

ISC Class 12 History Specimen Paper 2

Written by the Future Topper subject team on the CISCE examination pattern. Not an official CISCE paper.
Found a mistake? Write to contactfuturetopper@gmail.com

Maximum Marks: 80 | Time Allowed: Three hours | Reading Time: 15 minutes

Both Parts are compulsory. Part I carries 40 marks and Part II carries 40 marks. This paper carries 80 marks, the remaining 20 being for the project work.

General Instructions

Write your answers on the separate answer paper provided. The first 15 minutes are for reading the paper and you may not write during that time. Both Parts are compulsory and must be attempted. In Part I, Question 1 is compulsory and you must attempt any three of the five questions that follow it. In Part II, Question 7 is compulsory and you must attempt any three of the five questions that follow it. No credit is given for a fourth question in either Part. Marks for each question, or part of a question, are shown in brackets. Answers should be in your own words and of a length suited to the marks offered, a one-mark part needing no more than a sentence and a four-mark part needing a short developed argument supported by evidence. Dates and the names of persons, treaties and places should be given wherever they are relevant. Where a question asks you to examine arguments on both sides, credit is given for presenting each side fairly, not for the side you prefer. No maps, diagrams, photographs or printed source extracts are used in this paper, and no map work is required.

PART I: WORLD HISTORY (40 Marks)

Question 1 is compulsory. Attempt any three questions from Questions 2 to 6.

Question 1 [10]

Each part carries 1 mark. For the parts that offer four choices, write only the option you choose. For the rest, answer in a single sentence or give the single word, name or date asked for.

- (i) The destruction of tea in an American harbour in 1773, in protest against British duties, took place at:
(a) New York (b) Philadelphia
(c) Boston (d) Charleston
- (ii) Name the fortress prison in Paris whose storming in July 1789 became the symbol of the French Revolution, and give the date on which it was stormed.
- (iii) The steam engine whose improvement made it suitable for driving machinery in factories was developed by:
(a) James Hargreaves (b) James Watt
(c) Richard Arkwright (d) Edmund Cartwright
- (iv) Name the canal opened in 1869 which shortened the sea route between Europe and Asia.
- (v) The assassination at Sarajevo in 1914 was of:
(a) King Alexander of Serbia (b) Kaiser Wilhelm II
(c) Tsar Nicholas II (d) Archduke Franz Ferdinand
- (vi) Name the organisation established by the peace settlement of 1919 to preserve international peace.
- (vii) The German political system established after the First World War, and overthrown in 1933, is known as:
(a) the Weimar Republic (b) the Second Reich
(c) the Third Republic (d) the Confederation
- (viii) State the year in which the Second World War ended in Europe.
- (ix) The military alliance formed by the United States and the states of western Europe in 1949 was:
(a) the Warsaw Pact (b) the Central Treaty Organisation

- (c) the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (d) the Comintern
- (x) Name the wall whose opening in 1989 marked the collapse of communist rule in eastern Europe.

Question 2 [10]

- (a) Explain the meaning of the phrase no taxation without representation as the American colonists used it. [3]
- (b) Explain three reasons for the defeat of Britain in the American War of Independence. [3]
- (c) Explain the difficulties the new United States faced under the Articles of Confederation, and explain the chief compromises reached at the Philadelphia convention of 1787. [4]

Question 3 [10]

- (a) Explain the position of the three estates in France before 1789. [3]
- (b) Explain the events of the summer of 1789 that brought the old order to an end. [3]
- (c) Explain the reforms carried out by the National Assembly between 1789 and 1791, and explain why the constitutional monarchy it established did not survive. [4]

Question 4 [10]

- (a) Explain three inventions that transformed the textile industry in Britain. [3]
- (b) Explain the part played by the railway in the spread of industrialisation. [3]
- (c) Explain how industrialisation spread beyond Britain in the nineteenth century, and explain the consequences of industrial rivalry for relations between the European powers. [4]

Question 5 [10]

- (a) Explain the difference between colonialism and imperialism. [3]
- (b) Explain three methods by which European powers established control over territories in Asia. [3]
- (c) Explain the forms taken by resistance to colonial rule in Asia and Africa before 1914, and explain the part played by the two World Wars in the coming of decolonisation. [4]

Question 6 [10]

- (a) Explain three causes of the Second World War. [3]
- (b) Explain three features common to Fascism in Italy and National Socialism in Germany. [3]
- (c) Explain the main stages of the Cold War from 1945 to the 1960s, and explain the reasons for its ending between 1985 and 1991. [4]

PART II: HISTORY OF INDIA (40 Marks)

Question 7 is compulsory. Attempt any three questions from Questions 8 to 12.

Question 7 [10]

Each part carries 1 mark. For the parts that offer four choices, write only the option you choose. For the rest, answer in a single sentence or give the single word, name or date asked for.

- (i) The battle of 1764 by which the East India Company defeated the combined forces of the Nawab of Awadh, the deposed Nawab of Bengal and the Mughal Emperor was fought at:
 (a) Plassey (b) Buxar
 (c) Assaye (d) Seringapatam
- (ii) Name the system by which Indian rulers were required to accept a British force in their territory and to pay for its maintenance, and name the Governor-General associated with it.
- (iii) The practice of sati was prohibited by regulation in:
 (a) 1829 (b) 1813
 (c) 1856 (d) 1891

- (iv) Name the reformer who founded the Arya Samaj and state the year in which he founded it.
- (v) The outbreak of the revolt of 1857 began among the sepoys at:
(a) Barrackpore (b) Kanpur
(c) Meerut (d) Lucknow
- (vi) Name the two Congress leaders of opposed views whose differences led to the split of 1907.
- (vii) Separate electorates for Muslims were introduced by the Act of:
(a) 1892 (b) 1919
(c) 1935 (d) 1909
- (viii) State the year of the Quit India resolution and name the city in which it was passed.
- (ix) The Lahore session of the Indian National Congress which declared complete independence to be its goal was held in:
(a) 1916 (b) 1922
(c) 1935 (d) 1929
- (x) Name the commission that recommended the reorganisation of the Indian states on linguistic lines.

Question 8 [10]

- (a) Explain three means by which the East India Company extended its territory in India after 1765. [3]
- (b) Explain the condition of Indian handicrafts under British rule. [3]
- (c) Explain what Indian writers meant by the drain of wealth, and explain the arguments made for and against the view that British rule retarded India's economic development. [4]

Question 9 [10]

- (a) Explain three measures of social legislation enacted in India in the nineteenth century. [3]
- (b) Explain the growth of the press and of political associations in India before 1885. [3]
- (c) Explain the aims and the work of three movements that sought to improve the position of the lower castes, and explain why their relation with the national movement was not always easy. [4]

Question 10 [10]

- (a) Explain the course of the revolt of 1857 in three of its principal centres. [3]
- (b) Explain three reasons for the failure of the revolt of 1857. [3]
- (c) Explain the arguments made about whether the events of 1857 should be described as a mutiny or as a war of independence, and state the evidence on which each view relies. [4]

Question 11 [10]

- (a) Explain three features of the Swadeshi movement. [3]
- (b) Explain the aims and the methods of the revolutionary nationalists. [3]
- (c) Explain the main constitutional reforms introduced between 1909 and 1935, and explain the Indian response to them. [4]

Question 12 [10]

- (a) Explain three contributions of Dr B. R. Ambedkar to the making of modern India. [3]
- (b) Explain the part played by women in the national movement. [3]
- (c) Explain the work of the Constituent Assembly, and explain the main decisions it took about the form of the Indian state. [4]

ANSWER KEY AND MARKING SCHEME

Marks shown at the end of each answer are the step marks an examiner would award. Answers are given in full so that a candidate may see what a complete response looks like, and a shorter answer that carries the same substance earns the same marks. Where a part asks for arguments on both sides, no mark is attached to the view the candidate holds, and the marks go to the fair statement of each position and to the evidence offered. Accept any correct alternative example, cause or consequence not printed here, and accept a date given correctly to the year where the answer does not turn on a closer date.

Question 1 [10]

- (i) (c) Boston. Men boarded the ships in the harbour and threw the cargoes of tea into the water in protest against the duty and against the privileges granted to the East India Company, and Parliament's punitive response followed.
Correct option 1.
- (ii) The Bastille, stormed on 14 July 1789. The fortress held few prisoners by that date and its importance was as a symbol of arbitrary royal authority, the crowd being also in search of arms and powder.
Bastille named, with the date 14 July 1789 1.
- (iii) (b) James Watt. His separate condenser and the later provision of rotary motion made the engine efficient enough and suitable enough to drive machinery, where the earlier engine had been used mainly for pumping water out of mines.
Correct option 1.
- (iv) The Suez Canal, which joined the Mediterranean to the Red Sea and shortened the voyage between Europe and Asia by removing the need to sail round Africa.
Suez Canal named 1.
- (v) (d) Archduke Franz Ferdinand. He was the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and his assassination in June 1914 was the immediate occasion of the crisis that led to the First World War.
Correct option 1.
- (vi) The League of Nations, whose Covenant formed the first part of the Treaty of Versailles.
League of Nations named 1.
- (vii) (a) the Weimar Republic. It took its name from the town where its constitution was drawn up, and it ended when Hitler came to power in 1933.
Correct option 1.
- (viii) 1945. Germany surrendered in May of that year, and the war against Japan ended a few months later.
Year 1945 given 1.
- (ix) (c) the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. The Warsaw Pact was the answering alliance of 1955.
Correct option 1.
- (x) The Berlin Wall, which had divided the city since 1961 and whose opening in November 1989 came in the midst of the revolutions that ended communist rule in eastern Europe.
Berlin Wall named 1.

Question 2 [10]

- (a) The phrase expressed a constitutional principle rather than an objection to the amount of the tax. The colonists held that an Englishman could be taxed only by a body in which he was represented, that this was an ancient right established in England itself and that it had been carried across the Atlantic with them; their own elected assemblies had voted their taxes for generations, and they claimed that the British Parliament, in which they elected no member, had no authority to tax them. The British answer was the doctrine of virtual representation, that members of Parliament represented the whole empire and not merely the constituencies that elected them, and that the colonists were represented in that sense as were many Englishmen who had no vote. The colonists rejected this, holding that representation must be actual and must involve a member answerable to those he taxed, and the practical point behind the principle was that a Parliament which could tax them without their consent could take as much as it pleased and they would have no means of resisting.

They drew a distinction, at least at first, between external taxation, in the form of duties regulating the trade of the empire, which they were prepared to accept as a matter of imperial regulation, and internal taxation for the purpose of raising revenue, which they held to be the business of their own assemblies alone. The significance of insisting on the principle was that it could not be met by concession of the amount, which is why the repeal of most of the duties did not end the quarrel, and why the retention of a single duty on tea, kept to assert the right, provoked the resistance it did.

The principle that taxation requires consent through an elected representative body 1. The colonial assemblies' claim to the sole power of taxation, against the British doctrine of virtual representation 1. The distinction between regulation of trade and taxation for revenue, with the point that the dispute was about the right and not the amount 1.

- (b) First, the difficulties of distance and of terrain. Britain had to transport men, horses, arms and provisions across three thousand miles of ocean, with a voyage of many weeks, so reinforcement and supply were slow and expensive and commanders had to act on instructions months out of date. The country itself was vast, heavily wooded and thinly settled, with few roads and no single centre whose capture would end the war; the British took New York, Philadelphia and Charleston in turn without decisive effect, because there was no capital whose fall would compel surrender. Second, the nature of the opposition and the problem of holding ground. The British had the better army and command of the sea for most of the war, but a conventional army cannot occupy a country whose population is hostile: Washington's strategy was to preserve his force rather than to risk it, so he avoided decisive battle, withdrew when pressed and kept the war going, and the militia harassed detachments and supply columns and made the countryside unsafe wherever the main army was not present. Loyalist support, on which British plans in the south depended, proved smaller and less effective than expected. Third, foreign intervention and the widening of the war. France entered in 1778 after the American success at Saratoga, followed by Spain and the Netherlands, and the war became a general one in which Britain had to defend the West Indies, Gibraltar and her other interests and faced a combination of fleets, so that she lost the unquestioned command of the sea on which everything else depended. The French supplied money, arms, officers and troops, and it was the French fleet's control of the Chesapeake that cut off Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781 and made his surrender inevitable. To these may be added divided opinion in Britain, where the war was never popular with the whole political nation and where opposition grew as the cost rose, and the errors of British commanders, whose plans were poorly coordinated between one another and with London.

The difficulties of distance, supply and the absence of a decisive centre 1. The character of the opposition, with Washington's avoidance of decisive battle and the hostility of the population 1. Foreign intervention, with the French alliance and the loss of command of the sea at Yorktown 1.

- (c) The Articles of Confederation, in force from 1781, established a league of states rather than a government. The Congress had no power to tax and could only request contributions from the states, which frequently did not pay, so it could neither discharge the debts of the war nor maintain an army; it had no power to regulate commerce, so the states taxed one another's goods and made their own arrangements with foreign countries, and British and other governments found there was no single authority with whom to deal; there was no national executive and no national judiciary, so laws could not be enforced and disputes between states had no forum; each state had a single vote regardless of size, the more important measures required the assent of nine states and amendment of the Articles required unanimity, which made reform almost impossible; and the states issued their own currencies and conducted their own policies on debt, which produced confusion in trade and resentment between them. The weakness was brought home by an armed rising of indebted farmers in Massachusetts in 1786 and 1787, which the state suppressed with difficulty and which the Congress was powerless to assist in putting down, and by the inability of the Confederation to secure the frontiers or to make the British evacuate the western posts. These difficulties persuaded the states to send delegates to Philadelphia in 1787, nominally to revise the Articles, and the convention proceeded instead to frame a new constitution. The chief compromises reached there were these. The first concerned representation. The larger states wished representation in the legislature to be by population, which would give them control; the smaller wished each state to have an equal voice, as under the Articles. The compromise, associated with the Connecticut delegation, created a legislature of two chambers, the House of Representatives apportioned by population and the Senate with two members from each state, and required

the assent of both to legislation, so that neither principle was abandoned. The second concerned slavery and its relation to representation and taxation. The southern states wished the enslaved population to be counted in determining their representation but not in assessing their contribution to direct taxation, the northern the opposite. The convention settled on a formula by which three-fifths of that population was counted for both purposes; it further provided that the importation of slaves could not be prohibited for twenty years, and it required the return of persons escaping from service in one state to another. These provisions, which the Constitution stated without using the word slave, postponed rather than resolved the question, and the conflict it contained issued in civil war two generations later. The third concerned the powers of the federal government against those of the states. The federal government was given enumerated powers, over commerce, currency, war and foreign relations and the levying of taxes, together with the authority to make laws necessary to carry them out, and federal law was declared supreme; the states retained the residue, a point afterwards made explicit by amendment. The fourth concerned the executive and the manner of his election. Direct popular election was distrusted and election by the legislature was thought to make the executive dependent on it, so the device of an electoral college was adopted, with each state choosing electors in such manner as its own legislature directed, and the president was given a fixed term, a veto over legislation and the command of the forces, while the Senate was given a part in appointments and in treaties. The ratification itself required a further accommodation, since the Constitution contained no declaration of rights and several states ratified only on the understanding that one would be added, which was done by the first amendments shortly afterwards.

The weaknesses of the Articles, including the absence of power to tax and to regulate commerce and the lack of an executive and a judiciary 1. The compromise over representation, producing a bicameral legislature 1. The compromise over slavery, with the counting of three-fifths of the enslaved population and the postponement of the question 1. The division of powers between the federal government and the states, with the electoral college or the addition of a bill of rights 1.

Question 3 [10]

- (a) French society before the Revolution was divided in law into three estates. The First Estate was the clergy, numbering perhaps a hundred and thirty thousand in a population of some twenty-six million. The church held very extensive lands, perhaps a tenth of the soil of France, collected the tithe from the produce of the peasantry, was exempt from the principal direct taxes and instead made a voluntary grant to the Crown at intervals, and it administered its own courts, hospitals, schools and charities. The estate was itself deeply divided: the bishops and abbots were drawn almost entirely from the nobility and lived on large revenues, while the parish clergy were poor, were close to the people of their villages and sided with the Third Estate in 1789. The Second Estate was the nobility, numbering perhaps four hundred thousand. Its members were exempt from the chief direct tax, held the great majority of the higher posts in the army, the church, the courts and the administration, enjoyed the right to collect dues and services from the peasants on their estates and the exclusive right of hunting, and had their own jurisdictions; this estate too was divided between the great families of the court, who lived on pensions and offices, and the much poorer provincial nobility, and between the nobility of the sword, whose titles were ancient, and the nobility of the robe, which had acquired its status through judicial office. The Third Estate was everyone else, some ninety-five per cent of the population, and it was not a class but a residue containing very different conditions. At its head stood the bourgeoisie, the merchants, bankers, manufacturers, lawyers, doctors and officials, who were often wealthy, educated and acquainted with the ideas of the Enlightenment, and whose grievance was not poverty but exclusion from the offices and the honours reserved to birth. Below them were the artisans and shopkeepers of the towns and the urban wage earners, whose condition depended directly on the price of bread. The great majority were peasants, among whom there were proprietors, tenants, sharecroppers and landless labourers; they bore the land tax, the tithe and the feudal dues and services, paid the indirect taxes including the hated tax on salt, and were liable for labour on the roads. The whole burden of direct taxation thus fell on the estate least able to bear it, while the two privileged estates, holding most of the land and almost all the offices, were substantially exempt, and the Estates General, which had not met since 1614, was so constituted that the two privileged orders could outvote the third.

The clergy described, with its lands, the tithe, its tax exemption and its internal division 1. The nobility described, with its exemptions, its monopoly of high office and its feudal dues 1. The Third Estate described, with the bourgeoisie, the urban workers and the peasantry, and the inequity of the fiscal burden 1.

- (b) The Estates General met at Versailles in May 1789. The question of procedure decided everything: the Third Estate, whose number of deputies had been doubled, demanded that the three orders meet and vote together, since separate voting by order would allow the clergy and nobility to outvote it, and the Crown would not decide. After six weeks of deadlock the Third Estate declared itself in June the National Assembly, claiming to represent the nation and inviting the other orders to join it, and a number of parish clergy and some nobles did so. Finding its hall closed a few days later, the deputies assembled in an indoor tennis court and swore not to separate until they had given France a constitution, which is known as the Tennis Court Oath; the king, after attempting to annul their proceedings, gave way and directed the orders to sit together, and the body took the name of the National Constituent Assembly. Events in Paris then determined the outcome. The dismissal of the popular minister Necker, the concentration of troops around the capital and the high price of bread convinced the city that the Assembly was to be dispersed by force; crowds searched for arms, and on 14 July they stormed the Bastille, a royal fortress and prison that stood as the symbol of arbitrary authority. The king withdrew the troops and accepted what had happened, and the municipal government of Paris and a National Guard were formed. Through the latter part of July the countryside rose in what is called the Great Fear, peasants attacking chateaux, burning the registers in which their dues and obligations were recorded and seizing land, driven by rumour, by scarcity and by the hope that the old obligations were at an end. The Assembly, unable to suppress the rising and partly in sympathy with it, responded on the night of 4 August by abolishing the feudal regime: dues and services, serfdom where it survived, the tithe, the privileges of the provinces and the exemptions from taxation were surrendered in a single sitting, the nobles present renouncing their rights in a remarkable scene, though provision for compensation was added afterwards and had later to be abandoned. At the end of the month the Assembly adopted the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. In October, a crowd of women from the markets of Paris, provoked by the price and scarcity of bread, marched to Versailles and brought the king and the royal family back to Paris, where they lived thereafter under the eye of the city, and the Assembly followed them. By the end of that summer the privileged orders had been abolished, sovereignty had been transferred in principle from the king to the nation, and the initiative had passed from Versailles to Paris and to the countryside.

The deadlock over voting by order and the formation of the National Assembly with the Tennis Court Oath 1. The storming of the Bastille on 14 July and the peasant rising in the countryside 1. The abolition of the feudal regime on 4 August and the Declaration of Rights, with the removal of the king to Paris in October 1.

- (c) The National Assembly carried out a reconstruction of France between 1789 and 1791. Politically, it produced the constitution of 1791, which established a constitutional monarchy: the king retained the executive power and a suspensive veto but became an officer of the nation rather than its sovereign, legislative power was vested in a single elected assembly, and the Declaration of Rights was placed at the head of the document. The franchise, however, was restricted by a property qualification, citizens being divided into active and passive, and only active citizens voted; this limitation was criticised at once as a contradiction of the Declaration. Administratively, the old provinces with their varying laws, privileges and jurisdictions were swept away and France was divided into departments of roughly equal size, subdivided into districts and communes, with elected local authorities, which produced a uniform administration for the first time. Legally, the old courts and the venal judicial offices were abolished, judges were made elective, the use of torture and the arbitrary letters of imprisonment were ended, trial by jury was introduced in criminal cases, and work was begun on a uniform code. Economically, internal customs barriers, guild restrictions and the hated tax on salt were abolished, taxation was reorganised on a uniform basis to be paid by everyone, and a uniform system of weights and measures was set in train. To meet the financial crisis the Assembly confiscated the lands of the church, declared them the property of the nation and issued paper notes against them, and it reorganised the church itself by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which reduced the number of dioceses to match the departments, made bishops and priests salaried officials elected by the citizens of their districts and severed the authority of the Pope over appointments. The constitutional monarchy did not survive, for several connected reasons. The religious settlement divided the country. The Assembly required the clergy to swear an oath to the Civil Constitution; about half refused, the Pope condemned the measure, and France was split

between a constitutional church and a refractory one, which turned devout peasants, who had gained by the abolition of the dues, against the Revolution and gave the counter-revolution a popular base it had not previously had. The king's own position became untenable. Louis XVI had accepted the settlement under compulsion and had never reconciled himself to it; he was a devout man who regarded the religious legislation as sinful, and in June 1791 he attempted to leave the country with his family and was stopped at Varennes and brought back. The flight destroyed the credibility of a constitution that rested on a king who had tried to escape it, and republican opinion, hitherto small, became a serious force. The restricted franchise and the economic distress alienated the urban poor, who had made the revolution of July 1789 and who found themselves excluded from the constitution and still short of bread; the clubs and the sections of Paris became centres of pressure on the Assembly from the left, while emigre nobles abroad worked for intervention and the Assembly contained no organised party capable of governing. War was decisive. The declaration of war on Austria in April 1792, urged by those who believed it would either expose the king or spread the Revolution, brought military disaster, invasion and the suspicion that the court was in communication with the enemy; the manifesto threatening Paris with destruction if the royal family were harmed confirmed that suspicion, and in August the Tuileries was stormed, the monarchy was suspended and a new assembly elected by universal male suffrage was summoned, which declared the republic in September. The constitutional monarchy had lasted less than a year in operation.

The constitution of 1791 with its restricted franchise, and the administrative reorganisation into departments 1. The legal and economic reforms, including the abolition of guilds and internal barriers and the reform of taxation and justice 1. The confiscation of church lands and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, with the division it produced 1. The reasons for the failure, including the king's flight to Varennes, the exclusion of the urban poor and the effect of the war, leading to the fall of the monarchy in 1792 1.

Question 4 [10]

- (a) First, the flying shuttle, devised by John Kay, which allowed a weaver to throw the shuttle across the loom mechanically instead of passing it by hand. It roughly doubled the speed of weaving and made it possible for one man to weave a broad cloth alone, and by increasing the weaver's output it created a shortage of yarn, which drove the search for better spinning machinery; the sequence by which an improvement in one process creates pressure on the next is characteristic of the whole industrial revolution. Second, the spinning machines. The spinning jenny of James Hargreaves allowed one worker to spin several threads at once on a hand-driven frame, and it could be used in a cottage; the water frame of Richard Arkwright produced a stronger yarn and was driven by a water wheel, which meant it had to be housed in a mill beside a stream and so helped to create the factory; and the mule of Samuel Crompton combined the principles of the two and produced yarn both fine and strong, suitable for the best cloth, which allowed Britain to compete with the finest Indian muslins. The shortage of yarn was thereby turned into a surplus. Third, the power loom of Edmund Cartwright, which applied power to weaving and in its improved forms transferred weaving from the cottage to the mill, and alongside it the cotton gin, invented in America, which separated the fibre from the seed rapidly and so vastly increased the supply of raw cotton. The series was completed by the application of the steam engine, which freed the mills from the need to stand beside running water and allowed them to be built on the coalfields and in the towns, and by machines for carding, printing and finishing. The combined effect was to multiply output many times over, to shift the industry from the household to the factory, to concentrate it in Lancashire and to destroy the hand spinning and in time the hand weaving by which large numbers had lived, in Britain and still more in India.

The flying shuttle and its effect in creating a shortage of yarn 1. The spinning machines, with at least two correctly named and described 1. The power loom, with the application of steam power or the cotton gin, and the general consequence for the location and scale of the industry 1.

- (b) The railway was both a product of industrialisation and one of the chief means by which it spread. Its effect on transport was the most obvious. Before it, goods moved by road at the pace of a horse and by river and canal cheaply but slowly and only where water ran; the railway carried heavy and bulky freight overland at speeds previously impossible and at falling cost, so coal, ore, grain, timber and finished goods could be moved far from where they were produced, and the market for a manufacturer ceased to be local. Perishable goods could be carried, which altered the food supply of the growing towns, and the movement of people on a scale

never seen before made labour mobile, so that workers could reach the places where industry was expanding. Its effect on industry itself was as important. The construction of railways consumed iron and later steel in enormous quantities, for rails, bridges, locomotives and rolling stock, and consumed coal both in making the iron and in running the trains, so the industries that supplied them grew with them; the demand for locomotives and machinery developed engineering and the machine tool trades, and the precision and the organisation that railway building required raised the general level of technical skill. It drew capital on a new scale: railways were too expensive for individual proprietors, so they were financed by joint stock companies selling shares to the public, which developed the capital market and the practices of company finance and management, and they required large organisations with hierarchies of salaried staff, timetables, telegraphs and standard time, which were among the first modern business corporations. Its effect beyond Britain was to carry industrialisation outwards. British engineers, contractors, rails and locomotives built railways in Europe, in the Americas, in India and elsewhere, and where railways went, mines, mills and towns followed; in Europe and North America the railway unified national markets and made industrialisation on a continental scale possible, and the United States and Germany both built the systems on which their industrial rise rested. In the colonies the effect was different and has been much debated: railways were laid out to carry raw materials from the interior to the ports and manufactures inland, were financed by loans on which a return was guaranteed out of local revenues, and they integrated these territories into the world economy as suppliers rather than as manufacturers, so the same instrument that industrialised one region commercialised another without industrialising it.

The effect on transport, with cheap and rapid movement of heavy goods and of people 1. The effect on industry, with the demand for coal, iron and engineering and the development of joint stock finance and large organisations 1. The spread of industrialisation abroad through railway building, with the different effect in the colonies 1.

- (c) Industrialisation spread from Britain to the Continent and beyond in the course of the nineteenth century, and the manner of its spread differed from the British case. Belgium, with coal and iron and an established textile trade, was the first on the Continent. France industrialised more slowly and unevenly, hampered by a slower growth of population, by the structure of her agriculture and by scattered resources, but developed textiles, iron and railways. The German states, after the customs union removed internal barriers and above all after unification in 1871, industrialised with great rapidity on the coal and iron of the Ruhr, and by the end of the century Germany led in the newer industries, in chemicals, in dyes and in electrical engineering, in which the connection between university science and industry was deliberately cultivated. The United States, with vast resources, a large internal market, a rapidly growing population swelled by immigration and a continental railway system, overtook Britain in output before 1900 and developed the methods of mass production. Japan industrialised from the later part of the century under the direction of the state, which built railways, founded model factories, sent men abroad for technical training and fostered large enterprises, and became the first non-western industrial power. Russia industrialised late, with state direction, foreign capital and the building of the trans-Siberian railway, in a few concentrated regions while the mass of the population remained peasant. Two features of this later industrialisation are commonly noticed. The followers could borrow technology already developed, so they advanced faster and began at a more advanced stage, and they frequently adopted tariffs, state investment, technical education and large banks to overcome the advantages of the established producer, so the role of the state was greater than it had been in Britain. The consequences of industrial rivalry for relations between the European powers were considerable. The relative decline of Britain's share of world manufacture, and the rise of Germany and the United States, altered the distribution of power on which the long peace after 1815 had rested; industrial capacity now determined military capacity, since armaments, railways for mobilisation and the output of steel and chemicals decided what a state could do in war, so economic growth became a matter of national security. Protection replaced free trade in most countries from the 1870s, each state raising tariffs against the manufactures of the others, and the search for markets and raw materials that could be reserved rather than shared was among the motives of the partition of Africa and of the scramble for concessions in China, so industrial rivalry was carried into imperial rivalry and produced collisions between the powers in Morocco, in southern Africa and in the Far East. The clearest instance was the Anglo-German naval race: German industrial strength made it possible to build a battle fleet, Britain regarded naval supremacy as a condition of her own survival, and each new programme provoked

another, which embittered relations between two countries that had no territorial quarrel. Rivalry also encouraged the alliances and the arms expenditure of the pre-war decades, and it gave governments a domestic interest in success abroad, since industrialists, shipping and armament firms pressed for markets and contracts and a confident public opinion rewarded assertive policies. Historians caution that industrial rivalry alone did not produce the war of 1914, since Britain and Germany were each other's major trading partners and interdependence might as easily have restrained them, and that the political decisions of 1914 must be explained on their own terms; the economic competition is best described as having created the capacity and the atmosphere in which those decisions were taken.

The spread to Belgium, France and Germany, with the newer industries in which Germany led 1. The United States and Japan, with the greater part played by the state in later industrialisation 1. The effect on the distribution of power, with protection replacing free trade and the search for reserved markets 1. Industrial rivalry carried into imperial and naval rivalry, with the caution that it does not by itself explain the war of 1914 1.

Question 5 [10]

- (a) The two terms overlap and are often used interchangeably, but a distinction is commonly drawn. Colonialism refers to the practice of acquiring a territory, settling or administering it and exploiting its resources and labour for the benefit of the acquiring country, so it describes the relationship on the ground: the planting of settlers, the establishment of an administration, the alienation of land, the reorganisation of the economy to supply the metropolitan country, and the subordination of the indigenous population. Imperialism is the wider term and refers to the policy, the system and the ideology of extending the power of one state over others, whether or not formal possession follows. On this usage imperialism is the drive and the doctrine while colonialism is one of the forms it takes, and the distinction is useful because a state may exercise imperial control without annexing territory at all. Historians accordingly distinguish formal from informal empire. Formal empire involves annexation, a flag, a governor and a colonial administration, as in India after 1858 or in the African colonies. Informal empire involves control exercised through other means: treaties imposed on a nominally independent government, the opening of its markets by force, as in China after the wars of the mid nineteenth century, the control of its customs revenue, loans on terms that give the lender a hold over its finances, the supply of military advisers and the threat of intervention, as in much of Latin America and in parts of the Ottoman Empire. The second distinction sometimes drawn is chronological, between an older colonialism of trading posts, plantations and settlement from the sixteenth century and the new imperialism of the late nineteenth century, which was rapid, competitive, driven by industrial needs and accompanied by the partition of whole continents. A further point is that colonialism commonly involves a transfer of population, of settlers or of labourers, and a direct reordering of the colonised society, whereas imperialism may operate at the level of policy and of economic pressure alone, which is why the end of formal colonial rule was argued by later writers to have left behind economic relations that amounted to a continuing imperialism.

Colonialism defined as the acquisition, settlement and administration of territory with the exploitation of its resources 1. Imperialism defined as the wider policy and ideology of extending a state's power, of which colonialism is one form 1. The distinction between formal and informal empire, with examples, or the distinction between older colonialism and the new imperialism 1.

- (b) First, by trade followed by the use of force, the method of the chartered companies. The European companies came as traders, obtained permission from local rulers to establish factories and warehouses, fortified them, maintained their own troops and ships, and intervened in local politics and in disputed successions, lending money and soldiers to a claimant and extracting concessions in return; where a ruler resisted they made war on him, and the territory passed to the company. The progress of the East India Company in Bengal, from a trading settlement to the collection of the revenue within a decade, is the clearest example, and the Dutch company in the Indonesian archipelago proceeded in much the same way in the spice trade. Second, by treaty and subsidiary arrangement, which left a ruler nominally in place while transferring real power. Treaties of alliance and protection obliged a ruler to accept a European force in his territory and to pay for it, to conduct his foreign relations through the protecting power and to receive a resident at his court, with the result that he lost control of his revenue, his army and his external policy while remaining responsible for the government; where he fell into arrears, territory was taken in satisfaction. The system of subsidiary alliances associated with Lord Wellesley in India operated in this way, protectorates were established over the

Malay states and over parts of Indo-China on similar principles, and unequal treaties were imposed on China and on Siam opening ports, fixing low tariffs and granting foreigners exemption from local jurisdiction. Third, by direct conquest and annexation, resorted to where neither trade nor treaty sufficed. Wars were fought against the states that could offer resistance, Mysore and the Marathas and the Sikhs in India, Burma in three wars, Vietnam by France, the Philippines by Spain and afterwards the United States, and the territory was annexed outright; pretexts for annexation were also found in alleged misgovernment or in the absence of an heir, as under the doctrine of lapse. The European advantage in these wars lay in disciplined infantry, artillery, the command of the sea and, later in the century, in the breech-loading rifle, the machine gun, the steamship and the telegraph, and it lay equally in the divisions among Asian states, which allowed each to be dealt with separately and frequently with the assistance of its neighbours.

Trade followed by force under the chartered companies, with an example 1. Treaty, protectorate and subsidiary arrangement leaving a nominal ruler in place, with an example 1. Direct conquest and annexation, with an example, and the sources of the European military advantage 1.

- (c) Resistance to colonial rule before 1914 took several forms and it is a mistake to suppose that submission was general. The earliest was armed resistance by existing states and rulers at the point of conquest, which was widespread and in places prolonged: the wars of Mysore and of the Marathas and of the Sikhs in India, the long resistance of Burma, the Ashanti wars and the resistance of Samori in west Africa, the Zulu war, the Ethiopian defeat of an Italian invasion, which preserved that country's independence, and the resistance of the Herero and of the Maji Maji rising in German territories. A second form was popular rebellion, which continued after the states had been defeated: the revolt of 1857 in India, risings of tribal and peasant communities against the alienation of land, the appropriation of forests and the exactions of moneylenders and officials, among them the Santhal and Munda risings and the agitation of the indigo cultivators of Bengal, and movements with a religious character that combined a call to purify the faith with resistance to foreign rule, of which the Mahdist movement in the Sudan and the Boxer rising in China are examples. A third form was the resistance of everyday practice, which the written record registers poorly: the evasion of taxes, desertion from forced labour, the refusal to grow a compulsory crop, flight across a border, litigation in the colonial courts themselves and the withholding of cooperation. A fourth, which became the most consequential, was the political organisation of the educated classes created by colonial schooling. Associations, newspapers, petitions and congresses appeared from the later nineteenth century, pressing at first for a share in administration, for representation and for redress of economic grievance, and moving in time to demands for self-government; the Indian National Congress from 1885, the movements in Egypt and in the Ottoman provinces, the constitutional movements in Persia and in Turkey, the reform and revolutionary movements in China culminating in 1911, the early nationalist associations in west Africa and in South Africa, and the pan-African congresses belong here. Economic forms of pressure were developed in this period too, the boycott of foreign goods and the promotion of indigenous manufacture during the Swadeshi movement in India being the best-known instance, and a revolutionary wing resorting to individual acts of violence appeared in several countries. The two World Wars contributed decisively to decolonisation. The First War drew very large numbers of colonial soldiers and labourers into service in Europe, Africa and Asia, where they saw Europeans as combatants, as casualties and as fallible, which damaged the assumption of invincibility on which much of colonial authority rested; the war was declared to be a struggle for the rights of nations and for self-determination, a principle applied in Europe and withheld elsewhere, and the contrast was pressed by nationalist leaders at once; the colonies' contribution of men, money and materials created expectations of political advance in return, and when these were disappointed, as in India after 1919, the nationalist movements became mass movements. The war also weakened the European economies and transferred financial strength to the United States, and the mandate system introduced the idea, however imperfectly honoured, that the government of a dependent territory was a trust accountable to an international body. The Second War completed the process. The defeats inflicted on Britain, France and the Netherlands in Asia by Japan destroyed the prestige of the colonial powers irretrievably, and the occupation left behind administrations, armed movements and expectations that the returning powers could not reverse; Europe emerged exhausted, with its economies and its finances ruined, and lacked the means and increasingly the will to hold large empires by force against determined opposition. The war had been fought and declared to be

a war against racial domination and for freedom, which made the defence of colonial rule still harder to argue at home, and opinion in Britain and in France was divided and in part hostile to reconquest. The two new great powers were both, for their own reasons, unsympathetic to the old empires, and the Charter of the United Nations affirmed self-determination and created a forum in which colonial questions were raised continually. Nationalist movements emerged from the war stronger, better organised and with a mass following, and the independence of India and Pakistan in 1947, followed by Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia, began a process that ran through Africa in the two decades that followed.

Armed resistance by states and rulers at the point of conquest, with examples 1. Popular rebellion and everyday forms of resistance, with examples 1. Political organisation by the educated classes, with the associations and congresses named 1. The part of the two World Wars, including the effect on European prestige and resources and the appeal to self-determination 1.

Question 6 [10]

- (a) First, the peace settlement of 1919 and the grievances it created. The Treaty of Versailles was regarded in Germany as a dictated and humiliating peace, with its clause on responsibility for the war, the loss of territory and of the colonies, the disarmament imposed on Germany alone and the reparations; the revision or repudiation of the treaty was the common ground of German politics and the declared object of Hitler's policy, so the settlement supplied both the grievance and the programme. Italy, though on the winning side, had not obtained what she expected and spoke of a mutilated victory, and Japan had similar complaints. Second, the rise of aggressive and expansionist governments and the collapse of collective security. The Fascist government in Italy, the National Socialist government in Germany from 1933 and the military ascendancy in Japan all held that their nations required territory and that war was a legitimate means of obtaining it, and each tested the resolve of the other powers: Japan seized Manchuria in 1931, Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935, Germany reintroduced conscription, reoccupied the Rhineland in 1936, annexed Austria and then the Sudetenland in 1938 and the remainder of Czechoslovakia in 1939. The League of Nations proved unable to act in any of these cases, since it lacked force, required unanimity and its leading members would not risk war, and the policy of appeasement, which reached its furthest point at Munich in 1938, was read in Berlin as evidence that no resistance would be offered. Third, economic distress and the world depression. The slump that began in 1929 produced mass unemployment, destroyed confidence in parliamentary government and strengthened the parties of the extremes; it made governments turn to tariffs, to currency controls and to the search for self-sufficiency, and it gave force to the argument that a nation needed territory and resources of its own. To these should be added the failure of disarmament, the ideological hostility between the Soviet Union and the western powers, which prevented the combination that might have deterred Germany and which the pact between Germany and the Soviet Union of August 1939 exploited, and the immediate occasion, the German invasion of Poland in September 1939, which brought Britain and France into the war on their guarantee.

The grievances arising from the peace settlement of 1919 1. The rise of expansionist governments with the failure of the League and the policy of appeasement 1. The world depression and its political effects, with the invasion of Poland as the immediate occasion 1.

- (b) First, both were authoritarian, one-party states that abolished political liberty. Each came to power through a combination of electoral support, street violence by its own uniformed organisation and the acquiescence of established elites, and each then destroyed the constitutional order from within: other parties were dissolved or suppressed, the legislature was reduced to formality, elections ceased to be contested, the press was censored and brought under control, trade unions were abolished or replaced by state bodies, and a secret police and a system of camps dealt with opponents. Each subordinated the individual to the state, rejecting liberal democracy as weak and divisive and socialism as the enemy of the nation, and each exalted a single leader, Duce in Italy and Fuhrer in Germany, whose will was presented as the will of the nation and around whom a deliberate cult was built. Second, both were nationalist, militarist and expansionist. Each held that the nation was the supreme value and that it required the recovery of lost standing and the acquisition of territory; each glorified war, discipline and sacrifice as the virtues of a healthy people, maintained mass paramilitary organisations, rearmed in defiance of treaty obligations and used mass spectacle, uniform, salute and anniversary to make the nation visible. Each pursued economic self-sufficiency and the direction of industry to

military ends, while leaving private ownership and the profits of large firms in place, so the economy was neither socialist nor liberal but directed. Each sought the total mobilisation of society: youth organisations, controlled leisure and sport, a state monopoly of information and the organisation of women around the family and the raising of children. Third, both rested on the suppression of the enemy within as well as without, and here the resemblance has a limit that should be stated. Each defined an internal enemy and used violence against it, and each pursued the restoration of national greatness by reference to a glorious past, Rome in the Italian case and a mythical Germanic antiquity in the German. The difference is that racial doctrine, and anti-Jewish doctrine in particular, was central and systematic in National Socialism from the beginning, supplying the whole framework of its policy and leading to the persecution and then the extermination of European Jews, whereas Italian Fascism was not founded on race and adopted anti-Jewish legislation comparatively late and under German influence; Fascism was corporatist and statist in its theory, National Socialism racial and biological. Historians therefore group the two together as forms of fascism while insisting that the resemblance is one of political form rather than of doctrine throughout.

The one-party authoritarian state with the suppression of political liberty and the cult of the leader 1. Nationalism, militarism, expansion and the mobilisation of society through mass organisations 1. The use of an internal enemy, with the qualification that racial doctrine was central to National Socialism and not to Italian Fascism 1.

- (c) The Cold War developed in stages. The wartime alliance broke down over the settlement of Europe. The Soviet Union established governments subservient to it across the states of eastern Europe it had occupied, which the western powers regarded as expansion in breach of the undertakings given about free elections; the Soviet Union regarded a belt of friendly states as the guarantee of its own security after two invasions. In 1947 the United States announced the policy of assisting states resisting communist pressure, beginning with Greece and Turkey, and followed it with large-scale economic aid to western Europe under the Marshall Plan, which the Soviet Union forbade its own sphere to accept; the division of Europe into two blocs was thereby confirmed. Germany was the first point of crisis: the western zones were combined and a new currency introduced, the Soviet Union closed the land routes to Berlin in 1948 and the city was supplied by air for nearly a year, after which two German states were established. The division was then militarised, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation being formed in 1949 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955. The conflict spread beyond Europe. China became communist in 1949, the Soviet Union acquired atomic weapons in the same year, and from 1950 to 1953 the Korean War was fought, which established the pattern of fighting through a divided country without direct war between the superpowers. The years that followed combined crisis with the beginnings of restraint: risings in eastern Europe were suppressed, in East Germany in 1953 and in Hungary in 1956; the Suez crisis of 1956 divided the western allies; the Berlin Wall was built in 1961; and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, which brought the two powers nearer to nuclear war than at any other time, was followed by the installation of direct communication between them and by the partial test ban treaty of 1963, after which the arms race continued alongside negotiations to limit it. The non-aligned movement, formed by states refusing to join either bloc, met in summit from 1961. The reasons for the ending of the Cold War between 1985 and 1991 are of several kinds. The first is the condition of the Soviet economy. Growth had slowed to a halt, the centrally planned system could not supply consumer goods or absorb new technology, agriculture remained unproductive, and the burden of military expenditure, of subsidies to allies and of the war in Afghanistan was unsustainable; the fall in the price of oil, on which Soviet export earnings depended, made matters worse. The second is the policy of Mikhail Gorbachev, who became General Secretary in 1985 and concluded that reform at home required a reduction of commitments abroad. His policies of glasnost, meaning openness, and perestroika, meaning restructuring, loosened the controls that had held the system together; in foreign policy he negotiated arms reductions with the United States, including the treaty removing intermediate-range missiles, withdrew Soviet forces from Afghanistan, and above all made it clear that the Soviet Union would not use force to maintain the governments of eastern Europe, which removed the condition on which their survival had depended. The third is the action of the peoples of eastern Europe themselves. Movements that had been building for years, Solidarity in Poland most notably, took the opportunity in 1989: Poland and Hungary moved to free elections, the Berlin Wall was opened in November, and the communist governments fell one after another, in most places without bloodshed, after which Germany was reunited in 1990 and the Warsaw Pact was dissolved. The fourth is the pressure from the western side, which included the renewed arms

expenditure and the technological competition of the early 1980s, which the Soviet economy could not match, together with the willingness of western leaders to negotiate once Gorbachev had shown himself serious. The fifth is the internal disintegration of the Soviet Union itself: the nationalities, beginning with the Baltic republics, demanded independence as central authority weakened, an attempted coup by conservatives in August 1991 failed and destroyed what remained of the party's authority, and in December 1991 the Soviet Union was dissolved into fifteen independent states, which ended the Cold War by removing one of its two parties.

The breakdown of the wartime alliance over eastern Europe, with the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the Berlin blockade 1. The militarisation of the division with the two alliances, and the extension of the conflict to Korea and to the Cuban missile crisis 1. The economic condition of the Soviet Union and the policies of Gorbachev, including the refusal to use force in eastern Europe 1. The revolutions of 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, with the pressure of western arms expenditure 1.

Question 7 [10]

- (i) (b) Buxar. The victory in 1764 was followed by the grant of the diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the Company in the next year.

Correct option 1.

- (ii) The subsidiary alliance system, associated with Lord Wellesley, under which a ruler accepted a British force in his territory, paid for its maintenance and conducted his external relations through the Company.

Subsidiary alliance named, with Wellesley 1.

- (iii) (a) 1829. The regulation was passed under Lord William Bentinck, following the long campaign of Ram Mohan Roy and others, and was upheld on appeal.

Correct option 1.

- (iv) Swami Dayanand Saraswati, who founded the Arya Samaj in 1875.

Dayanand Saraswati named, with 1875 1.

- (v) (c) Meerut. The sepoys there rose in May 1857 and marched on Delhi, where they proclaimed Bahadur Shah II as Emperor; an earlier isolated protest had occurred at Barrackpore.

Correct option 1.

- (vi) Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who led the extremist wing, and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who led the moderates; the split occurred at the Surat session in 1907.

Both leaders named 1.

- (vii) (d) 1909. The Indian Councils Act of that year, known as the Morley-Minto reforms, provided for separate electorates for Muslims.

Correct option 1.

- (viii) 1942, at Bombay, where the All India Congress Committee passed the resolution in August of that year.

Year 1942 and Bombay both given 1.

- (ix) (d) 1929. The session under the presidency of Jawaharlal Nehru adopted complete independence as the goal, and independence was declared on 26 January 1930.

Correct option 1.

- (x) The States Reorganisation Commission, on whose report the states were redrawn largely on linguistic lines in 1956.

States Reorganisation Commission named 1.

Question 8 [10]

- (a) First, outright war and annexation. The Company fought and annexed the states that could offer military resistance: four wars against Mysore ended with the death of Tipu Sultan and the division of his territory; three wars against the Marathas broke the only power capable of contesting northern and western India; two wars against the Sikhs ended with the annexation of the Punjab in 1849; Sind was annexed in 1843 and Burma was taken in stages. The Company's advantage lay in disciplined infantry, artillery, command of the sea, the resources of the territories it already held and the divisions among Indian states, which allowed each to be dealt with separately and frequently with the assistance of its neighbours. Second, the system of subsidiary

alliances, developed by Lord Wellesley, which transferred real power without immediate annexation. A ruler who accepted the arrangement received protection and surrendered his external relations to the Company, agreed to maintain a British force in his territory and to pay for it, received a British resident at his court and undertook to employ no other European. The effect was to disarm him, to burden his revenues with a charge he could seldom meet and to make him dependent, so that when he fell into arrears territory was ceded in satisfaction, and when his administration failed under the strain the Company intervened or annexed on the ground of misgovernment, as happened in Awadh. Hyderabad, Awadh, Mysore after the war and the Maratha states in turn came under this system. Third, annexation without war on grounds the Company itself defined, which was pressed furthest under Lord Dalhousie. By the doctrine of lapse, a ruler without a natural heir was not permitted to adopt one in the Indian manner and his state was taken, which was applied to Satara, Jhansi, Nagpur and other states. Annexation was also carried out on the ground of alleged misgovernment, as in Awadh in 1856, and territory was absorbed by the lapse of titles and the discontinuance of pensions. Alongside all three ran the method with which the Company had begun, the exploitation of disputed successions and internal rivalries by lending troops and money to one claimant in return for territory, revenue or trading privilege, which had given it Bengal and which continued to be useful wherever an Indian state was divided.

War and annexation, with the wars against Mysore, the Marathas or the Sikhs named 1. The subsidiary alliance system and the manner in which it produced dependence and cession of territory 1. The doctrine of lapse and annexation for alleged misgovernment under Dalhousie, or the exploitation of disputed successions 1.

- (b) Indian handicrafts, and the cotton textile industry above all, had been among the most important manufactures in the world before the nineteenth century: Indian cottons, silks and muslins were exported to Europe, to west Asia and to south-east Asia, and the crafts of metalwork, glass, pottery, shipbuilding, paper and jewellery supported large populations in the towns and the villages. Their decline in the nineteenth century proceeded from several causes acting together. The industrial revolution in Britain produced machine-made yarn and cloth at a cost no handloom could match, and these were admitted to India at low or nominal duties while Indian cottons entering Britain had earlier been met with heavy duties, so the Indian weaver lost first his export market, then the home market for the coarser cloths, and the hand spinners, who were the most numerous and the poorest in the trade and were very largely women, were ruined first because imported yarn displaced their work entirely. The export of raw cotton to Britain raised the price of the weaver's own material at the same time as it cheapened his competitor's. The disappearance of the Indian courts removed the patronage that had sustained the finest work in textiles, metal, jewellery and the arts, since a craft producing luxury goods for a court cannot survive the court; the adoption of European dress, furniture and utensils by the officials and the new middle class turned demand towards imported articles. The railways, by carrying cheap manufactures into the interior, destroyed the local monopoly that distance had given the village craftsman, and they carried his raw materials out. State policy made no provision for protection or for technical assistance, and in the one field where Indian mill industry did develop, cotton, an excise was imposed on Indian cloth in the interest of Lancashire. The consequences were serious. The old manufacturing towns declined, Dacca being the most frequently cited, and their populations fell; artisans thrown out of their crafts had nowhere to go but back to the land, since modern industry was small and employed few, so the proportion of the population dependent on agriculture rose and holdings were further subdivided, which depressed rural incomes. Writers of the period, Ram Mohan Roy and later Dadabhai Naoroji, Romesh Chunder Dutt and others, described the process and it was called de-industrialisation, and it became one of the main heads of the nationalist economic critique, the charge being that India was converted from a manufacturing country into a supplier of raw materials and a market for British goods. Two qualifications are made by historians. The decline was uneven: hand weaving survived in many places, assisted later by cheap mill yarn and by improved looms, and certain crafts serving local needs continued; and the statistical measurement of the fall, which depends on census categories that changed over time, has been disputed, so the magnitude of the decline is debated even where the direction is not.

The displacement of handloom cloth and hand-spun yarn by machine imports, with the asymmetry of tariffs 1. The loss of court and aristocratic patronage, with the effect of the railways and of state policy 1. The consequences, including the decline of manufacturing towns and the increased pressure on agriculture, with the term de-industrialisation and the qualifications made about it 1.

- (c) By the drain of wealth Indian writers of the later nineteenth century meant the continuous transfer of a part of India's annual product to Britain for which no equivalent came back. The argument was stated most fully by Dadabhai Naoroji and was developed by Romesh Chunder Dutt and others. Its elements were these. The home charges, that is the payments made in England out of Indian revenues, covered the interest on the public debt, the pensions and salaries of British officials serving in India and of those retired, the cost of stores purchased in Britain, the expenses of the India Office and a share of military expenditure including campaigns outside India; these were met every year from Indian taxation and were spent in England. To them were added the profits and the interest remitted by British companies, banks, shipping lines and planters operating in India, and the savings sent home by British employees. The transfer was effected through India's export surplus, which the critics pointed out was not paid for in goods or in money coming in but discharged these obligations, so that India exported more than she imported year after year and received nothing for the difference. Naoroji attempted to estimate the annual amount, and the figures were disputed at the time. The consequences claimed were that the capital which might have been invested in Indian agriculture and industry was withdrawn instead, that taxation was higher than it need have been, and that the poverty and the recurrent famines of the period were connected with this continuous withdrawal; the moral point, which weighed as heavily, was that Indians were taxed to pay for an administration in which they had no part and for wars in which they had no interest. On whether British rule retarded India's economic development, those who argue that it did rely on the following. The drain itself, however its magnitude is estimated, took a part of the surplus out of the country annually, so the rate of investment within India was lower than it would otherwise have been. The de-industrialisation of the handicrafts was not accompanied by any corresponding growth of modern industry until late, and the tariff policy, which admitted British manufactures freely and placed an excise on Indian cotton cloth, denied Indian industry the protection that every industrialising country of the period, Germany, the United States, Japan, employed. Railways were built on a scale greater than Indian traffic warranted, financed by guaranteed loans whose return was a charge on Indian revenues, and laid out to connect the interior with the ports rather than Indian regions with one another, so they served export rather than internal development. Agriculture, on which the great majority lived, received little investment: irrigation was undertaken in some regions but expenditure on it was small beside military expenditure, the revenue demand in cash drove the cultivator into debt, and the frequency and severity of famine in the second half of the century, with exports of grain continuing during scarcity, are pointed to as evidence. Expenditure on education, public health and sanitation remained very low, so literacy was minimal and life expectancy short at the end of the period, and the per capita income of India is estimated to have grown little or not at all over the half century before independence while that of the industrial countries rose substantially. Those who argue that British rule did not retard, or that the question is more complicated, reply as follows. India received institutions and infrastructure she did not previously possess: a unified administration and legal system, a currency, the railways, ports, the telegraph, canals and the beginnings of a modern banking and company sector, without which the industrial growth of the twentieth century would not have been possible. Peace was established over a subcontinent that had been fought over for a century, which is itself a condition of economic activity. Modern industry did develop, in cotton at Bombay and Ahmedabad, in jute at Calcutta, in iron and steel at Jamshedpur under Indian ownership, and an Indian commercial and industrial class emerged. They argue that the comparison should be with what India's own rulers would have achieved rather than with an imagined independent industrialisation, that other Asian countries which were not colonised, with the exception of Japan, did not industrialise either, and that the fundamental constraints, a very large population on limited land, low savings, little technical education and an agriculture dependent on the monsoon, were not of British making. They point out that the quantitative estimates of the drain are small as a proportion of national income on some calculations, that the empire as a whole may not have been profitable to the British economy taken together, and that the railways and the irrigation works were real assets left behind. The disagreement turns on three things which the arguments do not settle: the magnitude of the transfer, on which the estimates differ widely and the data are poor; the counterfactual, since any judgement of retardation requires a view of what would otherwise have happened, and there is no agreement on that; and the weighing of different kinds of effect against one another, the institutions and infrastructure on one side against the loss of manufacture, the fiscal transfer and the neglect of education and health on the other. The present position

among economic historians is that the stagnation of Indian per capita income and the neglect of human development in the colonial period are well established, while the attribution of the whole of it to colonial policy, and the magnitude of the drain, remain disputed. A candidate should present it in these terms.

The drain of wealth explained, with the home charges, remittances and the export surplus, and the writers who advanced it 1. The case that British rule retarded development, with de-industrialisation, tariff policy and the neglect of agriculture and education 1. The case on the other side, with institutions, infrastructure, peace and the development of modern industry 1. The disagreement identified as turning on the magnitude of the transfer, on the counterfactual and on the weighing of different effects, with no verdict 1.

Question 9 [10]

- (a) First, the prohibition of sati by regulation in 1829 under Lord William Bentinck. The practice of the immolation of a widow on her husband's pyre had been attacked by Ram Mohan Roy and the reformers of Bengal, who argued against it from the scriptures themselves as well as on grounds of humanity and who collected evidence of its incidence, and the measure was defended before the Privy Council when an appeal was made against it. It was the first considerable intervention by the state in a practice sanctioned by custom, and the method, agitation by Indian reformers followed by legislation, became the pattern for what came after. Second, the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act of 1856, which legalised the remarriage of Hindu widows and declared the children of such marriages legitimate, a measure for which Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar campaigned with great persistence, again arguing from the texts. The condition of the widow, often a child, who was required to live in austerity and had no prospect of a second marriage, was among the heaviest of the disabilities imposed on women, and the Act removed the legal obstacle although social practice changed very slowly and a woman who remarried commonly lost her claim to her husband's property. Third, the Age of Consent Act of 1891, which raised the age below which cohabitation was an offence, and which followed the death of a child wife; the controversy it raised was severe, since even some nationalists who favoured reform objected to its being carried out by a foreign government, and this episode showed how far the question of reform had become entangled with the question of who had the right to legislate. Other measures that may be given are the legislation of 1850 protecting the right of a convert to inherit, the Acts against female infanticide and against human sacrifice, the abolition of slavery as a legal status in 1843, the Special Marriage Act of 1872 permitting marriage outside the ordinary religious forms, and the much later Sarda Act of 1929 fixing a minimum age of marriage. Two observations are usually made about all of them: the initiative came in most cases from Indian reformers rather than from the government, which acted cautiously and more cautiously still after 1857; and legislation altered the law far more effectively than it altered practice, since enforcement depended on complaint in a society where the complainant would be the person least able to make one.

The prohibition of sati in 1829, with the part of Ram Mohan Roy 1. The Widows' Remarriage Act of 1856, with the part of Vidyasagar 1. The Age of Consent Act of 1891 or another correct measure, with the observation that legislation changed the law more readily than the practice 1.

- (b) The press in India grew from small beginnings into the principal instrument of political education before the Congress existed. English newspapers appeared in the presidency towns from the later eighteenth century, and journals in the Indian languages followed from the 1820s, Ram Mohan Roy publishing in Bengali and Persian and others in Marathi, Gujarati, Urdu, Tamil and Telugu; by the later nineteenth century there were hundreds of papers, most of them small, short-lived and produced on little money, with a readership extended far beyond the purchasers by reading aloud in public places. Their function was to criticise the administration, to report the proceedings of the councils and the courts, to publish accounts of famine, of revenue settlements and of official conduct, to carry the writings of the reformers and in time to circulate the programme and the resolutions of the associations. The government's attitude varied: the restrictions imposed early in the century were relaxed in 1835, which was long remembered in India, but the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 imposed restraints on the Indian-language press alone, which caused great resentment and was repealed a few years later; prosecutions for sedition were used from the 1890s, Tilak's trials being the best known. Political associations preceded the Congress by half a century. The earliest were bodies of landholders and of the professional classes of the presidency towns, among them the Landholders' Society and the British Indian Association in Calcutta, formed in the 1830s and 1850s, which petitioned on questions of revenue and representation and whose members were drawn from the wealthy. From the 1870s a younger and more

broadly based generation founded associations with a wider programme: the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, which collected information on agrarian conditions; the Indian Association of Calcutta, founded in 1876 by Surendranath Banerjea and others, which agitated over the age limit for the civil service, organised meetings across the province and tried deliberately to reach beyond the wealthy by charging a low subscription; the Madras Mahajana Sabha and the Bombay Presidency Association. These bodies held meetings, drafted memorials, sent delegations to England, organised campaigns on particular questions and corresponded with one another, and two agitations in particular gave them momentum: the campaign over the holding of the civil service examination and the age limit, and the Ilbert Bill controversy of 1883, in which the European community in India succeeded in defeating a measure that would have allowed Indian judges to try Europeans in the interior, which taught Indians both the effectiveness of organised agitation and the limits of official sympathy. The press and the associations worked together, since the associations relied on the papers to publish their proceedings and the papers relied on the associations for their material, and between them they created a public opinion across provinces. It was out of this network that the Indian National Congress was formed in 1885, its first session bringing together men who had been active in these provincial bodies.

The growth of the press, in English and in the Indian languages, with its functions and the restrictions placed on it
 1. The earlier associations of the presidency towns, with the British Indian Association named 1. The associations of the 1870s and 1880s, with the Indian Association and the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha named, and the agitations that gave them momentum 1.

- (c) Three movements may be described. The Satyashodhak Samaj, founded by Jotirao Phule in Maharashtra in 1873, was the earliest sustained movement of this kind. Its aim was to free the lower castes from what Phule described as the religious and social domination of the Brahmins, and its analysis was that the caste hierarchy and the scriptures that sanctioned it were instruments by which one group had subordinated the rest. It rejected the necessity of Brahmin priests, conducting marriages without them and at low cost, campaigned against untouchability and against the treatment of widows, and above all worked for education, Phule and his wife Savitribai opening schools for girls and for children of the lower castes at a time when almost no one else did so; his writings turned the accepted account of Indian history on its head and supplied the vocabulary that later non-Brahmin movements used. The movement led by Ambedkar from the 1920s took the question into the political field. Its aim was not reform within the hierarchy but the destruction of untouchability and the securing of rights by law, and its method was organisation, publication and the assertion of civil rights: he led the satyagraha at Mahad in 1927 for the right of untouchables to take water from a public tank and the campaign at Nashik for entry to a temple, founded newspapers and associations, gave evidence before the official commissions, pressed successfully for separate representation and for reservation in education, in employment and in legislatures, and advised his followers that political power and education, rather than the goodwill of the higher castes, were the means of advance; late in his life he led a conversion to Buddhism as a rejection of the religious order that had sanctioned the disability. In the south the non-Brahmin movement, which took organised form in the Justice Party and later in the Self-Respect Movement of E. V. Ramasamy, known as Periyar, aimed at breaking the hold of Brahmins over education, the administration and the professions in the Madras Presidency. It secured early and extensive reservation in education and in public employment, promoted marriages conducted without priests or religious ritual, campaigned against caste titles and against the use of religion to justify inequality, and linked the question of caste to that of language and of Tamil identity. Other movements that may be given are the Sri Narayana Dharma Paripalana movement in Kerala founded under the inspiration of Narayana Guru, the Mahar and Nadar movements, and the Adi movements of the north, which asserted that the excluded castes were the original inhabitants of the country. The relation of these movements with the national movement was not always easy, for reasons on both sides. The leadership of the Congress was drawn in its early decades overwhelmingly from the upper castes and the professional classes, and the movements of the lower castes argued that a struggle against foreign rule led by that leadership would replace the British with a domestic ruling class and would leave the structure of caste untouched; Phule had argued that the peasant and the untouchable suffered more at the hands of their Indian superiors than from the foreign government, and Ambedkar put the point in the form that the Congress sought self-government while the depressed classes needed government that would protect them from their own countrymen, so for them the question of who would hold power after independence was prior to the question of independence itself. From the other side, the Congress held that the first business was national unity and

that the raising of caste questions divided the movement and served the government's interest in presenting itself as the protector of minorities; it also held that the British were using the grievances of the depressed classes as an argument for continued rule, which was a charge with some foundation. The sharpest disagreement came over separate electorates for the depressed classes, which Ambedkar demanded at the second Round Table Conference and which the government conceded, and which Gandhi opposed absolutely on the ground that it would divide Hindu society permanently and remove the incentive for reform within it; Gandhi's fast brought about the Poona Pact of 1932, by which separate electorates were given up in favour of reserved seats within the general electorate, in larger numbers than had been proposed. The two also differed in their understanding of the problem: Gandhi attacked untouchability as a sin to be removed by the change of heart of caste Hindus and worked through the organisation he founded for that purpose, while retaining a conception of varna, whereas Ambedkar held that the disability was inseparable from the religious and social order itself and would not be removed by appeals to conscience. Yet the relation was not simply one of opposition: the Congress committed itself to the abolition of untouchability from the 1920s, the movements of the lower castes contributed very large numbers to the campaigns of civil disobedience in several provinces, and Ambedkar himself became chairman of the Drafting Committee of the Constituent Assembly, so that the abolition of untouchability, the prohibition of discrimination and the provision for reservation were written into the Constitution of independent India.

Two movements described with their aims and work 1. A third movement described with its aims and work 1. The reasons for difficulty from the side of the lower-caste movements, that the Congress leadership was upper caste and that the social question was prior to the national one 1. The reasons from the side of the Congress, with the dispute over separate electorates and the Poona Pact, and the eventual convergence in the Constitution 1.

Question 10 [10]

- (a) The revolt began at Meerut in May 1857, where sepoys who had refused the new cartridges were punished and their comrades rose, killed their officers and marched on Delhi. At Delhi the garrison joined them, the city fell within a day, and the aged Bahadur Shah II was proclaimed Emperor, which gave the revolt a centre and a name under which disparate groups could act; the administration of the city was carried on by a council of soldiers and officials. Delhi became the object of the British effort, and after a siege of several months it was retaken in September 1857, the fighting in the streets being severe and followed by the sack of the city, the execution of the princes and the deportation of Bahadur Shah to Rangoon, which ended the Mughal dynasty. At Kanpur the sepoys rose in June under the leadership of Nana Sahib, the adopted son of the last Peshwa, whose pension and title the Company had refused to continue; the British garrison and the civilians with it were besieged, surrendered on terms and were killed, an event that became central to British memory of the revolt and to the ferocity of the reprisals; the city was retaken, lost again and finally secured, and Tantia Tope, Nana Sahib's commander, continued the fight in the field for more than a year, conducting a mobile campaign across central India until he was captured and executed. At Lucknow the revolt was the most broadly based of all, because Awadh had been annexed only the year before and the dispossessed talukdars, their armed retainers, the disbanded soldiers of the Nawab's army and the peasantry all had reason to rise; Begum Hazrat Mahal led the resistance in the name of her young son, the British residency was besieged for months and twice relieved with difficulty, and the countryside of Awadh remained in arms long after the city was retaken in March 1858, the pacification of the province taking until the end of that year. At Jhansi, Rani Lakshmibai, whose adopted son's succession had been refused under the doctrine of lapse, led the defence of her city, which was stormed with great loss of life; she escaped, joined Tantia Tope, took Gwalior with him and was killed in action in June 1858. Other centres were Bareilly under Khan Bahadur Khan, Bihar under Kunwar Singh, an elderly landholder who fought a skilful campaign, and Faizabad under Maulvi Ahmadullah Shah.

Delhi described, with the proclamation of Bahadur Shah and the recapture in September 1857 1. Kanpur described, with Nana Sahib and Tantia Tope 1. Lucknow with Begum Hazrat Mahal, or Jhansi with Rani Lakshmibai, correctly described 1.

- (b) First, the revolt was limited in its extent and its support. It was confined substantially to the north and centre of the country, to the upper Ganges valley, Awadh, Rohilkhand, Bundelkhand and parts of Bihar and central India, while Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, Rajputana, most of the Deccan and the whole of the south and east remained quiet, so the British were able to draw troops, revenue and supplies from the unaffected provinces

and to concentrate them against the areas in revolt. Important groups stood aside or assisted the government: the great majority of the princes, Gwalior, Hyderabad, Kashmir, the Rajput states, Nepal, gave help or at least neutrality; the Sikh soldiers of the recently annexed Punjab and the Gurkhas fought for the British; the merchants and bankers, who held government paper and whose trade depended on order, were hostile to the revolt, as were the new landed and professional classes created by British rule; and the educated classes of the presidency towns saw in the rebel leaders a return to an order from which they expected nothing. Second, the revolt had no unity of aim, no central leadership and no common plan. Its participants were held together by what they opposed rather than by anything they intended: a dispossessed prince sought his pension and his throne, a talukdar his estate, a peasant relief from the revenue demand, a sepoy his allowances and his religion, and there was no programme that joined these objects. Bahadur Shah was a figurehead of great symbolic value and no capacity, the local leaders fought in their own regions and did not combine their operations, there was no coordination of the risings in time, and no attempt was made to appeal to the country as a whole or to the provinces that had not risen; the rebels also failed to use their early numerical advantage decisively, allowing the British time to bring up reinforcements. Third, the material and organisational superiority of the British. They held command of the sea and could bring troops from Britain, from the Crimea and from China; the telegraph allowed them to coordinate across distances the rebels could not match, and the rebels' failure to destroy the telegraph lines systematically was a serious error; the railway, though incomplete, assisted the movement of forces. Their artillery was better, their troops better armed, trained and above all better led, since the rebel sepoys were excellent soldiers but had lost their officer corps and had no commanders accustomed to handling large formations or to planning a campaign, and the few who were, Tantia Tope and Kunwar Singh among them, were fighting after the decisive engagements had been lost. The British also controlled the resources of a continental administration, revenue, supply, and intelligence, while the rebel centres could not feed and pay their forces for long.

The limited extent of the revolt, with the regions that remained quiet and the groups that assisted the British 1. The absence of unity of aim, of central leadership and of a common plan 1. British material and organisational superiority, in reinforcement, the telegraph, artillery and leadership 1.

- (c) The question has been argued since the events themselves, and the labels carry a political weight, since the British official account called it the Sepoy Mutiny and Indian nationalist writing called it the First War of Independence. Those who describe it as a mutiny, or as a series of mutinies accompanied by local revolts, rely on the following evidence. It began in the army and over a military grievance: the immediate occasion was the issue of cartridges and the punishment of the sepoys who refused them, the first outbreaks were in cantonments, and the sepoys were the striking force throughout. The grievances voiced were particular and backward-looking: the restoration of a pension to Nana Sahib, the restoration of Awadh to its dynasty, the recognition of an adopted heir at Jhansi, the return of an estate to a talukdar, the removal of a revenue assessment; they were claims to recover something lost rather than a demand for a new order. The leaders were princes, talukdars and dispossessed nobles whose object was the restoration of the authority they had enjoyed before annexation, and the government they would have established was the one the Company had displaced; the proclamation issued in the name of the Emperor appealed to the established orders of society, not to the people as a whole. There was no conception of a nation and no common programme: the rebel centres acted separately, no attempt was made to appeal to the provinces that had not risen, and the term India as a political community in whose name the revolt was made does not appear. Large parts of the country took no part and important groups actively assisted the government, so the revolt cannot be called national in extent. And modern nationalism, with a demand for self-government and a conception of the people as the source of authority, appeared in India a generation later and from a quite different social source, the educated classes, who were hostile to the revolt. Those who describe it as a war of independence, or at least as something much more than a mutiny, rely on the following. Whatever its origin, it spread far beyond the army: the civil population rose in Awadh, in Bundelkhand, in parts of Bihar and of the Doab, peasants attacked the records and the houses of moneylenders and the offices of the revenue administration, and the disturbance in Awadh continued long after the sepoys had been defeated, which no military mutiny can explain. The grievances were general and not merely military: annexation and the doctrine of lapse, the revenue settlements and the dispossession of those whose titles could not be documented, the decline of the

handicrafts, the exclusion of Indians from office and the fear of interference with religion, which affected rulers, landholders, artisans, peasants and soldiers alike, so the revolt drew on the accumulated resentment of a whole society against an alien administration. The scale was very large, the government's authority was destroyed over a wide area and for many months, and the rebels proclaimed a government of their own under the Emperor at Delhi, which gave the movement a political object, the expulsion of the Company and the restoration of indigenous rule. Hindus and Muslims acted together without serious friction, which was noted at the time and has been emphasised since. And the revolt was taken up into the memory of the later national movement, which treated its leaders as the first to have fought for the country's freedom, so whatever the participants understood themselves to be doing, the event functioned in Indian political consciousness as a war of independence. A third position, taken by many historians now, is that both labels are inadequate because they ask the wrong question. The evidence supports neither a purely military mutiny nor a national war in the modern sense, and the event is better described as a composite revolt, in which a mutiny in the Bengal army triggered a series of local uprisings whose participants had very different objects, in which the strongest element was agrarian and in which the leadership was supplied by those whom British rule had dispossessed; the degree of popular participation varied greatly from district to district, and recent work has concentrated on explaining that variation rather than on assigning a single character to the whole. A candidate should set out the evidence on both sides and may note this third position, and no mark attaches to the label chosen.

The case for calling it a mutiny, including its military origin, the particular and restorative grievances and the absence of a national conception 1. Further evidence for that view, including the limited extent of the revolt and the groups that assisted the government 1. The case for calling it a war of independence, including the civil and agrarian participation, the generality of the grievances and the proclamation of a government 1. The third position that it was a composite revolt, with the question left open and no verdict given 1.

Question 11 [10]

- (a) First, the boycott of British goods and the promotion of swadeshi enterprise, which gave the movement its name and its character. Foreign cloth, salt, sugar and manufactures were boycotted, bonfires of imported cloth were made, shopkeepers were persuaded or pressed not to stock them, and the washermen and priests of some localities refused to serve those who used them; alongside the negative programme ran a positive one, the founding of Indian mills, weaving establishments, soap and match factories, banks, insurance companies and stores, and the promotion of handloom weaving, so that an economic boycott was converted into a programme of indigenous industry. The movement thus combined a political protest with an economic policy, and the imports of British cloth into Bengal fell appreciably during its course. Second, the extension of the protest into education, into culture and into the forms of organisation. Students left government schools and colleges, which brought official reprisals, and a Council of National Education was formed to establish national schools and a technical institute, so that an alternative system was attempted outside the government's. Literature, music and painting were enlisted, Rabindranath Tagore writing songs for the movement and the observance of Raksha Bandhan being used to express solidarity across the proposed partition line; samitis, that is volunteer associations, were formed which combined physical training, social work, relief during epidemics and the enforcement of the boycott, and these became the organisational model for later movements. Women and students took part in public activity in numbers not seen before, and the movement's propaganda was conducted in Bengali rather than in English, which widened its reach. Third, the movement produced the first serious attempt at passive resistance and the first open assertion that self-government was the object, and in doing so it split the Congress. The extremist leaders, Tilak, Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal, wished the boycott extended from goods to the whole apparatus of government, to schools, courts, councils and offices, and wished the agitation carried beyond Bengal and beyond the educated classes, holding that the object was swaraj and not administrative reform; the moderates supported the boycott of goods as a protest against the partition but were unwilling to go further, and the disagreement produced the split at Surat in 1907. The movement's limitations should also be noticed: it remained strongest among the educated and the urban, its appeal to boycott bore hardly on poor consumers for whom Indian cloth was dearer, the Muslim population of eastern Bengal, which the partition was said to benefit, was largely unmoved or hostile, and the movement declined after 1908 under heavy repression, some of its younger

adherents turning to revolutionary methods. The partition was annulled in 1911.

The boycott of British goods together with the promotion of swadeshi industry 1. The extension into national education, into culture and into volunteer associations 1. The assertion of swaraj as the object with the adoption of passive resistance, leading to the split of 1907, or the limitations of the movement 1.

- (b) The revolutionary nationalists were the wing of the movement that concluded, after the failure of the Swadeshi agitation and under heavy repression, that neither petition nor passive resistance would remove British rule and that it must be ended by force. Their aim was the complete independence of India, stated without qualification, and in its developed form it included the establishment of a republic, so their object differed from that of the moderates, who sought reform within the empire, and was more sharply stated than that of the extremists, who had spoken of swaraj without defining the means. The later groups, and Bhagat Singh in particular, went further and declared that the object was not merely the transfer of power to Indian hands but a social revolution that would end the exploitation of the peasant and the worker; the association formed in 1928 took the name Hindustan Socialist Republican Association to express that aim. Their methods were those of a secret society. They formed small groups bound by oath, among them Anushilan Samiti and Jugantar in Bengal, Abhinav Bharat in Maharashtra and later the Hindustan Republican Association and its successor in the north; they recruited chiefly young men from schools and colleges, trained them in the use of arms and in physical discipline, and used religious and literary imagery to bind them. They collected arms and money by raids on government treasuries and by political dacoities, manufactured bombs, and carried out assassinations of officials whom they held responsible for repression, the killing of unpopular officers and the attempt on the Viceroy's train being examples; they also sought assistance abroad, and Indians in England, Europe, North America and east Asia formed organisations of which the India House in London, the work of Shyamji Krishna Varma and V. D. Savarkar, and the Ghadar Party formed among emigrants on the Pacific coast were the best known, the last attempting during the First World War to raise a mutiny in the Indian army. A number of leaders operated from abroad, among them Rash Behari Bose and Madame Bhikaji Cama. A distinct and deliberate feature of their method was the use of the trial and the scaffold as propaganda: a captured revolutionary used the dock to state his case, conducted hunger strikes to protest against the treatment of political prisoners, as Jatindranath Das did to his death, and accepted execution in the expectation that it would move opinion more than the act itself. The throwing of the bomb in the Central Legislative Assembly in 1929 by Bhagat Singh and Batukeshwar Dutt was done expressly in order to be arrested and to obtain a platform, and Bhagat Singh's writings from prison, including his statement of his atheism, were addressed to the public. Their achievements and their limits are both clear. They created a tradition of fearlessness and sacrifice that moved a whole generation, the executions of Khudiram Bose, of Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhdev and of others producing a wave of feeling across the country, and they compelled the government to divert great effort to security; the later groups also introduced socialist ideas into the national movement and pressed the Congress towards a clearer statement of its aims. But the method could not succeed on its own terms. The groups were small and were penetrated by the police, the loss of a leader was irreparable, and the removal of individual officials did not weaken an administration that replaced them at once; the activity provided the government with a justification for emergency powers and for detention without trial that were used against the constitutional movement as well; and the method had no means of involving the mass of the population, since a secret society cannot be a popular movement. Gandhi opposed it absolutely, on the ground that the means would corrupt the end, while expressing respect for the courage of those who practised it; several revolutionaries themselves came in the 1930s to the view that mass organisation, of peasants and workers, was the necessary basis of any struggle, and a number joined the socialist and communist movements or the Congress.

The aim of complete independence by force, with the later addition of social and republican objects 1. The methods of the secret society, with named organisations, the collection of arms, assassination and work abroad 1. The deliberate use of trial and execution as propaganda, with the achievements and limits of the method 1.

- (c) Three sets of constitutional reforms were introduced in this period. The Indian Councils Act of 1909, known as the Morley-Minto reforms, enlarged the legislative councils at the centre and in the provinces and introduced an elected element into them, provided for non-official majorities in the provincial councils while keeping an official majority at the centre, allowed members to ask supplementary questions and to move resolutions on

the budget, and admitted an Indian to the Viceroy's Executive Council for the first time. Its most consequential provision was the creation of separate electorates for Muslims, by which Muslim members were elected by Muslim voters alone, with a weighting in their favour. The Government of India Act of 1919, known as the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, followed the declaration of 1917 that the policy was the progressive realisation of responsible government. It enlarged the electorate on a property franchise, created a bicameral legislature at the centre with an elected majority, separated central from provincial subjects, and introduced in the provinces the arrangement called dyarchy: provincial subjects were divided into transferred subjects, such as education, local self-government, public health and agriculture, administered by ministers responsible to the legislature, and reserved subjects, such as finance, police, justice and irrigation, administered by the Governor and his executive council, who were not so responsible. Separate electorates were extended to further communities. The Government of India Act of 1935 was the most substantial. It ended dyarchy in the provinces and established provincial autonomy, with ministries responsible to legislatures elected on a franchise extended to about a sixth of the population, though the Governor retained wide special and emergency powers; it proposed a federation of the provinces and the princely states with dyarchy at the centre, defence and external affairs remaining with the Governor-General, but the federal part never came into force because the princes did not accede; it separated Burma from India, created a Federal Court, and extended separate electorates further while providing reserved seats for the depressed classes in accordance with the Poona Pact. The Indian response to each was critical, and increasingly so. The reforms of 1909 were welcomed by the moderates as a first step towards representative government but were quickly found to be of little substance, since the councils could not control the executive, their resolutions were recommendations only and the official majority at the centre remained; the separate electorates were objected to by the Congress as an attempt to divide the political nation and to create a permanent communal cleavage in the representative system, and the significance of that objection grew with time. The reforms of 1919 were rejected by the Congress as disappointing and inadequate, the more so because they were accompanied by the Rowlatt legislation and followed by Jallianwala Bagh; the Congress launched non-cooperation and boycotted the first elections, while a section, the Swarajists under C. R. Das and Motilal Nehru, decided afterwards to enter the councils in order to obstruct their working from within. Dyarchy was criticised as unworkable in principle, since the ministers held the subjects that required money while the Governor held the finances, and responsibility was divided in a way that allowed each side to blame the other. The appointment of the Simon Commission in 1927 without a single Indian member was answered by a boycott and by demonstrations at which Lala Lajpat Rai was injured, and the Congress responded by framing its own constitution in the Nehru Report and then, at Lahore in 1929, by declaring complete independence to be its object. The Act of 1935 was described by Nehru as a charter of slavery, because the special powers of the Governor and of the Governor-General left the substance of authority where it had been, because the federal scheme gave the princes a weight out of proportion to their populations and would have operated as a conservative check on the elected provinces, and because the extension of separate electorates further entrenched communal division. The Congress nevertheless contested the elections of 1937 under the Act and, having won most of the provinces, formed ministries in them after obtaining an assurance about the use of the Governor's powers; they held office for a little over two years and resigned at the end of 1939 over the terms of India's involvement in the war. The Muslim League, which had fared badly in those elections, drew from the experience the conclusion that a Congress majority in a unitary India would be permanent, and that conclusion underlay the demand of 1940.

The reforms of 1909 correctly described, including the introduction of separate electorates 1. The reforms of 1919 correctly described, including dyarchy in the provinces 1. The Act of 1935 correctly described, including provincial autonomy and the federal scheme that did not come into force 1. The Indian response to each, including the rejection of 1919 and non-cooperation, the boycott of the Simon Commission and the criticism of the Act of 1935 with the decision to contest the elections of 1937 1.

Question 12 [10]

- (a) First, his leadership of the struggle against untouchability and his insistence that it was a question of rights rather than of charity. Born into a Mahar family and subjected to the disabilities himself, he obtained an education abroad of a quality then rare in India and turned it to the service of the excluded castes. He

organised them, founded newspapers and associations, and led direct action for civil rights, the satyagraha at Mahad in 1927 for the right to take water from a public tank and the campaign at Nashik for entry to a temple being the best known; he argued that the disability was not an abuse within an otherwise sound order but inseparable from the religious and social hierarchy itself, and he told his followers that their advance lay in education, in organisation and in political power rather than in the goodwill of the higher castes. He gave evidence before the official commissions, attended the Round Table Conferences as the representative of the depressed classes, secured the recognition of their claim to representation and, after the dispute with Gandhi over separate electorates, concluded the Poona Pact of 1932 by which reserved seats within the general electorate were provided in larger numbers. Second, his part in the framing of the Constitution. He was elected to the Constituent Assembly, became Chairman of its Drafting Committee and was Law Minister in the first government of independent India, and he was the Assembly's principal spokesman on the text. The Constitution embodies the measures he had argued for over a quarter of a century: the abolition of untouchability and the prohibition of its practice in any form, the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth, equality of opportunity in public employment with power to reserve posts, the reservation of seats in the legislatures for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, the prohibition of forced labour, and the guarantee of a right to move the courts for the enforcement of these rights, which he described as the provision that gave the rest their meaning. He also defended the scheme of parliamentary government, the strong centre and the Directive Principles, and he warned the Assembly in his closing speeches that political democracy would not survive without social and economic democracy, and that a nation divided into graded inequality could not sustain the fraternity the Preamble proclaimed. Third, his work on the legal and social position of women, and his thought as a whole. As Law Minister he prepared the Hindu Code Bill, which proposed to codify and reform the law of marriage, divorce, succession, maintenance, adoption and guardianship, and to give daughters a share in property and women the right to divorce; the Bill met heavy opposition and was not passed as a whole, and he resigned from the government in 1951 largely on that account, but its provisions were enacted in substance in the separate statutes of the following years, so the reform of Hindu personal law is substantially his. His other contributions should be noted: his economic writings on the problem of the rupee and on public finance, on which he was a trained economist, and his part in the design of labour legislation and of welfare provision during his years on the Viceroy's Executive Council, including employment exchanges and provisions on hours and conditions of work; his argument for the development of river valleys and power; and at the end of his life his conversion to Buddhism with very large numbers of his followers, which he presented as the rejection of a religious order that had sanctioned inequality and as the choice of one that he held to rest on reason and on compassion. His writings, among them the work on the annihilation of caste, remain the most searching Indian criticism of the caste order.

His leadership of the movement against untouchability, with the campaigns for civil rights and the Poona Pact 1. His part in framing the Constitution, with the provisions he secured for equality and against untouchability 1. His work on the Hindu Code Bill and the position of women, or his economic and labour work and his conversion to Buddhism 1.

- (b)** Women's participation in the national movement grew from the involvement of a few individuals to the involvement of very large numbers, and it changed both the movement and the position of women. In the Swadeshi period women of educated families took part in the boycott, gave up foreign cloth and ornaments, joined processions and contributed to the funds, and a few were associated with the revolutionary groups; their activity was still mainly within the limits that respectability allowed. The change came with the Gandhian movements. Gandhi held that women were particularly suited to a struggle conducted without violence, which required endurance and the acceptance of suffering rather than physical strength, and he addressed himself to them directly; the programme he adopted, the spinning wheel, the boycott of foreign cloth and of liquor, the picketing of shops, could be carried out from the home and in the neighbourhood, so it reached women who could not have joined a conventional political organisation. During non-cooperation women spun and wore khadi, sold it, picketed cloth and liquor shops and gave their ornaments to the funds. During civil disobedience their part was much larger and more public: Gandhi had at first wished to confine the salt march to men, and women insisted on being included; Sarojini Naidu led the raid on the Dharasana salt works after Gandhi's arrest, Kamaladevi Chattopadhyay and many others manufactured and sold salt, and women picketed in large numbers and went to prison in thousands, which broke the convention that a respectable woman did not

appear in a public confrontation or in a jail. In the Quit India movement, with the leadership arrested, women such as Aruna Asaf Ali and Sucheta Kripalani took a leading part in directing an underground movement, and Usha Mehta operated a clandestine radio. Women also served in other capacities: Sarojini Naidu presided over the Congress and Nellie Sengupta and Annie Besant held that office too, Annie Besant having led the Home Rule agitation; Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit and others were elected to the legislatures; Bhikaji Cama worked abroad for the revolutionary cause; the Rani of Jhansi regiment was raised within the Indian National Army; and Begum Hazrat Mahal and Rani Lakshmbai belonged to the earlier resistance of 1857. Organisations of women were formed, the Women's Indian Association, the National Council of Women and the All India Women's Conference among them, which combined work for the movement with their own programme of the franchise, of education, of the raising of the age of marriage and of legal reform, and the Congress committed itself to equality of the sexes and to adult suffrage in its resolution on fundamental rights. The consequences were considerable in both directions. The movement gained enormously in numbers, in legitimacy and in moral authority, since a government that imprisoned large numbers of women lost standing at home and abroad. Women gained a public life: fifteen women sat in the Constituent Assembly, universal adult suffrage was adopted without the long struggle it had required elsewhere, and equality of the sexes and the prohibition of discrimination were written into the Constitution. Two qualifications are made by historians. Participation was greatest among women of the urban educated and the middle classes, though peasant and working women took part in large numbers in particular regions and in the labour and peasant movements; and the movement's conception of women's role was in some respects conservative, since women were praised for the qualities of self-sacrifice and endurance associated with the household and were seldom placed in the organisational leadership, so the question of equality within the family and of property was not pressed as hard as the political question, and much of it was left to be dealt with after independence.

Participation in the Swadeshi period and the change brought by the Gandhian movements, with the reasons Gandhi addressed women directly 1. The scale of participation in civil disobedience and in Quit India, with named leaders 1. The organisations of women and the consequences, including the franchise and constitutional equality, with the qualifications made about class and about role 1.

- (c) The Constituent Assembly was constituted under the Cabinet Mission's scheme and met for the first time in December 1946. Its members for the provinces were elected by the members of the provincial legislative assemblies, themselves chosen on a restricted franchise, by proportional representation through the single transferable vote, with seats divided among the main communities, and the princely states were to send representatives. The members of the Muslim League largely stayed away and the representatives of the areas that became Pakistan withdrew after Partition, so the body that completed the work was smaller than the one that began it; after August 1947 it was also the Dominion legislature, and it acted in that double capacity. Rajendra Prasad presided over it, B. N. Rau served as constitutional adviser and prepared a draft, and B. R. Ambedkar was Chairman of the Drafting Committee. Most of the work was done in committees, on fundamental rights, on minorities, on the union and the provincial constitutions and on the tribal areas, whose reports the Drafting Committee turned into a text that was then debated clause by clause in the Assembly; the debates were held in public and the record is voluminous. Jawaharlal Nehru moved the Objectives Resolution in December 1946, which set out the aims and whose language was carried into the Preamble. The Assembly sat for a little under three years, adopted the Constitution on 26 November 1949, and the Constitution came into force on 26 January 1950, the date having been chosen because independence had been declared on that day in 1930. The main decisions about the form of the state were these. It was to be a sovereign democratic republic, with an elected head of state rather than a monarch, and India remained in the Commonwealth as a republic by a separate arrangement. Government was to be parliamentary rather than presidential, with a Council of Ministers collectively responsible to the popularly elected House and a head of state who acted on its advice, the Assembly preferring a form with which Indian politicians were familiar and which kept the executive continuously answerable. The structure was to be federal, with a Union and the states each having its own government and legislature and with legislative subjects divided by lists, but with a decidedly strong centre: residuary powers were given to the Union, the Union prevailed in the concurrent field, Parliament was empowered to alter the boundaries and names of states, and the emergency provisions allowed the normal division to be set aside, the experience of Partition and the fear of further fragmentation weighing heavily on the Assembly in this respect. The franchise was to be universal adult suffrage without any

qualification of property, education or sex, which was a bold decision in a largely illiterate population and was adopted with little dissent. A set of Fundamental Rights was made enforceable by the courts, with the right to move the Supreme Court directly for their enforcement, and alongside them Directive Principles of State Policy were included, expressly not justiciable, as instructions to the legislature and the executive about the ends of policy. Untouchability was abolished and its practice in any form forbidden, discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth was prohibited, and reservation of seats and of posts was provided for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, originally for a stated period in the case of legislative seats. The state was to have no official religion, freedom of religion was guaranteed and minorities were given the right to establish and administer their own educational institutions; a uniform civil code was placed among the Directive Principles rather than enacted, the Assembly leaving that question for the future. The judiciary was made single and integrated, with a Supreme Court at its head possessing the power of judicial review, and the independence of judges was secured by provisions on their appointment, tenure and removal. The Assembly also dealt with language, providing that Hindi in the Devanagari script should be the official language of the Union with English continued for a period of fifteen years, a compromise reached after long and difficult debate, and it listed the languages of the Eighth Schedule. Separate electorates, which had existed since 1909, were abolished for all communities, reservation of seats within a common electorate being retained only for the Scheduled Castes and Tribes; the Assembly regarded separate electorates as having contributed to the division of the country. Provision was made for a single citizenship for the whole of India, for an independent Election Commission, for a Comptroller and Auditor General and for a Finance Commission, and for an amending procedure of graded difficulty, requiring a special majority in each House and in certain matters the ratification of half the states. Criticism has been made of the Assembly, that it was indirectly elected on a narrow franchise and so could not claim to represent the people, that the document it produced is very long and borrows heavily from the Government of India Act of 1935, and that the central bias and the emergency provisions were drawn from a colonial statute; its defenders answer that it contained the leading figures of the national movement and representatives of the various communities and schools of opinion, that it debated in public and amended its draft extensively, and that the choices it made about suffrage, rights and the abolition of untouchability went well beyond anything the colonial order had contemplated.

The composition of the Assembly, its indirect election and the withdrawal of the members from the areas that became Pakistan, with the dates of adoption and commencement 1. The method of work through committees and the Drafting Committee, with the Objectives Resolution 1. The decisions on the form of government, a republic with parliamentary government, a federal structure with a strong centre and universal adult suffrage 1. The decisions on Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles, the abolition of untouchability with reservation, the position on religion and language and the abolition of separate electorates 1.