

UGANDA MARTYRS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LAW
BACHELOR OF LAW
END OF SEMESTER EXAMINATION
YEAR 1. SEMESTER 1
ENGLISH LANGUAGE GRAMMAR ENG 1101

Time : 3 Hours

Instructions : Answer a total of 3 questions. Question 1 in Section A is Compulsory.

SECTION A

Question 1 : 40 marks

Read the passage and answer all the questions that follow.

The result of Rousseau's meditations was his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, published in 1755. It did not win the prize, but it brought him much notoriety and a swarm of attacks from philosophes and devout Christians alike. Voltaire was not the least caustic. "I have received, sir," he wrote to Rousseau, "your new book against mankind. You will please men when you tell them the truth about themselves, but you will not improve them. It is impossible to paint in stronger colors the horrors of human society, from which we in our ignorance and weakness expect so much consolation. Never has so much cleverness been used in trying to turn us into beasts ; it makes one feel like walking on all fours, when one recalls your work. However, it being more than sixty years since I lost the habit, I feel unfortunately that it is impossible for me to get it back, and I leave that natural gait to those who are worthier of it than you or I."

Palissot, in his sharply satirical comedy, *Les Philosophes*, grouped Rousseau with his enemies and represented him, much as Voltaire had suggested, walking on the stage on all fours, munching lettuce. The *Discourse*, then, was misunderstood, as too often it is in our own day, as an appeal for a "return to nature."

To ask how inequality came to be is to inquire how society came to be, since inequality is a social relationship. Rousseau's cardinal assumption, then, is that society " came to be, " as an act of human will, and that it is possible to conceive of a " natural man " living in isolation. On this assumption all the rest stands. If it is not historically true (Rousseau cautiously avoids the commitment to fact, though his reasoning proceeds as if his hypotheses were factual), it is at least a theoretical truth, both valid and necessary.

In the drama of the establishment of civil society, the villain in the piece is property ; from it grew all the inequalities and moral ills of mankind. But property itself was a rather late institution, one that “came to be “ as a result of increasing population, the discovery of metallurgy and consequent division of labor. To determine how all this may have developed, Rousseau paints an unforgettable picture of man in the “state of nature, “ and then describes the steps which led to what might be called a secular version of his “ Fall “ and expulsion from the “ Garden of Eden.” While much of Rousseau’s anthropology is false, some of it is his philosophy that is a constant provocation and challenge.

What is man ? What is nature ? These are the ultimate questions at stake. Rousseau tries to reconstruct the logic of human development. In so doing, he posits a “man “ who lacks qualities we consider necessary to the human status ; moral notions, language, thought, the need for others, and a continuing relationship with others. His “original man “ is human only by virtue of his feeling of pity, his freedom, and his fatal perfectibility (once again, the transposed myth of the Fall). Historically, this “natural “ man is completely artificial. Yet the picture has a strong appeal to our imagination, and upon it Rousseau builds his theory.

It is also possible to consider Rousseau’s natural man, although he never sates, as a pseudo-historical transposition of a psychological reality. This is the “original nature “ we bring with us at birth, before the awakening of moral responses and the molding process of social patterns. Again it might be objected that “human” beings have never existed and never could exist without others, nor, consequently, without judgments of right and wrong. This was the common eighteenth-century opinion. But Rousseau really escapes this criticism, since the creature he paints is admittedly not human, but pre-human, living “in a state of animality.” If we should object further that even this animal is a purely mythical construct, as unreal as a faun or a phoenix, Rousseau might reply that it is a necessary hypothetical construct for his purpose, leading to valid conclusions.

We must remember that Rousseau is striving to show that man, naturally good, has been corrupted and perverted by society. To demonstrate this, he must obviously find a way of revealing a man who is outside of society, and prior to it. Such then, is his artificial “natural man “ - “natural” only in the sense of a nature which is purely metaphysical, absolute, or essential. The real difficulty in Rousseau’s argument is that he cannot stay on this level. To make his point, he must also consider man in an empirical nature and in a historical order. His “trick” is to make it seem that there is no break ; that the historical man is the logical and actual development of the other, the abstract “original “ man. In the first situation, man is good, or at least, not evil ; in the second he is, inevitably evil. So the conclusion becomes inescapable : society has corrupted man !

extract from; Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *The Social Contract and Discourse on the*

Origin of Inequality (1967)

Questions :

From the above passage, write ;

- i. Two adjectives ----- and ----- **4 marks**
- ii. Two adverbs ----- and ----- **4 marks**
- iii. Write a word which is a synonym to each of the following words **4 marks**
-notoriety ----- (paragraph 1)
-villain ----- (paragraph 4)
- iv. Re-write the first two sentences of Paragraph 1 in the future tense. **6 marks**
- v. Using clear illustrations from the passage, explain the arguments Rousseau advances about the cause/s of inequality in man. **8 marks**
- vi. Develop the following topic sentence in a paragraph basing on your own **14 marks** experiences :
In the drama of the establishment of civil society, the villain is property.

SECTION B

Question2 : 30 marks

As a student, you are expected to read in order to excel.

- a. Explain the strategies you could use for reading textbooks. **15 marks**
- b. What would hinder you from effectively reading ? **15 marks**

Question 3 : 30 marks

- a. Explain the meaning of the term ‘ note taking ‘ **10 marks**
- b. What is involved in note making and why must a student make notes ? **20 marks**

Question 4 : 30 marks

- a. What do you understand by the term, ‘plagiarism’ ? **5 marks**
- b. In what ways can you avoid plagiarism in your writing ? **25 marks**

Question 5 : 30 marks

With adequate explanations, explain what is involved in ‘academic writing.’

Question 6 : 30 marks

Using ample illustrations, analyze the relevance of the course, ‘English Language Grammar’ to a student

at Uganda Martyrs University.

END