Kartik wala RC

In our time it is broadly true that political writing is bad writing. Where it is not true, it will generally be found that the writer is some kind of rebel, expressing his private opinions and not a “party line.” Orthodoxy, of whatever color, seems to demand a lifeless, imitative style. The political dialects to be found in pamphlets, leading articles, manifestoes, White papers and the speeches of undersecretaries do, of course, vary from party to party, but they are all alike in that one almost never finds in them a fresh, vivid, homemade turn of speech. When one watches some tired hack on the platform mechanically repeating the familiar phrases — bestial atrocities, iron heel, bloodstained tyranny, free peoples of the world, stand shoulder to shoulder — one often has a curious feeling that one is not watching a live human being but some kind of dummy: a feeling which suddenly becomes stronger at moments when the light catches the speaker’s spectacles and turns them into blank discs which seem to have no eyes behind them. And this is not altogether fanciful. A speaker who uses that kind of phraseology has gone some distance toward turning himself into a machine. The appropriate noises are coming out of his larynx, but his brain is not involved as it would be if he were choosing his words for himself. If the speech he is making is one that he is accustomed to make over and over again, he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying, as one is when one utters the responses in church. And this reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, is at any rate favorable to political conformity.

In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible. Things like the continuance of British rule in India, the Russian purges and deportations, the dropping of the atom bombs on Japan, can indeed be defended, but only by arguments which are too brutal for most people to face, and which do not square with the professed aims of the political parties. Thus political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question-begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenseless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine-gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called pacification. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no more than they can carry: this is called transfer of population or rectification of frontiers. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called elimination of unreliable elements. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them. Consider for instance some comfortable English professor defending Russian totalitarianism. He cannot say outright, “I believe in killing off your opponents when you can get good results by doing so.” Probably, therefore, he will say something like this:

“While freely conceding that the Soviet regime exhibits certain features which the humanitarian may be inclined to deplore, we must, I think, agree that a certain curtailment of the right to political opposition is an unavoidable concomitant of transitional periods, and that the rigors which the Russian people have been called upon to undergo have been amply justified in the sphere of concrete achievement.

What can be inferred from the example of an English professor defending Russian totalitarianism?
a Some actions of the Russian political class need to be defended.
b Some despicable actions of the Russians are consciously dismissed by some as collateral damage.
c Many people in the West find themselves defending the indefensible actions of Russia.
d The British or Western actions are in general not in any need of such defense.

Why, according to the author, are euphemisms so common in political parlance?
a Euphemisms can be pleasing to the ear.
b Euphemisms do not raise any hackles.

c Euphemisms can sugarcoat the bitter truth.
d Euphemisms are a linguistic tool in the manipulative hands of the politicians.

Q.3
What, according to the author, are the ill-effects of using hackneyed language?
a It makes the users mindlessly mimic political ideologies and engage in stale writing.
b It indulges deliberately in clouded vagueness, which makes it impossible for the listener to figure out the intended meaning of the speaker.
c It allows the users to be insincere about their chosen topic.
d It is used by people to obfuscate the truth and to defend politically, actions which are contemptible.

4) What is the theme of this passage?
a Political communication and the misuse of euphemisms
b Political communication and the usage of clichéd phrases
c Deliberately obfuscating political communication
d Political communication and the English language

Q.5
According to the author, which of the terms given below would most aptly replace ‘pacification’ and ‘rectification of frontiers’?
a ‘Political stabilization’ and ‘agricultural reform’
b ‘Spreading democracy’ and ‘land reform’
c ‘Big brother politics’ and ‘boundary dispute resolution’
d ‘State terrorism’ and ‘forced migration’

Mere wala RC

The production of histories of India has become very frequent in recent years and may well call for some explanation. Why so many and why this one in particular? The reason is a two-fold one: changes in the Indian scene requiring a re-interpretation of the facts and changes in attitudes of historians about the essential elements of Indian history. These two considerations are in addition to the normal fact of fresh information, whether in the form of archeological discoveries throwing fresh light on an obscure period or culture, or the revelations caused by the opening of archives or the release of private papers. The changes in the Indian scene are too obvious to need emphasis. Only two generations ago British rule seemed to
most Indian as well as British observers likely to extend into an indefinite future; now there is a teenage generation which knows nothing of it. Changes in the attitudes of historians have occurred everywhere, changes in attitudes to the content of the subject as well as to particular countries, but in India there have been some special features. Prior to the British, Indian historiographers were mostly Muslims, who relied, as in the case of Sayyid Ghulam Hussain, on their own recollection of events and on information from
friends and men of affairs. Only a few like Abu'l Fazl had access to official papers. These were personal narratives of events, varying in value with the nature of the writer. The early British writers were officials. In the 18th century they were concerned with some aspect of Company policy, or like Robert Orme in his Military Transactions gave a straight narrative in what was essentially a continuation of the Muslim tradition. In the early 119th century the writers were still, with two notable exceptions, officials, but they were now engaged in chronicling, in varying moods of zest, pride, and awe, the rise of the British power in India to supremacy. The two exceptions were James Mill, with his critical attitude to the Company and John
Marchman, the Baptist missionary. But they, like the officials, were anglo-centric in their attitude, so that the history of modern India in their hands came to be the history of the rise of the British in India.

The official school dominated the writing of Indian history until we get the first professional historian's approach. Ramsay Muir and P. E. Roberts in England and H. H. Dodwell in India. Then Indian historians trained in the English school joined in, of whom the most distinguished was Sir Jadunath Sarkar and the other notable writers: Surendranath Sen, Dr Radhakumud Mukherji, and Professor Nilakanta Sastri. They, it may be said, restored India to Indian history, but their bias was mainly political. Finally have come the
nationalists who range from those who can find nothing good or true in the British to sophisticated historical philosophers like K. M. Panikker.

Along the types of historians with their varying bias have gone changes in the attitude to the content of Indian history. Here Indian historians have been influenced both by their local situation and by changes of thought elsewhere. It is this field that this work can claim some attention since it seeks to break new
ground, or perhaps to deepen a freshly turned furrow in the field of Indian history. The early official historians
were content with the glamour and drama of political history from Plassey to the Mutiny, from Dupleix to the Sikhs. But when the raj was settled down, glamour departed from politics, and they turned to the less glorious but more solid ground of administration. Not how India was conquered but how it was governed was the theme of this school of historians. It found its archpriest in H. H. Dodwell, its priestess in Dame Lilian Penson, and its chief shrine in the Volume VI of the Cambridge History of India. Meanwhile, in Britain
other currents were moving, which led historical study into the economic and social fields. R. C. Dutt entered the first of these currents with his Economic History of India to be followed more recently by the whole group of Indian economic historians. W. E. Moreland extended these studies to the Mughal Period.
Social history is now being increasingly studied and there is also of course a school of nationalist

historians who see modern Indian history in terms of the rise and the fulfillment of the national movement.

All these approaches have value, but all share in the quality of being compartmental. It is not enough to remove political history from its pedestal of being the only kind of history worth having if it is merely to put other types of history in its place. Too exclusive an attention to economic, social, or administrative history can be as sterile and misleading as too much concentration on politics. A whole subject needs a whole treatment for understanding. A historian must dissect his subject into its elements and then fuse them together again into an integrated whole. The true history of a country must contain all the features just cited but must present them as parts of a single consistent theme

A. Which of the following may be the closest in meaning to the statement ‘restored India to Indian history’?
1. Indian historians began writing Indian history.
2. Trained historians began writing Indian history.
3. Writing India-centric Indian history began.
4. Indian history began to be written in India.

B. Which of the following is the closest implication of the statement ‘to break new ground, or perhaps to deepen a freshly turned furrow’?
1. Dig afresh or dig deeper.
2. Start a new stream of thought or help establish a recently emerged perspective.
3. Begin or conduct further work on existing archeological sites to unearth new evidence.
4. Begin writing a history free of any biases.

C. Historians moved from writing political history to writing administrative history because
1. attitudes of the historians changed.
2. the raj was settled down.
3. politics did not retain its past glamour.
4. administrative history was based on solid ground.

D. According to the author, which of the following is not among the attitudes of Indian historians of Indian origin?
1. Writing history as personal narratives.
2. Writing history with political bias.
3. Writing non-political history due to lack of glamour.
4. Writing history by dissecting elements and integrating them again.