

1. THE GENTLEMEN OF THE JUNGLE

..... JOMO KENYATTA

COMPREHENSION 1

1. WHAT FAVOUR DID THE ELEPHANT ASK THE MAN ON A RAINY DAY?

On a rainy day, the Elephant asked the man if he could let him to put his trunk inside his hut to keep it out of the torrential rain.

2. ACCORDING TO THE MAN HIS HUT HIS HUT HAD ROOM ONLY FOR HIM.

TRUE /FALSE

3. HOW DID THE ELEPHANT SNEAK INTO THE MAN'S HUT?

The Elephant made a friendship with the man .one day a heavy thunderstorm broke out. The Elephant went to the man to ask him a favour to let him to put his trunk inside his hut. The man out of pity agreed to this. As soon as the Elephant put his trunk inside the hut, slowly he pushed his head inside, and finally flung the man out in the rain and this way the Elephant sneaked into the man's hut.

4. ACCORDING TO THE ELEPHANT, THE MAN CAN AFFORD TO REMAIN IN THE RAIN BECAUSE,

- a) The skin of the man is harder than any other animal.
- b) The skin of the Elephant is delicate
- c) The skin of the Elephant is harder than that of the man.

5. HOW DID THE LION DECIDE TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

The lion commanded his ministers to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to go thoroughly into his matter and report accordingly and thus decided to solve the problem.

6. WHAT KIND OF JUDGEMENT DID THE MAN EXPECT? The man expected an impartial judgement.

7. WHY WAS THE MAN UNHAPPY WITH THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION IF ENQUIRY? The man was unhappy with the Members of the Commission because they did not allow him to include a member from his side, in the commission.

8. WHY THE MAN WAS TOLD THAT ONLY JUNGLE ANIMALS WOULD BE ON THE JUNGLE COMMISSION?

The man was told that only jungle animals would be on the jungle commission because according to them, no one from his side was well enough educated to understand the intricacy of jungle law.

9. ACCORDING TO THE ELEPHANT, THE MAN HAD INVITED HIM INTO THE HUT

- a) to save his skin.
- b) to give shelter to his trunk.
- C) to save the hut from the hurricane.
- d) to fill the empty space in the hut.

10. IN WHOSE FAVOUR WAS THE JUDGEMENT GIVEN?

The judgement was given in favour of Mr. Elephant.

11. WHY DID THE MAN ACCEPT THE SUGGESTION OF BUILDING A NEW HUT?

The man accepted the suggestion of building a new hut because he had no alternative. He feared that his refusal might expose him to the teeth and claws of members of the commission.

12. HOW DID THE BUY PEACE FINALLY?

All the animals began disputing about their rights of penetration, and from disputing they came to fighting, and while they were all embroiled together, the man set the hut on fire and burnt it to the ground, jungle lords and all. Thus the man bought peace finally.

COMPREHENSION II.

1. WHY WAS THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY APPOINTED BY THE KING OF THE JUNGLE?

The commission of enquiry was appointed by the king to solve the dispute that arose between the man and the Elephant. The Elephant had occupied the man's hut and had thrown the man out from his hut. The man started grumbling on seeing what the Elephant had done to him. Hearing the noise, all the animals gathered to see what has happened. There was a heated argument going on between the Elephant and the man. By then the king Lion came there and roared at them that how dare they disturb the peace of the kingdom. The Elephant started narrating the case in his favour to which the man did not agree. The Lion who wanted 'peace and tranquility' in his kingdom, commanded his ministers to appoint a commission of enquiry to go thoroughly into the matter and report accordingly.

2. WHY DID THE ANIMALS DECIDE NOT TO HAVE ANYONE FROM THE MAN'S SIDE ON THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY?

The animals decided not to have anyone from the man's side on the commission of enquiry because no one from his side was well enough educated to understand the intricacy of jungle law. Further, that there was nothing to fear, for the members of the commission were all men of repute for their impartial justice and as they were the gentlemen chosen by God to look after the interest of race less adequately endowed with teeth and claws, the man might stay assured that the commission would investigate the matter with the greatest care and report impartially.

3. HOW DID THE ELEPHANT JUSTIFY ITS ACT OF OCCUPYING THE HUT? The Elephant justified its act of occupying the hut by stating his case in an authoritative voice to the commission of enquiry that he had always regarded it as his duty to protect the interests of his friends, and that appears to have caused the misunderstanding between him and the man. According to the Elephant, the man invited him to save his hut from being blown away by a hurricane. As the hurricane had gained access owing to the unoccupied space in the hut, the elephant considered it necessary, in the man's interest, to turn the undeveloped space to a more economic use by sitting in it himself, a duty which any of them would have undoubtedly have performed with equal readiness in similar circumstances.

4. Do you think the verdict by the commission of enquiry was on the expected lines? Why? The verdict of the commission was not on the expected lines. Because, the verdict is strange and that cannot be agreed on any ground. It seems to be baseless and cannot be appreciated and also it deviates from the legal law. The commission of enquiry keeps fooling the man all the time not considering his evidence or allowing him to state his case single time.

5. WHAT FATE AWAITED THE MAN EACH TIME HE BUILT A NEW HOUSE?

The commission of Enquiry gave the verdict that the man's hut would be occupied by Mr. Elephant and the man has to build a new hut. Having no alternative, the man did as they suggested. No sooner had he built another hut than Mr. Rhinoceros charged in with his horn lowered and ordered the man to quit. Again a royal commission was appointed to look into the matter, and the same finding was given. This procedure was repeated until Mr. Buffalo, Mr. Leopard, Mr. Hyena and the rest were all accommodated with new huts. This was the fate that awaited the man each time he built the house.

COMPREHENSION III.

1. Do you agree with the action of the man at the end? Why?

Yes we can certainly agree with the action of the man at the end. The man had been given an impartial justice, and was not allowed to state his case not even once. The commission of enquiry had allowed Mr. Elephant to state his side of case, who had justified his act of occupying the man's hut. All the time the judgement was in favour of the animals and not the man. The number of times the man built the hut, all the animals occupied it every time. The commission of enquiry had taken advantage of man's helplessness and his goodness. The man felt that it was of no use being good and to have patience any more. He could not tolerate the attitude of the commission of enquiry any more. The man was fed up of this act and waited for a right opportunity to teach them a lesson. While they were all embroiled together, the man set the hut on fire and burnt them to the ground.

2. 'AN ACT OF KINDNESS IS MISUNDERSTOOD AS WEAKNESS.' DISCUSS THIS WITH REFERENCE TO THE STORY.

This statement holds very good and true to this story. The good and noble man helped the Elephant by letting him to put his trunk in his hut. But once the Elephant put his trunk inside the hut, slowly he pushed his head inside, and finally flung the man out in the rain. The man felt bad at the Elephants act and started to grumble. There started a heating argument between the Elephant and the man. By then the king lion came there to look into the matter. The Lion then commanded his ministers to appoint a commission of enquiry to go thoroughly into the matter and report accordingly. But the commission of enquiry did not allow the man to state his case and gave an impartial justice. The Elephant was asked to occupy man's hut and the man was asked to build a new hut. The man who waited that his hut would be returned to him was not pleased with the impartial justice from the king and the commission of enquiry. He was not allowed to include in the commission a member from his side. He then obeyed the commission of enquiry and built another hut. But again Mr Rhinoceros occupied his hut and ordered the man to quit. Again a commission was appointed to look into the matter and same finding was given. This procedure repeated until all the animals occupied his hut one after the other. Now the man realized that his patience, goodness, humanity, kindness is of no value. The commission of enquiry had misused the man for their benefit. They considered his good qualities as his weakness. They had ill-treated him and fooled him. Neither the Elephant nor the commission had the grace to understand the kindness of the man when he had helped him the storm. They understood that the man could only grumble and protest but cannot do anything physically to evict the animals from his hut.

3. 'PEACE IS COSTLY BUT IT IS WORTH THE EXPENSE.' WHAT IS THE IRONICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STATEMENT?

THIS STATEMENT IS IRONICALLY USED BECAUSE THE MAN HAD TO LOOSE HIS HUT SEVERAL TIMES BECAUSE OF THE PARTIAL INJUSTICE. THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY ALWAYS FAVOURED THE ELEPHANT PERMITTING HIM TO OCCUPY THE MAN'S HUT. THE MAN HAD TO BUILD ANOTHER HUT AND EACH TIME HE BUILT A NEW HUT, THE ANIMALS OCCUPIED HIS HUT WITHOUT ANY CONCERN OF HIS GOODNESS, KINDNESS AND HIS HARDWORK. THEY TAKE HIM FOR GRANTED AND DO NOT VALUE HIS GOOD QUALITIES OR HIS NOBILITY. IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR THE MAN TO COPE WITH THE DOMINATING ATTITUDE OF THE COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY AND THE OTHER ANIMALS. HE WAS FED UP OF THIS AND WAS WAITING A RIGHT OPPORTUNITY TO END THIS HARSH TRIALS ON HIM.

PEACE IS HARD TO ATTAIN AND COMES WITH TRIALS. WHEN YOU MAKE IT THROUGH THE EXPENSE AND FINALLY HAVE PEACE, THEN YOU CAN SAY IT WAS WORTH GOING THROUGH. PEACE IS NOT THE ABSENCE OF WAR BUT THE PRESENCE OF HARMONY. PEACE GIVES US INNER TRANQUILITY. THAT IS WHY IT IS WORTH THE EXPENSE.

IN THIS STORY, THE MAN ATTAINED PEACE BY BURNING ALL THE ANIMALS IN THE HUT BUT AT THE END IT WAS NOT WORTH THAT HE HAD TO LIVE ALONE IN THE JUNGLE LIVING A TASTELESS LIFE.