History should be world history rather than national history, and should emphasise matters of cultural importance rather than wars. In so far as wars must be taught, they should not be taught only from the point of view of the victor, and of heroic deeds. The pupil should linger on the battlefield among the wounded, should be made to feel the plight of the homeless in devastated regions, and should be made aware of all the cruelties and injustices for which war affords an opportunity. At present, almost all the teaching is of a sort to glorify war. Against the teaching of the schools, the labours of pacifists are vain. This, of course, applies especially to schools for the rich, which are everywhere morally and intellectually inferior to schools for the poor. Children learn in school the faults of other nations, but not the faults of their own. To know the faults of other nations ministers only to self-righteousness and war-like feeling, whereas to know the faults of one's own nation is salutary. What English boy is taught in school the truth about the Black and Tans in Ireland? What French boy is taught the truth about the occupation of the Ruhr by coloured troops? What American boy is taught the facts about Sacco and Vanzetti, or Mooney and Billings? Owing to such omissions, the ordinary citizen of every civilised country is wrapped in self-complacency. He knows about other nations all the things they do not know about themselves; but the things they know about his country, he does not know.

Qno.1 What is patriotic teaching?

Qno.2 Why is "the teaching of hatred" a bad thing?

Qno.3 Do you agree what is taught to children should be true?

Qno. 4 Why should history be world history, not national history?

Qno.5 Should children be taught their own faults?

Men's Descent from Higher Animals

By the use of scientific method, it is proven that men have descended from the higher animals and in this course he has lost several characteristics.

This theory is proven through experiment and it also establishes that humans are a discrete specie with variations due to their ~~climate~~ environment, akin to quadrupeds. In addition, fishes, reptiles, and aves are more or less similar and are the middle links of the chain that descends from ^{the} higher animals to the man at the bottom. In comparison of men with other animals, man has an appetite for accumulation, and he gathers wealth more than he needs. For this purpose, he cheats his fellow naive kind of their savings, just for the satisfaction of his appetite. On the other hand, animals, at first do not accumulate resources, and if some of them do, they only gather limited resources for their future needs. In addition, man is the only animal that has a desire for revenge of the insult that he has borne; he takes it, but at an appropriate time. Moreover, man also uses coercion through law to keep concubines, unlike animals. Similarly, he has engendered vulgarity. Man during his descent from the cat, who is inadvertently immoral, has brought ^{its} loose morals, leaving behind ^{its} the unconsciousness of the cat. Although man covers his outerself, he speak obscence in his company. Moreover, man has some character that is unknown to any higher animal

and that is cruelty. He is the only animal that gains pleasure from inflicting sufferings to others. A cat unknowing of the suffering of the mouse plays with it, but man deliberately hurts his own kind. He pulls out the eyes of his captive; uses red hot iron against his own kin; skins alive his prisoners and burns families by locking them in a tower. In addition, contrary to the animals who fight individually, man organises mass killings. In a state of war, he exterminates members of his own specie, even those who have done no harm to him; he kills in cold blood and with no hesitation. Also, among animals, it is only man that loots and drives out his fellows of their nation. In addition, he organises mass killings for his entertainment, evident from the incident when man killed dozens of buffaloes for his sport, eating only one leaving other kills to waste. On the other, an animal kills only when it has a desire to eat, and does not plunder the excessive resources.

Words in Paragraph: approx. 1280.

Words in precis: 384.