

International Institute of Information Technology, Hyderabad

**Mid-Semester Examination (History Module)**

**Introduction to Human Sciences, HS8.102**

**ONLINE QUESTION PAPER      4 March 2022**

**All Questions Need to be Answered**

**Total Marks: 50**

**Question One**

**Read the following passage and answer questions at the end of it (marks for each part indicated in brackets):**

As our perceptions of the great agitations launched by Mahatma Gandhi against the British Raj grows in subtlety and in detail, we are obliged to discard many dearly held views about the quality of nationalist politics in the subcontinent. It is clear, for instance, that hagiographical accounts portraying the political campaigns conducted by the Mahatma as monolithic struggles, which drew together all the peoples of the country in bonds of solidarity against the British Raj, are divorced from historical reality. It is also obvious that sectional interest and sectional conflict played an important part in nationalist politics; and it has to be conceded that important classes and communities often denied support to the Mahatma in his confrontations with the Raj. The myth of an all embracing nationalist movement, which united Hindu and Muslim, rich and poor, Gujarati and Bengali, or Punjabi and Behari, is all too easy to bury.

Yet what may prove equally misleading, in the long run, is the view advanced in a number of scholarly studies about the elitist quality of nationalist politics, and the extent to which nationalism was divorced from popular aspirations, no less than popular grievances, in the country. It is, therefore, fitting to emphasise, in the cities of the subcontinent, if not in its villages, the importance of popular participation in nationalist politics, particularly after the entry of Gandhi on the stage; to emphasise also the fact that the agitations led by the Mahatma rested upon loose alliances reflecting the interests and aspirations of a large number of classes and communities. Indeed, the most striking feature of the political campaigns conducted by Gandhi was the changing profile of the social groups which supported him at different stages of this struggle with the British Raj.

This changing quality of the Mahatma's support was related just as much to the politicisation of the new social groups in the country, as it was related to the emergence of a new, or the disappearance of old, issues in nationalist politics. Such, at any rate, is the picture which emerges from an examination of nationalist politics in the city of Bombay, the great metropolis of western India, in the crucial years between the initiation of non-cooperation in 1920 and the conduct of civil disobedience during 1930-32.

The quality of politics in Bombay prior to 1920, and the role which the local leaders played in nationalist politics, has already been described in a number of excellent studies. These studies focus

in the first instance, on the activities of the Bombay Presidency Association, a body representing the interests of the leading industrialists, merchants and professional men in the city. During the years of the First World War, however, the leaders of the Presidency Association were eclipsed by a new class of political activists who commenced an agitation for Home Rule, and who were successful in reaching out to the middle and lower middle classes of Bombay. The agitation for Home Rule, in turn, prepared the ground for the Rowlatt Satyagraha which Gandhi conducted in April 1919, in the city of Bombay and the rest of the country.

Although the Rowlatt Satyagraha was a remarkably successful agitation in the subcontinent as a whole, there is little reason to believe that it marked political breakthrough in Bombay. The leading men of the city, who were attracted to the Satyagraha, were men already active in the affairs of the Home Rule Leagues. Not all who were prominent in the affairs of the Home Rule Leagues, however, associated themselves with the Satyagraha, largely because of reservations about the style of Gandhi's politics. Popular participation in the Rowlatt Satyagraha, too, was in the main confined to the idle and lower middle classes, Gujarati or Maharashtrian, that had already been politicised by the agitators of the Home Rule movement. It would, therefore, be true to say that if the demonstrations of April 1919 in Bombay against the Rowlatt Act reflected any progress for the cause of nationalism, in addition to what the Home Rule leagues had already achieved, then this progress rested upon the subcontinental character of the Rowlatt Satyagraha, rather than upon the recruitment of new social groups in the city to the ranks of those who rejected the British Raj.

Indeed, the striking feature of the Rowlatt Satyagraha in Bombay was the extent to which it did not attract the working classes and, by and large, the Muslim community in the city. Bombay, it is important to remember, possessed a substantial population of Muslims. The city was also a great industrial metropolis, with a thriving textile and transport industry, a busy harbour and a flourishing commercial life. More than half the citizens of Bombay, in 1920, sustained themselves through work in industry, on the docks, or in the transport system. The working classes of Bombay, men drawn from the cultivating or untouchable castes of the surrounding rural districts, with a strong leavening of local Muslims, were unaffected by Gandhi's agitation against the Rowlatt Act, just as they were also unaffected by the activities of the Home Rule Leagues. Yet it would be a fallacy to assume that the working classes of Bombay were innocent of political consciousness. In particular, the textile workers of the city, despite the absence of trade unions among them, had struck repeatedly in the preceding decades to improve their conditions of livelihood. Again, in 1908, these impoverished citizens of Bombay had staged a massive strike in protest against the conviction of Lokamanya Balgangadhar Tilak on charges of sedition by the Government of Bombay.

Why the workers of Bombay, particularly the 140,000 men employed in the textile industry, did not participate in the Rowlatt Satyagraha was as much a result of concurrent developments in industrial politics in the city as it was a consequence of Gandhi's attitude towards the working classes. The years of war, which were characterised by rising prices and by phenomenally high profits in industry (profits which the owners appropriated wholly to themselves), had generated acute disaffection among the workers by the time hostilities came to an end. In the first week of 1919, therefore, the textile workers of Bombay staged a strike to secure higher wages for themselves, and their example communicated itself to workers on the docks, in the transport and engineering industries and in various municipal organisations. Since the strike of January 1919 secured for the workers a substantial rise in wages, they could have been indifferent to the agitation against the Rowlatt Act. However, there is little reason to believe that Gandhi even attempted to reach out to the working classes, just as there is little reason to believe that the Home Rule Leagues had anything to do with the strike of January 1919, despite official suspicions to the contrary. The fact of the matter was that working class politics in

Bombay, in 1919, were completely divorced from the politics of the middle and lower middle classes of the city. The gulf between these classes was to be bridged, with momentous consequences, during the campaign for non-cooperation that Gandhi launched in Bombay in 1920.

- 1 a. What are the two errors of historical interpretation that the author seeks to redress in the beginning of the passage? What does it tell us, if anything, about the author and the text? (4+3)
- 1 b. Do you think there is any particular reason why the author uses the term subcontinent and not India? What does it tell us about the author, the text, the topic, etc? (4+4)
- 1 c. When do you think this passage was written; after which year and before which year? How did you find out? (2+3)

=====

=====

## Question Two

**Read the following passage and answer questions at the end of it (marks for each part indicated in brackets):**

BARODA, a city of Guzerat, and the capital of the territory of the prince called the Guicowar, is situate near the river Biswamintri, which is there crossed by a stone bridge, consisting of two ranges of arches, one over the other. The fortifications of the town are of no great strength, consisting of slight walls, with towers at irregular intervals, and several double gateways. The town is intersected by divided into four equal quarters, by two spacious streets, meeting in the centre, at a market-place, containing a square pavilion, with three bold arches on each side, and a flat roof, adorned with seats and fountains.

The houses are in general very high, and built o wood, with sloping tiled roofs. The palace, of residence of the Guicowar, is a building o the same sort, having wooden galleries projecting one over another; and though the edifice is large, it is but of mean appearance. The house of the British resident may be characterised in like terms.

The British cantonment is outside the town, and consists of “a number of small brick houses, with trellis, wooden verandahs, sloping tiled roofs, and upper stories, each surrounded by a garden with a high green hedge of the milk-bush”. The church is a small, but convenient and elegant Gothic building, accommodating about 400 persons.

The population some years since was reported at 140,000. The dominions o the Guicowar, over which the government of India exercise political superintendence are describe in the article on Guzerat. His annual revenue is estimated at 668,744l. The military establishment of this prince, in addition to his regular troops, amounting to 6,059 cavalry and infantry, comprises also the subsidiary force at the disposal of the British government, which consists of five regiments o infantry, completed to 800 men each, two regiments of cavalry, and a company of artillery. He also maintains a contingent force of

3,000 cavalry, paid and equipped agreeably to the suggestions of the British government, and a corps of irregulars, known as the Guzerat Irregular Horse, commanded by British officers.

The state of Baroda was a branch of the great Mahratta confederacy, and its ruler, the Guicowar, one of the princes who acknowledged the puppet rajah of Sattara, the descendant of Sevajee, as their chief. Pelajee Guicowar succeeded his uncle Dunnajee Guicowar as second in command of the Mahratta armies in 1721, and by predatory excursions gradually extended his authority over Guzerat. Bajee Rao, the first Peishwa, conferred upon him the title of "Leader of the Royal Troops".

Pelajee was murdered in 1732 by the rajah of Joudpore, and succeeded by his son Damajee, who still further extended the authority of his family. Damajee then threw off allegiance to the Peishwa, and joined a conspiracy in favour of his rival; but being treacherously made prisoner, he was not allowed to obtain his liberty but at the sacrifice of half his possessions, and under acknowledgement that he held the other half in fief to the Peishwa.

Damajee dying in 1768, the succession was disputed by two of his sons, and finally decided in favour of Syajee, a prince of weak intellect, to the exclusion of Govind Rao, his elder brother. Syajee died without issue in 1792, and was succeeded by his elder brother, Govind Rao, whom he had supplanted in 1768. In 1800, the government devolved upon Annund Rao, a prince of weak intellect. His illegitimate brother Canojee usurped the administration, but was speedily ejected by Rawajee, the minister of the late Govind Rao. Shortly afterwards Rawajee solicited the assistance of the British government for the purpose of reducing Mulhar Rao, a relative of the late prince, who, advancing with a force in support of Canojee, had commenced hostilities against the Guicowar. A body of troops was detached by the government of Bombay, to prevent the subversion of Annund Rao's authority, and Mulhar Rao professed submission; but while negotiations were in progress, he availed himself of an opportunity to make a treacherous attack upon the British detachment, which was, however, successfully repelled, and on the arrival of reinforcements under Sir William Clark, Mulhar Rao was entirely defeated, and compelled to surrender at discretion.

During these proceedings, a convention was concluded between the government of Bombay and Rawajee, on behalf of Annund Rao. This was signed on the 15<sup>th</sup> of March, 1802. Thus the British government, by treating the Guicowar as a substantive state, secured his independence of the Peishwa. Under the treaty, the Guicowar had agreed to receive a British subsidiary force; and the Arab soldiers in his service being no longer required, it was resolved to disband them. These foreign mercenaries had for some time ruled at Baroda; and, alarmed at the prospect of reduction, they placed the Guicowar in confinement, and refused to release him till their claims were satisfied. They permitted Canojee to escape from Baroda, and serious disorders were apprehended. Major Walker called in the aid of an European regiment from Bombay, which, with the subsidiary force under Colonel Woodington, invested the town of Baroda, and after a siege of ten days, a practicable breach having been made, the garrison surrendered.

Other arrangements between the Guicowar and the British government followed, and on the 21<sup>st</sup> April, 1805, the stipulations of the existing agreements were consolidated in a definitive treaty of general defensive alliance. The Guicowar thereby agreed to receive a permanent subsidiary force, and to provide funds for their payment, as well as the liquidation of certain advances of money made for the benefit of the Guicowar state, and the interest thereon.

Henceforth there is little to notice in the history of the Guicowar state till disputes between the Guicowar and the Peishwa, in regard to certain territorial claims, gave rise to a series of events which dissolved the great Mahratta confederacy, and hurled its leader from sovereignty to captivity. To enter

minutely into these disputes is here neither necessary nor practicable. It may suffice to state, that with a view to their termination, Gungadhur Shastri, an able and upright servant of the Guicowar, proceeded to Poona, whence he was seduced to Punderpore, under pretence of devotion, and there treacherously murdered by the contrivance of a wretch named Trimbuckjee Dainglia, a prime favourite of the Peishwa. This led to a succession of hostile operations between the British government and the Peishwa, terminating first in the humiliation of the latter, and ultimately in the destruction of his state and power.

When, as a result of his first discomfiture, the Peishwa yielded to the British government his rights of Guzerat, the Guicowar received an accession of territory; and new treaty, supplemental to the former, was concluded by the resident, Captain Carnac.

Annund Rao died in 1819, and was succeeded by Syajee Rao. The rite of Suttee was abolished throughout the Guicowar's dominions, by proclamation dated the 12<sup>th</sup> February in the year 1840. The reigning prince has it in contemplation to connect his capital by railway with Tunkaria, on the coast of the Gulf of Cambay, a distance of about forty miles. The city of Baroda is distant from Ahmedabad, S.E., 68 miles; from Surat, N., 81; from Bombay, N., 231; from Poona, N., 263; from Mhow, W., 166; from Calcutta, W., 980. Lat. 22° 16', long. 73° 14'.

- 2 A) What do you think is the purpose of this document? Who do you think was it written by and who was it meant for? (2+2+2)**
- 2 B) Between which years was this document written? How do you know? (2+3)**
- 2 C) Who are the foreigners in Baroda? Give reasons for your answer. (1+2)**
- 2 D) How would you corroborate the information in this document? Give one example of fact and one of opinion contained in it. (4+1+1)**

=====

### Question Three

**Read the following passage and answer questions at the end of it (marks for each part indicated in brackets):**

27 August 1858, 25, S.C.

Foreign – Political,

National Archives of India.

From

George Cowper, Esq

Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of Oudh.

To

G. I. Edmonstone, Esq

Secretary to the Government of India.

Sir,

With reference to the Chief Comm<sup>rs</sup> letter to his Lordship the Governor General dated 14<sup>th</sup> September in which he stated that he had authorised the sum of Rs 50,000 to be expended in an attempt to raise the Hindoo population of Bareilly against the Muhomedans. While I am directed to submit the accompanying extract of a letter from Capt. Gowan dated the 14<sup>th</sup> Ultimo from which his Lordship in Council will perceive that the attempt was quite unsuccessful and has been abandoned without the expenditure of any portion of the amount in question.

I have the honour to be Sir

Your most obedient servant.

[sd]

Camp Alum Bagh,

Secretary to the Chief Commissioner

December 1<sup>st</sup> 1857

---

*Extract from Capt. Gowan's letter*

I have been quite unsuccessful in my attempt to induce the thakoors round about here to collect together any number of men. I had been led to suppose that they were inclined to render effectual aid to the Government but find that the extent of aid goes not beyond the professions of good will for the present and boasting of what they would do if they were backed by a well appointed European force which force would do very well without them and would only be hampered by their presence. I have consequently not spent any money whatever and not drawn any cheques upon Government for any purpose.

- 3 a) What is explicit and what is implicit in the information available in this historical source? (2+2)**
- 3 b) What is the Origin, Perspective, Context, Audience in this source? (1+1+1+1)**
- 3 c) How would you test the Reliability of this source? (2)**