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**You have 90 minutes to take the following test**

**First part (24 points)**

Write “True” or “False” only.

**Part One**

1. F
2. F
3. F
4. F
5. F
6. F
7. T
8. T
9. T
10. T
11. T
12. T

**Second part (32 points)**

Give answers of 80 to 100 words each (in case you write on paper, consider that a line contains more or less ten words):

1. According to Plumb, the origin of the Catholic Church has roots in the distance between what the early Christians believed to be “now” and the second coming of Christ. They thought that Jesus would return in their lifetime, but once the period of “waiting” increased much longer than they had originally though or planned, they realized there must be some institution that would guide the people *until* Jesus did return. They thought that the Church should exist to help with the issues of the *present* while guiding its congregation towards to *future.*
2. Cromwell call England “The new Israel” because in many ways, they had come to see themselves as the “new” chosen people of God, which the Israelites of course thought of themselves. When the Pope in Rome had come to make decisions that they did not agree with, England declared the Pope as akin to the devil and they began to feel need to fight against this new “evil”. By doing this, they took upon a new purpose that was “given” by God and so become the new Israel.
3. To secularize is to make “apart of the world” and in many ways, it means anything *not* having to do with religion – not necessarily against religion, but apart and distinct from it. The Christian view of history become secularized into the idea of “progress” by the continuing adoption of the Christian-like principles across cultures. As time passed and Christianity changed, so the ideas of “good and evil” become the values of “reason and ignorance”. As the Christians saw the righteous war of God over Satan, so did the “world” (the secular world) see the war of reason over ignorance.
4. O’Sullivan’s idea of Manifest Destiny was, in my ways, born out a religious idea to seek God’s favor and purpose in his life. By believing in this idea that God has a “chosen path” and that “all things work to His glory”, He is able to merge his humanistic desires to conquer with the will of God as defined in Christianity. Because God had set forth His plan for all of the people of Earth, the idea of Manifest Destiny must be intimately linked to this “great commission”.

**Third part (24 points)**

Write 400 to 500 words. (In case you write on paper, consider that a line contains more or less ten words).

In many ways, American culture has created a sense of national destiny that is very unlike that of other cultures. First of all, the origins of the country are somewhat different than that of any country in that the physical land it occupies was largely uninhabited. Because of this, many European countries were on a race to “discover it first” and somehow simply claim the land for themselves (even though we know they were already inhabited). Out of this grew the mindset to “push westward” and conqueror more than just what the original thirteen colonies had claimed.

As we studied with O’Sullivan, out of this desire to conquer the “unknown” and strong religious influence, the idea of “Manifest Destiny” was very quickly adopted into American legislature and firmly planted in the American mindset. O’Sullivan believed that westward expansion was good not for racial superiority reasons, but because the *idea* of America was worth spreading. He believed that the ideals of equality and freedom where strong and fundamental to human life that they should be proliferated to their maximum extent. This meant that as America grew, it would not be contained to one physical location, but could exist wherever the ideals of America did.

The American national destiny, in this sense, is much different than what Bhattacharya describes and attempts to prescribe as the national destiny for India. For Indians, their history is drastically different and so a drastically different destiny much take root. Since they were conquered by the British and essentially forced to adopt many practices (including a new language and education) from the British, there some amount of opposition towards the British in India. But Bhattacharya did not want his fellow Indian to think in this way – he described how even though they were dominated militaristically and politically by the Brits, there was still a deeper cultural aspect that the Indians had gone away from and that the cultural impact the British had had on them was had become ingrained in their society that they were not even away of it.

To set India “back on track” towards their rightful “national destiny”, Bhattacharya urges Indians to get back to their “roots” by reawaking the cultural aspects from the past like their language, religion, and customs. He did not advice against the “good” aspects of British life, either, but instead suggested that Indians reach back toward their indigenous roots and also forward towards the good things that the British had brought.