

CBSE CLASS X  
**Social Science (087)**

## ANSWER KEY

AI-generated question paper

Code: PINHI7

Questions: 70

Maximum Marks: 219

Generated: 2026-06-26 10:27

**SELECTIONS USED**

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Subject                | Social Science  |
| Lessons                | 2 Nationalism in India  |
| Level of understanding | Thorough understanding  |
| Question selection     | Curated chapter coverage (~5 questions per section + 8 synthesis) |
| Model                  | claude-sonnet-4-6   |

Composition — Difficulty: 4 straightforward · 35 medium · 31 deep | Types: 48 Short · 14 Long · 5 MCQ · 3 Very short

Q1. medium thorough-understanding § Introduction

[3]

The growth of nationalism in India was closely tied to the anti-colonial movement, unlike in Europe where nationalism was linked to the formation of nation-states. Why did the experience of colonialism itself help create a sense of national unity among Indians, even though different groups had very different experiences of colonial rule?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

Colonialism created a shared sense of oppression among Indians, which became the foundation of national unity. Although different classes and groups experienced colonial rule differently — peasants, tribals, merchants, and women all had distinct grievances — the common feeling of being dominated and exploited by a foreign power bound them together. This shared bond overcame differences of region, religion, caste, and language. The Congress under Mahatma Gandhi channelled these varied grievances into organised movements like Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience, forging unity through collective struggle, even though true unity often broke down due to conflicting aspirations.

Source: Chapter 2, Introduction and Conclusion

---

**Explanation**

- The examiner expects you to use the **key phrase** "shared bond of oppression" or equivalent — it comes directly from the passage.
- Mention that **different groups had different experiences** but a **common anti-colonial feeling** united them — this directly addresses the "why" in the question.
- Briefly name **Gandhi/Congress** as the force that tried to channel this unity into movement.
- Avoid listing all movements in detail — this is only 3 marks; one focused paragraph is enough.
- Do **not** invent points outside the passage (e.g., economic arguments not mentioned there).

Q2. deep thorough-understanding § 1 The First World War, Khilafat and Non-Cooperation

[3]

Mahatma Gandhi chose to link the Non-Cooperation Movement with the Khilafat issue, even though it was primarily a concern of Muslim communities. What was his reasoning, and what does this reveal about his broader strategy for building the national movement?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi linked the Non-Cooperation Movement with the Khilafat issue to unite Hindus and Muslims under a single platform against British rule. His reasoning was that British power survived only because Indians cooperated with it; if all Indians — Hindus and Muslims together — withdrew cooperation, colonial rule would collapse and Swaraj would come.

This reveals Gandhi's broader strategy of forging a **unified mass movement** by bringing together different communities and their grievances under one common struggle. He and Shaukat Ali toured extensively to mobilise popular support across communities, showing his belief that national unity required bridging religious divides, not ignoring them.

Source: Chapter 2 — *Why Non-Cooperation?, Differing Strands within the Movement*

---

### Explanation

- **Key point examiners look for:** Two things — (1) Gandhi's logic (British rule survives on Indian cooperation), and (2) the strategic intent (Hindu-Muslim unity as the foundation of a mass national movement).
- Don't just describe the Khilafat issue — explain **why Gandhi chose to link it**, which is what the question asks.
- The phrase "various social groups participated, each with its own aspiration" from the passage supports the idea that Gandhi consciously tried to channel multiple grievances into one unified movement.
- At 3 marks (~60–90 words), two tight points with brief elaboration is enough — no need to list all details of the movement.

Q3. medium thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Idea of Satyagraha

[3]

Mahatma Gandhi organised satyagraha movements in Champaran, Kheda and Ahmedabad before launching a nationwide one. What common principle did each of these struggles share, despite involving different groups of people with different grievances?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Despite involving different groups — Bihar peasants (Champaran), Gujarat peasants (Kheda), and Ahmedabad mill workers — all three struggles shared the common principle of **satyagraha**: fighting injustice through **non-violence** rather than physical force. Each movement appealed to the conscience of the oppressor instead of seeking vengeance or using aggression. Truth was considered powerful enough to win, without violence. Gandhi believed this principle of non-violence (non-violent soul-force) could unite all Indians across different classes and grievances.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 1.1 – The Idea of Satyagraha

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to identify the **shared principle**, not describe each movement separately.
- Key terms to use: **satyagraha, non-violence, truth, appealing to conscience, no physical force** — these come directly from the passage and score marks.
- Avoid listing grievances; the question asks what was *common*, not what was different.
- One mark each for: naming the principle (satyagraha/non-violence), explaining it (truth over force), and its universality (applicable to all groups/classes).

Q4. medium thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Idea of Satyagraha

[3]

Gandhi argued that satyagraha was a weapon of the strong, not the weak. How does this claim make sense when you consider that satyagrahis deliberately chose not to use physical force against the oppressor?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi's claim makes sense because satyagraha required **inner strength**, not physical force. Avoiding violence is not weakness — it demands immense courage, self-discipline, and willingness to suffer without retaliation.

Gandhi explained that satyagraha is "pure soul-force," rooted in truth. A satyagrahi wins by **appealing to the conscience of the oppressor**, persuading people to see the truth rather than forcing them. This requires active, intense moral resistance — far harder than responding with violence.

Physical force, by contrast, requires no such discipline; anyone can use it. Hence, non-violent resistance belonged only to those with exceptional moral strength, making it the weapon of the **strong**, not the weak.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 1.1 – The Idea of Satyagraha

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects you to:

1. Distinguish between *physical* strength and *moral/inner* strength.
2. Use Gandhi's own language from Source A: "pure soul-force," "intense activity," not passive.
3. Explain the mechanism: conscience-appeal, not coercion.

Avoid confusing "non-violence = passivity." Gandhi explicitly rejected the term "passive resistance." The key contrast is: anyone can use violence, but bearing suffering without retaliation demands exceptional courage — hence it is a weapon of the **strong**.

Q5. deep thorough-understanding § 1.1 The Idea of Satyagraha

[5]

[long\_answer] Gandhi believed that non-violence had the power to unite all Indians across caste, class, religion and region. To what extent did the national movement actually achieve this unity? Assess with reference to specific events, turning points and the eventual outcomes of the movement.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi believed non-violence could unite all Indians, but the national movement achieved this unity only partially and unevenly.

#### Achievements of Unity:

- The Non-Cooperation Movement (1921) brought together peasants, workers, students, and merchants under one platform.
- The Civil Disobedience Movement and Salt March (1930) saw women, tribals, and various classes participate actively.
- A shared anti-colonial bond created a sense of common identity across diverse groups.

#### Limitations:

- Different groups had different visions of swaraj — plantation workers in Assam wanted freedom of movement; tribals sought land; merchants wanted trade protection.
- The movement repeatedly broke down: Chauri Chaura violence forced Gandhi to withdraw Non-Cooperation (1922).
- Unity was followed by phases of disunity and inner conflict.

**Conclusion:** What emerged was, as the textbook states, "a nation with many voices wanting freedom from colonial rule" — united in opposition to colonialism, but divided in aspirations.

Source: *The Nationalist Movement in India, Chapter 2 (Introduction and Conclusion)*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for **balanced assessment** — both achievements and limitations — not a one-sided answer.
- Always use **specific events** (Chauri Chaura, Salt March, Assam plantation workers) to support points; vague claims lose marks.
- The **conclusion phrase** from the textbook ("a nation with many voices") is a high-value line to quote — it shows you have read the source carefully.
- At 5 marks, aim for 5 distinct, crisp points rather than long paragraphs; bullet structure is acceptable in CBSE board answers.

Q6. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Rowlatt Act

[3]

The Rowlatt Act of 1919 was seen by Indian nationalists as a direct assault on civil liberties. Explain the specific provisions of the Act that made it so controversial, and analyse why it provoked a far stronger nationalist reaction than ordinary emergency legislation would have.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Rowlatt Act (1919) was controversial because it gave the government sweeping powers to **detain political prisoners without trial for two years** and to repress political activities. It was hurriedly passed through the Imperial Legislative Council **despite the united opposition of all Indian members**, making it an act of deliberate disregard for Indian opinion.

It provoked a far stronger reaction than ordinary emergency legislation because it was a **peacetime law** — the war had ended, yet colonial authorities sought to make wartime repressive powers permanent. Indians saw it as a direct attack on fundamental civil liberties, with no legal recourse available to the accused. This sense of injustice united nationalists, leading Gandhi to call a nationwide hartal on 6 April 1919.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 1.2 — The Rowlatt Act

---

### Explanation

- The examiner awards marks for: (1) naming the specific provisions — detention without trial, repression of political activity; (2) noting it was passed despite Indian opposition; (3) explaining **why** it was worse than ordinary emergency law — it was a peacetime measure making wartime powers permanent, denying civil liberties with no legal remedy.
- Don't just describe the Act — the question asks you to *analyse* why the reaction was stronger, so the second paragraph is essential.
- Keep the answer focused; avoid narrating the Jallianwalla Bagh massacre unless directly asked.

Q7. medium thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Rowlatt Act

[1]

Mahatma Gandhi launched the Rowlatt Satyagraha as a strictly non-violent movement, yet violence broke out in several parts of the country. Analyse any three reasons why the movement could not remain non-violent, and explain how Gandhi responded to this situation.

A Gandhi had secretly encouraged workers to attack government buildings.

B The British administration's crackdown — arresting local leaders and firing on peaceful protesters — provoked widespread anger that escalated into attacks on symbols of authority.

C The hartal was poorly organised and participants did not understand it was meant to be non-violent.

D The Justice Party in Madras encouraged violent resistance to the Act.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Option B** is correct. The British crackdown — arresting local leaders and firing on peaceful protesters at Amritsar — provoked widespread anger, leading to attacks on banks, post offices and railway stations. Gandhi, seeing violence spread, called off the movement.

Source: *The Rowlatt Act, chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

This is a 1-mark MCQ, so only the correct option with a brief justification is needed. The passage explicitly states that police firing on a peaceful procession provoked attacks on government symbols, and Gandhi called off the movement when violence spread. Options A and D are factually incorrect; Option C is partially true but not supported by the passage as a primary cause.

Q8. deep thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Rowlatt Act

[3]

General Dyer said his aim at Jallianwalla Bagh was to 'produce a moral effect' on the satyagrahis. What does this reveal about the British government's strategy for dealing with the Indian nationalist movement at that moment, and why did this strategy ultimately backfire?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

General Dyer's aim to 'produce a moral effect' reveals that the British strategy was to use **terror and intimidation** to suppress the nationalist movement — crushing resistance through fear rather than addressing legitimate grievances.

This strategy backfired because the massacre had the **opposite effect**: instead of demoralising Indians, it intensified outrage and mass anger. Crowds took to the streets across north India; strikes and protests spread widely. The brutal repression — forcing satyagrahis to crawl, flogging, bombing villages — only deepened anti-British sentiment, ultimately strengthening the nationalist movement rather than suppressing it.

Source: Chapter 2 — The Nationalist Movement in India, Section 1.2 (The Rowlatt Act)

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for **two parts**: (1) what the strategy reveals — use of terror/repression to intimidate — and (2) why it backfired — it united and radicalised Indians further.
- Cite specific textbook details: crowds in north Indian towns, strikes, attacks on government buildings, humiliating punishments — these show the counter-productive effect.
- Avoid writing a general essay on Jallianwalla Bagh; stay focused on the *strategy* and its *failure*, as the question demands.

Q9. deep thorough-understanding § 1.2 The Rowlatt Act

[3]

Although the Rowlatt Satyagraha was widespread, Mahatma Gandhi acknowledged it had a significant limitation that made him think about how to broaden the next mass movement. What was that limitation, and how did it shape his decision to take up the Khilafat issue?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Limitation of the Rowlatt Satyagraha:** The Rowlatt Satyagraha was largely limited to cities and towns; it did not draw in the Muslim community on a large scale, making it difficult to build a truly broad-based, united national movement.

**How it shaped Gandhi's decision on Khilafat:** Gandhi saw the Khilafat issue — the Muslim concern over the dismemberment of the Ottoman Caliphate by the British after World War I — as an opportunity to bring Hindus and Muslims together under one mass movement. By linking Non-Cooperation with the Khilafat cause, he aimed to overcome the limitation of a movement confined to one community, forging Hindu-Muslim unity and expanding the movement's social base across the country.

Source: Chapter 2 — The Nationalist Movement in India, Section 1.3 Why Non-cooperation?

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for **two parts**: (1) naming the limitation clearly — narrow social/communal base — and (2) connecting it logically to Gandhi's Khilafat strategy.
- The key link is **Hindu-Muslim unity**: Gandhi used the Khilafat grievance to bring Muslims into the Non-Cooperation Movement.
- Note: The passages hint at Gandhi's goal of uniting all Indians through satyagraha's dharma of non-violence; the Khilafat angle is the practical step toward that goal.
- Avoid writing a lengthy essay — 3 marks = ~70 words, tightly organised in 2 short parts.

**Q10.** medium thorough-understanding § 1.3 Why Non-cooperation?

**[3]**

Mahatma Gandhi proposed that the Non-Cooperation Movement should unfold in stages, beginning with relatively mild forms of defiance before escalating to full civil disobedience. Why do you think he chose this gradual, staged approach rather than launching mass civil disobedience immediately? What does this reveal about his strategy?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:57 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi chose a staged approach because he understood that mass civil disobedience was difficult to control and could easily turn violent. By beginning with the surrender of titles and boycott of councils, schools, and foreign goods, he allowed people to build discipline and commitment gradually. Full civil disobedience would only be launched if the government used repression.

This reveals that Gandhi's strategy was rooted in **satyagraha** — appealing to conscience rather than force. He prioritised non-violence and wanted to ensure the movement remained morally strong and organised before escalating.

Source: *Why Non-cooperation?*, Chapter 2

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect two things here: **(1)** the practical reason — staged approach prevents premature violence and builds mass discipline; **(2)** the strategic/philosophical reason — it reflects satyagraha principles. Always link back to the source text (surrender of titles → boycott → civil disobedience only if repression occurs). Avoid writing a general essay on Gandhi; keep it focused on the staged structure and what it reveals about his thinking.

Q11. deep thorough-understanding § 1.3 Why Non-cooperation?

[3]

Gandhi argued that British rule in India survived only because Indians cooperated with it — by serving in the army, paying taxes, and attending government institutions. A critic counters: 'The British had superior military force; Indian cooperation was irrelevant to their hold on power.' Using Gandhi's logic as your framework, how would you refute this critic? What does Gandhi's argument reveal about his understanding of colonial power and the strategy of Non-Cooperation?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi's framework held that British rule survived **not through force alone, but through Indian cooperation** — taxes, army service, and use of government institutions. Without these, the colonial machine would collapse.

To refute the critic: superior military force is meaningless without soldiers to man it, funds to finance it, and a civilian administration to run it. All of these depended on Indian participation. As Gandhi argued in *Hind Swaraj*, if Indians simply withdrew cooperation, British rule would collapse within a year.

This reveals Gandhi's understanding that colonial power was not purely coercive — it was **sustained from below**. His strategy of Non-Cooperation was therefore designed to **withdraw the consent and labour** that made British rule possible, rendering military superiority irrelevant.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 1.3 — Why Non-cooperation?

---

### Explanation

- The key Gandhian idea is that **power rests on cooperation, not just force** — examiners look for this inversion of the critic's logic.
- Cite *Hind Swaraj* (1909) and the staged Non-Cooperation plan (boycott of army, courts, schools, etc.) to show you've used the textbook.
- The three-mark structure works best as: (1) state Gandhi's core claim, (2) directly refute the critic using that logic, (3) show what it reveals about his understanding of colonial power. Don't pad beyond ~80 words.

**Q12.** deep thorough-understanding § 2 Differing Strands within the Movement

[5]

Different social groups — urban middle class, Awadh peasants, tribal communities in Andhra Pradesh, and plantation workers in Assam — all joined the Non-Cooperation Movement, yet each understood 'swaraj' in a very different way. Choose any two of these groups and explain: (a) what swaraj meant to each of them, and (b) how their vision of swaraj created tension with the Congress leadership's goals for the movement.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Group 1: Awadh Peasants

(a) For Awadh peasants, swaraj meant freedom from oppressive landlords (talukdars) and colonial revenue demands. They believed Gandhi Raj would end exploitation — rents would be cancelled, lands restored, and their suffering would be over. They imagined swaraj as a time of complete economic liberation from landlordism.

(b) This clashed with Congress goals because the Congress refused to support "no-rent" campaigns, fearing it would alienate rich peasants and landlords who were useful allies. The Congress wanted a broad anti-imperial coalition, not a class struggle against landlords.

#### Group 2: Plantation Workers in Assam

(a) For plantation workers, swaraj meant the freedom to move freely — to leave tea gardens and return to their villages. Trapped under the Inland Emigration Act of 1859, they could not leave without permission. They believed Gandhi Raj would give them land in their home villages.

(b) Their response — abandoning plantations and marching home — went far beyond the Congress's organised, disciplined programme of boycotts. Congress had not sanctioned such spontaneous defiance, and their movement was unconnected to the Congress's strategic goals of political self-rule.

Source: Chapter 2, Sections 2.3 and 3.2

---

### Explanation

- Always name the group clearly before answering (a) and (b).
- Part (a) needs a specific definition of swaraj *for that group* — not a general statement.
- Part (b) must show a **clash** with Congress: what Congress wanted vs. what the group wanted.
- The plantation workers example is directly from Section 2.3 — examiners love this specific example because it's vivid and factually precise (Inland Emigration Act detail earns marks).
- Stay within ~120 words total; one tight paragraph per sub-question per group is enough.

Q13. medium thorough-understanding § 2.1 The Movement in the Towns

[3]

The Non-Cooperation Movement's urban phase gradually lost momentum despite an enthusiastic start. Analyse the reasons behind this slowdown and explain what these reasons reveal about the inherent challenges of sustaining a mass boycott movement over time.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The urban phase of the Non-Cooperation Movement slowed down due to two main reasons:

1. **Khadi was expensive:** Khadi cloth cost more than mass-produced mill cloth, so poor people could not afford it and could not sustain the boycott of foreign cloth for long.
1. **Lack of alternative institutions:** For the boycott of British schools and courts to succeed, Indian alternatives had to be established. These were slow to come up, so students and teachers drifted back to government schools and lawyers returned to government courts.

These reasons reveal that sustaining a mass boycott requires both economic accessibility and ready substitutes for what is being rejected. Without these, even enthusiastic participants are compelled to return to the system they sought to challenge.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.1 – The Movement in the Towns

---

### Explanation

Examiners expect you to identify **both specific reasons** (khadi being expensive + lack of alternative institutions) directly from the textbook passage. The second part asking about "inherent challenges" needs a brief inference — that boycott movements require viable alternatives and economic feasibility for all classes. Don't write in bullet points if the question says "analyse" — a mix of points and a concluding inference works best for 3 marks.

Q14. deep thorough-understanding § 2.1 The Movement in the Towns

[3]

The Justice Party in Madras chose NOT to boycott the council elections during the Non-Cooperation Movement, while most other provinces did. Why was the Justice Party's decision a rational one given its specific political situation, even though it went against the Congress call?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Justice Party, representing non-Brahman communities in Madras, chose not to boycott the council elections because entering the councils offered them a rare opportunity to gain political power — power that was usually accessible only to Brahmans. For this party, participating in the councils was a way to challenge Brahman dominance in local governance. Boycotting would have meant surrendering this hard-won political space. Thus, their decision prioritised community empowerment over Congress's call, making it rational given their specific social and political context.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.1 — *The Movement in the Towns*

---

### Explanation

The key fact is directly from the passage: "*the Justice Party, the party of the non-Brahmans, felt that entering the council was one way of gaining some power – something that usually only Brahmans had access to.*"

Examiners want you to clearly link the party's identity (non-Brahman), their goal (access to power), and why boycotting would have harmed their interests specifically. Avoid generalising — keep it specific to caste dynamics in Madras.

Q15. medium thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside

[3]

Who was Baba Ramchandra, and how did his personal background make him an effective leader of the peasant movement in Awadh? Explain with reference to the specific grievances he championed.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Baba Ramchandra was a **sanyasi** who had previously worked as an **indentured labourer in Fiji**. This background gave him firsthand experience of exploitation, making him deeply empathetic to peasant suffering and credible as their leader.

He led peasants in **Awadh** against talukdars and landlords who imposed:

- **Exorbitantly high rents** and various cesses
- **Begar** (unpaid forced labour on landlords' farms)
- **Insecure tenancy** — peasants were regularly evicted to prevent them from gaining legal rights over land

He championed demands for **reduction of revenue**, **abolition of begar**, and **social boycott of oppressive landlords** (through *nai-dhobi bandhs*). He co-founded the **Oudh Kisan Sabha** (October 1920) with Jawaharlal Nehru, which rapidly expanded to over 300 village branches.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.2 — *Rebellion in the Countryside*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for **three elements**: (1) who Baba Ramchandra was (sanyasi + indentured labourer background), (2) how that background helped him connect with peasants, and (3) the specific grievances — high rent, begar, eviction — and demands he raised. Avoid vague statements; name the specific issues from the passage. The Oudh Kisan Sabha detail shows organisational impact and scores well.

Q16. medium thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside

[3]

Peasants in Awadh organised 'nai-dhobi bandhs' against oppressive landlords. What does this form of protest reveal about the social and economic power that ordinary villagers could exercise, even without taking up arms?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The *nai-dhobi bandh* was a social boycott organised by panchayats in Awadh to deprive landlords of the services of barbers and washermen. This reveals that:

1. **Collective social power:** Even without weapons, ordinary villagers could unite and use everyday services as tools of pressure.
2. **Economic leverage:** Denying basic domestic services disrupted the landlords' daily life, showing peasants held real economic influence.
3. **Organised resistance:** The panchayat coordinated this protest, proving rural communities had structured leadership capable of sustained, non-violent action against oppressive talukdars.

Thus, peasants exercised significant social and economic power through organised, peaceful means.

Source: *Rebellion in the Countryside, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The examiner wants you to **explain what nai-dhobi bandh means**, then **link it to social/economic power** (not armed power). Three clear points are ideal for 3 marks. Avoid vague statements — be specific: services denied = barbers and washermen; organised by = panchayats; target = talukdars/landlords. The textbook passage directly supports all these points, so don't go beyond it.

Q17. deep thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside

[5]

The Congress leadership was uncomfortable with the way the Awadh peasant movement developed in 1921, even though it had worked to bring that movement into the Non-Cooperation fold. What specific actions by the peasants caused this discomfort, and what does this tension reveal about the difference in goals between the Congress and the rural poor?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Specific actions that caused Congress discomfort:

As the Awadh peasant movement spread in 1921, peasants began **attacking houses of talukdars and merchants, looting bazaars, and seizing grain hoards**. Local leaders told peasants that Gandhiji had declared no taxes were to be paid and land would be redistributed among the poor. Thus, the name of the Mahatma was being invoked to sanction all kinds of radical action that went beyond Congress's programme.

#### The underlying tension in goals:

The Congress wanted a disciplined, non-violent non-cooperation movement aimed at ending British rule. The rural poor, however, were driven by immediate economic grievances — oppressive rents, forced labour (begar), insecurity of tenure, and hunger. For them, swaraj meant redistribution of land and relief from landlord exploitation. The Congress, wary of alienating talukdars and propertied classes, was unwilling to endorse such demands. This revealed a fundamental difference: Congress sought political independence, while the peasants sought social and economic liberation.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.2 — Rebellion in the Countryside

---

### Explanation

- **Examiners expect two clear parts:** (1) the specific violent/radical actions, and (2) the analysis of contrasting goals. Both must be present for full marks.
- Directly quote or closely paraphrase the textbook phrases ("houses of talukdars and merchants were attacked, bazaars were looted, grain hoards were taken over") — these signal you've read the source.
- The key insight is the **Congress–peasant ideological gap**: Congress = political swaraj; peasants = economic/social swaraj. State this explicitly.
- Do not generalise vaguely; name specific actions and specific fears (alienating landlords/propertied classes).

**Q18.** deep thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside [3]

Local leaders in Awadh told peasants that Gandhiji had declared that no taxes were to be paid and that land would be redistributed among the poor. How did this interpretation differ from the actual goals of the Non-Cooperation Movement? What does this gap between official Congress aims and popular understanding reveal about how ordinary people engaged with nationalist politics?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The actual goal of the Non-Cooperation Movement was to boycott British institutions, foreign goods, and colonial services to force Britain to grant swaraj. It did **not** include redistribution of land or cancellation of taxes. Local leaders in Awadh reinterpreted Gandhiji's message to suit peasant grievances — no-tax campaigns and land redistribution — which were not part of the Congress programme.

This gap reveals that ordinary people engaged with nationalism on **their own terms**, linking it to immediate economic sufferings. As the textbook notes, "the visions of these movements were not defined by the Congress programme" — people imagined swaraj as an end to all suffering, yet by acting in Gandhi's name they connected local struggles to a broader national movement.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.3 — *Swaraj in the Plantations / Conclusion*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners look for: (1) what the official Congress goal actually was, (2) how Awadh peasants distorted it, and (3) what this reveals about popular engagement.
- Key phrase to quote or paraphrase: "visions of these movements were not defined by the Congress programme."
- Avoid over-explaining; 3 marks = 3 clear points in roughly 3–4 sentences.

**Q19.** straightforward thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside [1]

Alluri Sitaram Raju accepted some Gandhian ideas but rejected others. Which Gandhian idea did he explicitly reject, and what alternative did he champion for achieving swaraj?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

He rejected the idea of non-violence, believing that force/armed struggle was necessary to achieve swaraj, not peaceful non-cooperation.

### Explanation

The question focuses on Alluri Sitaram Raju's specific rejection of Gandhian non-violence while accepting other ideas like the need for swaraj. Examiners expect you to name the rejected idea (non-violence/peaceful means) and the alternative (armed resistance). Note: the source passages provided do not directly discuss Raju — this content comes from the tribal movements section of Chapter 2 (Non-Cooperation Movement and tribals). Keep the answer to one crisp line for 1 mark.

**Q20.** medium thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside

[3]

The grievances that drove the Gudem Hills tribal uprising were rooted in specific colonial policies. Identify TWO such policies and explain how each directly threatened the livelihood and way of life of the hill communities.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Gudem Hills tribal uprising was driven by two key colonial policies:

1. **Restriction on forest use:** The colonial government closed large forest areas, preventing tribals from grazing cattle and collecting wood and fruits. This directly destroyed their traditional subsistence economy, as the forest was their primary source of livelihood.
1. **Forced labour (veth):** The government forced hill people to do unpaid work for the colonial administration. This was deeply resented as it violated their freedom and disrupted their daily lives and agricultural work.

These policies together threatened the tribals' economic survival and autonomy, fuelling the armed uprising led by Alluri Sitarama Raju.

Source: Chapter 2, Nationalism in India

---

### Explanation

- The source passages provided do **not** contain details about the Gudem Hills uprising beyond a date reference (Alluri Sitarama Raju, 1924). However, this topic is well-covered in the **NCERT Class 10 History Chapter 2** textbook itself.
- Examiners expect you to identify **forest laws** and **forced labour/veth** as the two policies — these are the standard NCERT answers.
- For a 3-mark question with two points, briefly name each policy and explain its impact in 1–2 lines each. Don't just list — always link to "livelihood/way of life."
- The conclusion sentence tying grievances to the uprising earns the third mark.

Q21. deep thorough-understanding § 2.2 Rebellion in the Countryside

[5]

Both the Awadh peasant movement and the Gudem Hills tribal uprising emerged in the context of the Non-Cooperation Movement, yet differed sharply in their methods and their relationship with the Indian National Congress. Compare the two movements in terms of (a) the grievances that drove them, (b) the methods of protest adopted, and (c) how the Congress leadership viewed or responded to each.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### (a) Grievances:

In **Awadh**, peasants suffered under exploitative talukdars — exorbitant rents, forced *begar*, multiple *cesses*, and insecurity of tenure with no right over leased land. In the **Gudem Hills**, tribals were enraged by colonial forest laws that denied them traditional rights to graze cattle and collect fuelwood, and by forced *begar* for road construction.

#### (b) Methods of Protest:

Awadh peasants used largely non-violent means — social boycotts (*nai-dhobi bandhs*), hartals, and panchayat-organised pressure on landlords. However, movement later turned to looting bazaars and attacking talukdars' houses. Gudem tribals under **Alluri Sitaram Raju** adopted outright **guerrilla warfare** — attacking police stations and attempting to kill British officials, explicitly rejecting non-violence.

#### (c) Congress Response:

Congress tried to **integrate** the Awadh movement but was deeply **unhappy** with its violent turn. The Oudh Kisan Sabha was set up under Nehru and Ramchandra to channel it. The Gudem uprising was a form of struggle Congress **could not approve** at all, as it directly contradicted the principle of non-violence central to the Non-Cooperation Movement.

Source: Chapter 2, *Rebellion in the Countryside*

---

### Explanation

- The question has three labelled parts — always answer all three separately and label them (a), (b), (c).
- Examiners look for **specific details**: names (Baba Ramchandra, Alluri Sitaram Raju), specific grievances (*begar*, forest rights), and specific methods (*nai-dhobi bandh*, guerrilla warfare).
- The key contrast is **non-violence vs. armed struggle** in methods, and **partial integration vs. outright rejection** in Congress response.
- Don't write vaguely — "peasants were unhappy" scores nothing; "evicted tenants demanding abolition of *begar*" scores marks.

Q22. medium thorough-understanding § 2.3 Swaraj in the Plantations

[3]

Plantation workers in Assam interpreted the Non-Cooperation Movement as a chance to leave the tea gardens and return to their villages. Why were they unable to do so even under normal circumstances, and what does this reveal about the nature of colonial labour control?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Under the **Inland Emigration Act of 1859**, plantation workers in Assam were legally **not permitted to leave the tea gardens without permission**, which was rarely granted. They were essentially confined to the plantations, cut off from their villages.

This reveals that colonial labour control was **coercive and legally enforced** — workers were not free labourers but were bound to the plantations by law. The state used legislation to serve the economic interests of British planters, stripping workers of basic mobility rights. This shows how colonialism exploited labour through legal mechanisms, not merely economic pressure.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.3 — Swaraj in the Plantations

---

### Explanation

- The **Inland Emigration Act of 1859** is the key fact examiners look for — name it precisely.
- The answer must link the restriction to **colonial economic interests** (British tea planters needed captive labour).
- "Nature of colonial labour control" = coercive, legally enforced, prioritised planter profits over workers' rights. Mention all three angles briefly.
- Avoid retelling the full story of what happened during the movement; focus on **why they couldn't leave** and **what it reveals**.

**Q23.** deep thorough-understanding § 2.3 Swaraj in the Plantations

[3]

The plantation workers' vision of swaraj was very different from that of the Congress leadership, yet their action during the Non-Cooperation Movement can still be seen as part of the wider nationalist struggle. Justify this statement by explaining both the difference in vision and the common thread that linked their movement to the national cause.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:58 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Difference in Vision:

For Congress leadership, swaraj meant ending British rule and gaining political independence. For plantation workers in Assam, swaraj meant freedom of movement — the right to leave the tea gardens freely and return to their villages. Under the Inland Emigration Act of 1859, they were not permitted to leave without permission. They believed "Gandhi Raj" was coming and everyone would receive land in their own villages.

#### Common Thread:

Despite this difference, their movement was part of the wider nationalist struggle because when workers acted in the name of Mahatma Gandhi and defied colonial authority, they were emotionally relating to an all-India agitation. By linking their movement to the Congress, they were identifying with a struggle that went beyond their immediate locality — the common thread being resistance against colonial rule.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.3 — Swaraj in the Plantations

---

#### Explanation

The examiner looks for **two distinct parts**: (1) clearly stating the *difference* in vision and (2) explaining the *common thread*. Do not just describe one side. Key facts to include: the Inland Emigration Act of 1859, workers' specific idea of swaraj (free movement + land in villages), and the passage's point that acting in Gandhi's name linked local grievances to the national struggle. Avoid vague phrases — be specific.

Q24. medium thorough-understanding § 3 Towards Civil Disobedience

[3]

Why did Mahatma Gandhi choose salt as the central symbol for launching the Civil Disobedience Movement, rather than any other colonial injustice?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi chose salt as the central symbol because it was consumed by **all Indians — rich and poor alike** — making it a unifying grievance that cut across class, religion, and region. Salt was one of the most **essential items of food**, yet the British imposed a tax on it and held a **government monopoly over its production**. Gandhi declared that this tax revealed "the most oppressive face of British rule." By targeting salt, Gandhi ensured that every section of Indian society could identify with the struggle and be brought together in a united campaign against colonial injustice.

Source: *The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for **three clear points** in a 3-mark answer:

1. Salt's **universal use** (rich and poor alike) → ensured mass participation.
2. Salt tax + **government monopoly** → symbol of British exploitation.
3. Gandhi's strategic intent → to **unite all classes** under one demand.

Avoid writing a long narrative about the march itself — the question asks *why salt*, not *what happened*. Stick to the reasoning given in the passage. Quoting the textbook phrase "most oppressive face of British rule" scores well.

**Q25.** deep thorough-understanding § 3 Towards Civil Disobedience

[3]

The Civil Disobedience Movement saw rich peasants like the Patidars of Gujarat enthusiastically join in 1930, yet many refused to participate when the movement was restarted in 1932. What explains this shift in their attitude?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The rich peasants like the Patidars joined the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930 because they were badly hit by falling prices during the trade depression, making it impossible for them to pay government revenue. For them, swaraj meant relief from high revenue demands.

However, when the movement was called off in 1931, the revenue rates had not been revised. They felt deeply disappointed by this outcome. Since their main grievance remained unresolved, many of them refused to participate when the movement was restarted in 1932.

*Source: How Participants saw the Movement, Chapter 2*

### Explanation

- The examiner wants **two clear parts**: why they joined + why they refused in 1932.
- The **key cause of shift** is the movement being called off in 1931 without revision of revenue — state this explicitly.
- Avoid vague phrases like "they lost interest"; be specific about the unresolved revenue grievance.
- "Swaraj = end of high revenues" for rich peasants is a scoring point worth mentioning.

**Q26.** medium thorough-understanding § 3 Towards Civil Disobedience

[1]

[mcq] Which of the following best explains why the industrial working class largely stayed away from the Civil Disobedience Movement as an organised force?

- (A) Workers were ideologically opposed to Gandhi's methods of non-violence.  
(B) Congress's economic programme did not address workers' demands such as better wages and working conditions, making alliance with industrialists difficult.  
(C) The British government had successfully suppressed all trade union activity before 1930.  
(D) Workers were more loyal to the Muslim League and refused to join a Hindu-dominated movement.
- A Workers were prohibited by law from joining any political movement under the colonial government.  
B As industrialists drew closer to the Congress, workers felt the Congress would not champion their demands for better wages and conditions, keeping them at a distance from the movement.  
C Workers were satisfied with their wages and working conditions and had no reason to protest against British rule.  
D The Congress actively discouraged worker participation because it feared a violent uprising in industrial centres.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Option B** is correct. As industrialists drew closer to the Congress, workers felt the Congress would not champion their demands for better wages and conditions, keeping them at a distance from the movement.

### Explanation

The textbook explicitly states: "As the industrialists came closer to the Congress, workers stayed aloof" and "the Congress was reluctant to include workers' demands as part of its programme of struggle. It felt that this would alienate industrialists." This is the direct textual reason — not legal prohibition, worker satisfaction, or communal loyalty.

Q27. deep thorough-understanding § 3 Towards Civil Disobedience

[5]

The Poona Pact of 1932 emerged from a fundamental disagreement between Dr B.R. Ambedkar and Mahatma Gandhi over how to improve the condition of dalits. Explain the core positions of each leader and analyse why their approaches reflected two genuinely different visions of how social change should happen.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Gandhi's Position:** Gandhi believed untouchability was a social and moral evil that could only be eliminated by changing the hearts of upper-caste Hindus. He called untouchables *harijan* (children of God), organised satyagrahas for temple entry and access to public spaces, and cleaned toilets himself to dignify dalit labour. He opposed separate electorates because he felt they would permanently divide dalits from mainstream Hindu society, slowing their integration rather than helping it.

**Ambedkar's Position:** Ambedkar, who organised dalits into the Depressed Classes Association (1930), argued that political empowerment was the only real solution. He demanded separate electorates — dalits voting among themselves — so they could elect their own representatives without depending on upper-caste goodwill.

**The Clash:** When the British granted separate electorates, Gandhi fasted unto death in protest. Ambedkar yielded under pressure, and the **Poona Pact (1932)** gave dalits reserved seats in legislatures but elected by the general electorate — a compromise that dissatisfied many dalit leaders.

**Two Visions:** Gandhi believed change must come from within society through moral reform; Ambedkar believed oppressed groups needed independent political power to protect themselves, since moral appeals to oppressors rarely succeed.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.3 — *The Limits of Civil Disobedience*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) Gandhi's approach — moral/social reform, heart-change, integration; (2) Ambedkar's approach — political empowerment, separate electorates; (3) the specific event (Round Table Conference clash, Poona Pact outcome); (4) a clear analytical contrast of the two visions. Avoid padding — state each point crisply. The phrase "two genuinely different visions" in the question signals that analysis (not just description) is required, so the last paragraph is essential for full marks.

**Q28.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

Mahatma Gandhi chose salt as the symbol around which to launch the Civil Disobedience Movement. Why was salt particularly effective as a unifying symbol across all classes of Indian society?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Salt was an ideal unifying symbol because it was consumed by **rich and poor alike**, making it relevant to every section of Indian society. It was one of the most **essential items of food**, so the British tax on salt and their monopoly over its production directly affected all Indians regardless of class, religion, or region. Gandhi declared that this tax revealed the most **oppressive face of British rule**. By choosing salt, Gandhi ensured that every Indian — peasant, worker, or industrialist — could identify with the grievance and join a single united campaign.

Source: *The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects three clear points for 3 marks:

1. Salt was consumed by all — rich and poor (universal relevance).
2. It was an essential food item (necessity, not luxury).
3. The tax/monopoly exposed British exploitation, making it a powerful political symbol.

Avoid writing about the march itself in detail — the question asks *why* salt was effective as a symbol, not *what happened* during the march. Stick to the passage's reasoning.

**Q29.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

Why did Mahatma Gandhi deliberately make his list of demands to the Viceroy wide-ranging — covering issues from the salt tax to military expenditure — rather than focusing on a single political demand before launching the Civil Disobedience Movement? What was the strategic significance of this approach?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Gandhi deliberately made his eleven demands wide-ranging so that **all classes within Indian society could identify with them** and be brought together in a united campaign. Some demands were of general interest, while others addressed specific groups — industrialists, peasants, workers — ensuring everyone had a stake in the movement.

The strategic significance was:

- It broadened the social base of the Civil Disobedience Movement beyond any single class or community.
- The demand to abolish the **salt tax** was the most powerful, as salt was consumed by rich and poor alike, making it a unifying symbol against British oppression.
- It transformed an abstract demand for Purna Swaraj into **concrete, relatable grievances** of everyday life.

Source: *The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for two things: (1) the *reason* — making demands wide-ranging to unite all classes, and (2) the *strategic significance* — broad social base + salt as a unifying symbol + linking abstract freedom to concrete issues. Mention "eleven demands," "all classes," and "salt tax" specifically, as these are textbook key terms. Avoid vague statements like "it was good for India."

**Q30.** straightforward thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[1]

The Civil Disobedience Movement differed from the Non-Cooperation Movement in a fundamental way. What was this key difference in the form of protest expected from the people?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

In the Non-Cooperation Movement, people were asked to *refuse/boycott* British institutions, whereas in the Civil Disobedience Movement, people were expected to actively *break* colonial laws.

Source: Chapter 2, Why Non-cooperation? / Civil Disobedience Movement sections

---

### Explanation

The examiner wants a clear contrast: Non-Cooperation = passive withdrawal/boycott; Civil Disobedience = active law-breaking. The passage hints at this by stating that civil disobedience was to be launched only *after* non-cooperation, as an escalation. Remember this distinction for MCQs and short answers alike.

**Q31.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

When Abdul Ghaffar Khan was arrested in Peshawar and when Mahatma Gandhi was arrested during the Civil Disobedience Movement, the public responses differed markedly. Compare these two responses and explain what they reveal about the spread and character of the movement.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Arrest of Abdul Ghaffar Khan (Peshawar):** When Khan was arrested, the people of Peshawar took to the streets in protest. Crowds faced armoured cars without fear; some Indian soldiers of the Garhwal regiment even refused to fire on the unarmed crowd. This showed that the Civil Disobedience Movement had reached the predominantly Muslim North-West Frontier, a region previously considered outside the Congress's reach.

**Arrest of Mahatma Gandhi:** When Gandhi was arrested, the industrial workers of Sholapur attacked police posts, municipal buildings, and law courts, disrupting normal administration until martial law was imposed.

**What this reveals:** Together, these incidents show that the movement had spread geographically (from the frontier to peninsular India) and socially (from elites to workers and frontier communities), though the character of protest sometimes turned violent despite Gandhi's insistence on non-violence.

*Source: Chapter 2 – The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China / Nationalism in India, Civil Disobedience Movement section*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects a **comparison** (not just description of one event), so both responses must be addressed and contrasted.
- Key insight: Peshawar shows **geographical spread** to the frontier and **communal breadth** (Muslim participation); Sholapur shows **class spread** to industrial workers.
- Mention the **Garhwal soldiers' refusal** — it is a textbook detail that earns marks.
- End with a **synthesis line** about what both incidents collectively reveal about the movement's reach and character — that is what "explain what they reveal" demands.

**Q32.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

The Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931 has been described as a compromise. What did each side — the Congress and the British government — agree to under this pact, and why did the pact ultimately fail to resolve the political crisis?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Under the Gandhi-Irwin Pact (1931), the Congress agreed to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement and participate in the Second Round Table Conference. The British government agreed to release political prisoners (except those convicted of violence) and allow the collection of salt along the coast.

The pact ultimately failed because the British did not concede the fundamental demand of Purna Swaraj, and the Round Table Conference (1931) proved fruitless as the British refused to transfer real power. This left the core political crisis — the demand for full independence — unresolved.

Source: *The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects **both sides' concessions** to be named clearly — that's where most marks lie.
- The "why it failed" part needs a **specific reason** (no Purna Swaraj concession; Round Table Conference failed), not just a vague statement.
- The source passages don't detail the pact directly, so use your textbook knowledge of the pact terms while keeping the answer grounded in the chapter's theme of unresolved demands.
- Avoid listing too many minor points; keep it tight for 3 marks (~70 words).

**Q33.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

Women participated in the Civil Disobedience Movement in large numbers, yet Mahatma Gandhi's vision of women's role did not represent a radical change in their social position. Explain this contradiction.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Women joined the Civil Disobedience Movement in large numbers — picketing liquor shops, making salt, and defying British laws. Gandhi encouraged their participation as it added moral strength to the movement.

However, Gandhi saw women primarily as devoted wives, mothers, and *pativratas* (dutiful wives). He mobilised them as caregivers of the nation, not as individuals seeking equal rights. He did not champion changes in patriarchal social structures, women's property rights, or their equality within the family. Thus, while women gained a public presence in the movement, their traditional domestic role remained unquestioned, reflecting no radical change in their social position.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3 — *The Limits of Civil Disobedience*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to show **both sides** of the contradiction: women's active participation + Gandhi's conservative view of their role.
- Key phrase to use: *pativrata* or "ideal Indian womanhood" — Gandhi's vision was rooted in tradition, not emancipation.
- Avoid padding — 3 marks = ~3 distinct points: (1) women's large participation, (2) Gandhi's vision of their role, (3) why this is contradictory (no change in social/domestic status).
- The source passages do not directly state this; this is a standard textbook point from Ch. 2 (NCERT *India and the Contemporary World II*) — answer from your chapter knowledge while staying consistent with the passage's broader theme of "varied aspirations" and limits of the movement.

**Q34.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[5]

The colonial government responded to the Civil Disobedience Movement with large-scale repression. Analyse, with reference to events of 1930, how the government's response affected the course of the movement. What does this reveal about the limitations of repression as a tool against a mass nationalist struggle?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Government Repression in 1930:

When Gandhi launched the Civil Disobedience Movement by breaking the salt law at Dandi (March 1930), the colonial government responded with large-scale repression — arresting leaders, using police force, and jailing thousands of protesters, including women who picketed foreign cloth and liquor shops.

#### Effect on the Movement:

Rather than crushing resistance, repression broadened participation. Women came out of their homes in thousands, workers in Chotanagpur wore Gandhi caps and joined boycott campaigns, and railway workers struck in 1930. Repression generated resentment across classes and regions, sustaining the movement's momentum rather than ending it.

#### Limitations of Repression:

The movement's strength lay in its mass social base — rich peasants, women, workers, and business classes all participated for their own reasons. Repression could not address their underlying grievances (high revenues, colonial trade restrictions, low wages). Imprisoning participants only deepened anti-colonial anger, revealing that repression is ineffective against a movement rooted in genuine popular discontent with multiple social groups united against colonial rule.

Source: Chapter 2 — *The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China*; Sections 3.2, 1.3, Conclusion

---

### Explanation

- The examiner looks for: (1) factual reference to 1930 events, (2) how repression *backfired* or failed to stop the movement, (3) a clear analytical point on why repression has limits against mass movements.
- Avoid listing social groups without linking them to the question of repression's impact.
- The key insight CBSE expects: repression alienated more people and widened participation rather than suppressing it — this is the "limitation" the question asks about.
- Cite specific 1930 events (Dandi March, railway strikes, women's participation, Chotanagpur workers) to earn full marks.

**Q35.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.1 The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement

[3]

In 1932, when the Civil Disobedience Movement was relaunched, many rich peasant communities that had been enthusiastic supporters in 1930 refused to participate again. What explains this change in their attitude?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 14:59 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Rich peasant communities like the Patidars of Gujarat and Jats of Uttar Pradesh joined the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930 because the trade depression had drastically reduced their cash income, making it impossible to pay government revenue. For them, swaraj meant reduction of revenue demands.

However, when Gandhiji called off the movement in 1931 without the revenue rates being revised, these peasants felt deeply disappointed and betrayed. Since their main demand remained unmet, they saw little reason to participate again when the movement was relaunched in 1932.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 — How Participants Saw the Movement*

### Explanation

This is a cause-and-effect question. Examiners expect two things: (1) why they joined in 1930 (commercial crops, falling prices, high revenues), and (2) why they refused in 1932 (movement called off in 1931 without revenue revision — they felt cheated). Always link the disappointment of 1931 as the direct explanation for the 1932 refusal. Quote community names (Patidars, Jats) for precision.

**Q36.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[3]

Rich peasant communities like the Patidars and Jats were enthusiastic supporters of the Civil Disobedience Movement when it was launched in 1930, but many refused to participate when it was relaunched in 1932. What specific grievance drove their initial enthusiasm, and why did the same grievance cause them to withdraw later?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Specific Grievance:** Rich peasants like Patidars and Jats were severely hit by trade depression and falling agricultural prices. Their cash income disappeared, making it impossible to pay the government's high revenue demand. Since the government refused to reduce revenue rates, they joined the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930, seeing the fight for swaraj as a struggle against high revenues.

**Reason for Withdrawal:** When the movement was called off in 1931, the revenue rates had not been revised. Their core demand remained unmet. Deeply disappointed, when the movement was relaunched in 1932, many of these rich peasants refused to participate.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 — How Participants saw the Movement*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to clearly identify **one specific grievance** (high government revenue demand/falling prices) — not a general answer about "economic hardship."
- The key logic is: they joined **because** of high revenues → they left **because** revenue rates were still not revised when the movement was suspended in 1931 → felt betrayed, so boycotted the 1932 relaunch.
- Both parts of the question (initial enthusiasm + withdrawal) must be answered to get full 3 marks.
- Use phrases from the textbook like "cash income disappeared," "fight for swaraj was a struggle against high revenues," and "deeply disappointed" — examiners recognise and reward these.

**Q37.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[3]

Both rich peasants and poor peasants suffered economically during the Depression of the late 1920s–1930s, yet they had different demands from the Civil Disobedience Movement. What was the key difference in what each group wanted, and why did this difference make it difficult for the Congress to satisfy both?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Rich peasants** (like Patidars and Jats) wanted **reduction in government revenue** (land tax). Their cash incomes had collapsed due to falling prices, making revenue payments impossible.

**Poor peasants** (small tenants) wanted **remission of rent** owed to landlords, as they could not pay rent during the Depression.

This created a dilemma for the Congress: supporting 'no-rent' campaigns would alienate rich peasants and landlords, who were important supporters of the movement. So Congress avoided taking up poor peasants' demands, leaving their relationship with the movement uncertain.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 – How Participants saw the Movement*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants you to clearly **contrast** the two groups' demands, not just describe their hardships.
- The key analytical point is the **Congress's dilemma**: it could not satisfy both without alienating one group.
- Use specific examples (Patidars, Jats) to show you've read the text closely – this earns full marks.
- Avoid writing about other groups (businessmen, workers); keep focused on the two peasant groups asked about.

**Q38.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[2]

Indian industrialists actively supported the Civil Disobedience Movement when it was first launched but became noticeably less enthusiastic after the failure of the Round Table Conference. Identify TWO distinct reasons for their growing reluctance.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

After the failure of the Round Table Conference, Indian industrialists grew reluctant because:

1. **Fear of militant activities:** They were apprehensive of the spread of militant activities and worried about prolonged disruption of business affecting their trade and industry.
2. **Growing socialist influence:** They were alarmed by the increasing influence of socialism among younger Congress members, which threatened their business interests.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 – How Participants saw the Movement

---

### Explanation

The passage directly states **two reasons** for business groups losing enthusiasm: (i) apprehension of militant activities and prolonged business disruption, and (ii) the growing influence of socialism among younger Congress members. Examiners expect both reasons to be clearly stated — ideally as separate numbered points. Avoid vague answers like "they were unhappy"; be specific and use textbook language. Do not confuse this with reasons for initial support.

**Q39.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[1]

Industrial workers largely stayed away from the Civil Disobedience Movement in most parts of India, yet some workers in places like Chotanagpur tin mines and Nagpur did participate. What best explains why the Congress was reluctant to fully incorporate workers' demands into its programme?

- (A) The Congress believed workers lacked the discipline needed for non-violent protest.  
(B) Including workers' demands would have alienated industrialists whose financial support the Congress needed.  
(C) Workers' demands were considered too radical for any form of peaceful agitation.  
(D) The British government had specifically warned the Congress against organising industrial labour.
- A The Congress believed workers lacked the discipline needed for non-violent protest.  
B Including workers' demands would have alienated industrialists whose financial support the Congress needed.  
C Workers' demands were considered too radical for any form of peaceful agitation.  
D The British government had specifically warned the Congress against organising industrial labour.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

**(B)** Including workers' demands would have alienated industrialists whose financial support the Congress needed.

**Explanation**

The passage in Section 3.2 directly states: "The Congress was reluctant to include workers' demands as part of its programme of struggle. It felt that this would **alienate industrialists** and divide the anti-imperial forces." Since industrialists like G.D. Birla provided crucial financial assistance to the movement, Congress avoided actions that would upset them. Option B is the only answer directly supported by the source text.

**Q40.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[3]

Women participated in large numbers in the Civil Disobedience Movement for the first time. Yet, a historian could argue that this participation did not represent a fundamental shift in how Indian society viewed women's roles. Justify this argument using evidence from the period.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Women's participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement was large-scale but did not represent a fundamental shift in society's view of their roles. Evidence:

- Women's participation was largely **symbolic** — the Congress was keen only on their symbolic presence and was reluctant to allow them positions of authority within the organisation.
- Gandhiji himself believed women's primary duty was to look after **home and hearth**, be good mothers and wives — reinforcing traditional roles.
- This increased public role did **not** lead to any radical change in how women's position was visualised in society.

Thus, women were mobilised for national service, not for their own emancipation.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 – How Participants Saw the Movement

---

### Explanation

The key evidence is directly in the passage: "this increased public role did not necessarily mean any radical change in the way the position of women was visualised." Examiners expect you to quote/paraphrase this and back it with two specific points — Gandhi's view of women's domestic duty and Congress's reluctance to give them authority. Don't just say "women participated" — the question asks you to argue *against* it being a fundamental shift, so focus on the limitations.

Q41. medium thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[2]

For plantation workers in Assam, what did 'swaraj' concretely mean, and how did their response to the Non-Cooperation Movement reflect this understanding?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

For plantation workers in Assam, 'swaraj' meant the freedom to move freely out of the tea gardens and return to their home villages. Confined under the Inland Emigration Act of 1859, they could not leave without permission. When the Non-Cooperation Movement began, thousands defied authorities and left the plantations, believing Gandhi Raj was coming and they would receive land in their villages. They were, however, caught by police and brutally beaten up.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.3 – Swaraj in the Plantations

---

### Explanation

- The question tests understanding of how different groups interpreted 'swaraj' in their own way — a key theme in Chapter 2.
- Mention **two things**: (1) what swaraj meant to plantation workers, and (2) how they acted on it.
- Examiners expect reference to the **Inland Emigration Act of 1859** and the detail that workers **never reached home** — these fetch marks.
- Avoid mixing in details about other groups (peasants, business classes) — stay focused on plantation workers only.

**Q42.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[5]

[long\_answer] Rich peasants, industrial workers, women, and dalits each joined or avoided the Civil Disobedience Movement largely on the basis of their own immediate economic or social concerns rather than a shared idea of national freedom. What fundamental challenge did this diversity of motivations pose for the Congress in building and sustaining a unified national movement? Explain with specific examples from at least THREE of these groups.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Civil Disobedience Movement united various groups against colonial rule, but each group had different, often conflicting, understandings of *swaraj* — making it difficult for the Congress to sustain unity.

**Rich peasants** (Patidars of Gujarat, Jats of UP) joined to fight high revenue demands caused by the Depression. When the movement was called off in 1931 without revenue revision, they felt betrayed and refused to rejoin in 1932.

**Industrial workers** largely stayed aloof because the Congress prioritised industrialists over workers' demands for better wages. Including workers' demands would have alienated business supporters, so Congress deliberately excluded them.

**Dalits**, led by Ambedkar, sought political empowerment through separate electorates rather than symbolic inclusion. Their limited participation — especially in Maharashtra — reflected distrust of a Congress they felt had long ignored them.

**Women** participated in large numbers but Congress wanted only their symbolic presence, not leadership roles, showing their inclusion was conditional.

The Congress continuously tried to balance these competing demands, ensuring no group's aspirations alienated another. But this balancing act meant compromise, causing phases of disunity and inner conflict after every high point of the movement.

Source: Chapter 2, Sections 3.2 and 3.3 (Nationalism in India)

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects **at least three groups with specific examples** — name the groups, give concrete examples (Patidars, Ambedkar/Poona Pact, workers' exclusion), and link each to the **central challenge** for Congress.
- The key concept to hit: different groups defined *swaraj differently*, so satisfying one risked alienating another — that's the "fundamental challenge."
- End with the conclusion from the chapter: unity was fragile and cyclical.
- Avoid listing too broadly; depth on 3–4 groups beats shallow coverage of all.

**Q43.** straightforward thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[1]

[very\_short\_answer] Dalit participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement was notably limited, especially in areas where their organisations were well established. What was the main reason dalit leaders and communities were cautious about joining a Congress-led movement?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Dalit leaders feared that joining a Congress-led movement would not secure them political rights; they instead demanded separate electorates and reserved seats to achieve political empowerment and overcome social disabilities.

### Explanation

The examiner expects you to state that dalits were focused on political safeguards (separate electorates, reserved seats) rather than abstract swaraj, and distrusted a Congress that had historically ignored them to avoid upsetting high-caste Hindus. Mention of Dr Ambedkar or the Depressed Classes Association adds precision but is not strictly required for 1 mark.

Q44. deep thorough-understanding § 3.2 How Participants saw the Movement

[3]

The Poona Pact of 1932 was a compromise between two very different visions of how to improve the condition of the Depressed Classes. Compare Ambedkar's approach with Gandhi's approach, and explain what each believed was the correct path to dalit empowerment.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Ambedkar's Approach:** Ambedkar believed that political empowerment was the key to dalit liberation. He demanded **separate electorates** for dalits — a distinct electorate that would allow dalits to elect their own representatives. He organised dalits into the Depressed Classes Association (1930) and argued that political representation must come first to overcome social disabilities.

**Gandhi's Approach:** Gandhi believed that untouchability was a social and moral evil that had to be removed by changing the hearts of upper-caste Hindus. He called untouchables *harijan*, organised satyagraha for temple entry and access to public spaces, and stressed integration into mainstream Hindu society rather than separate political identity.

**The Compromise (Poona Pact, 1932):** When the British granted Ambedkar's demand for separate electorates, Gandhi fasted unto death, arguing it would slow social integration. The resulting Poona Pact gave Depressed Classes **reserved seats** in legislatures, but voting was by the general electorate — a middle path between the two visions.

Source: *The Limits of Civil Disobedience, Chapter 2*

### Explanation

- The examiner wants a **clear contrast** between both leaders' approaches, not just a description of the Poona Pact.
- Key terms to use: *separate electorates, reserved seats, Depressed Classes Association, harijan, integration vs. political empowerment.*
- End by linking both positions to the Pact — it shows you understand the "compromise" aspect the question asks for.
- Don't write more than this; 3 marks = ~70–80 words of actual answer content.

**Q45.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[3]

Dalit leaders like Dr B.R. Ambedkar argued that political representation through separate electorates was more important than Congress-led social reform campaigns. What was the core reasoning behind this demand, and why did many dalit leaders distrust the Congress's methods of addressing caste discrimination?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Dalit leaders like Dr Ambedkar argued that **political empowerment through separate electorates** was the true path to ending social disabilities. Their core reasoning was that having their own elected representatives in legislative councils would give dalits real power to change laws and policies affecting them, rather than depending on the goodwill of upper-caste reformers.

They distrusted the Congress because:

- Congress had long **ignored dalit issues** to avoid offending conservative high-caste Hindus (sanatanis).
- Gandhi's approach relied on **persuading upper castes to reform voluntarily**, which dalits saw as slow and uncertain.
- Dalits believed social reform from above could not substitute for direct **political representation and self-advocacy**.

This led Ambedkar to clash with Gandhi at the Second Round Table Conference (1930), ultimately resulting in the Poona Pact (1932).

Source: *The Limits of Civil Disobedience, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The examiner looks for **three clear points**: (1) the core argument for separate electorates (political empowerment), (2) at least one or two reasons for distrust of Congress, and (3) a factual reference (Ambedkar, Round Table Conference, or Poona Pact). Avoid writing too much about the Poona Pact outcome — focus on the *reasoning* behind the demand. Using words like "voluntary reform" vs "structural/political power" shows conceptual clarity.

Q46. medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[3]

Gandhi and Ambedkar held fundamentally different views on how dalits could best achieve political empowerment. What was the central point of disagreement between them in 1932, and how did the Poona Pact attempt to reconcile their positions?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Central Point of Disagreement:

At the Second Round Table Conference (1931), Dr B.R. Ambedkar demanded **separate electorates** for dalits, meaning dalits would vote only among themselves to elect their representatives. Gandhi opposed this, arguing that separate electorates would **slow down dalits' integration into mainstream society** and deepen social divisions rather than end untouchability.

#### The Poona Pact (September 1932):

When the British government conceded Ambedkar's demand, Gandhi began a fast unto death. Ambedkar ultimately yielded and the Poona Pact was signed. It gave the Depressed Classes **reserved seats** in provincial and central legislative councils, but these seats would be contested within the **general electorate** (not a separate one). This preserved dalit political representation while maintaining a unified electorate.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.3 – The Limits of Civil Disobedience

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to identify **two things**: (1) the exact disagreement — separate electorates vs. integration — and (2) what the Pact actually settled — reserved seats but voted by general electorate.
- Don't confuse "reserved seats" with "separate electorates"; they are different. The Pact gave reserved seats but **denied** separate electorates — that distinction is the key to full marks.
- Quote the text: "gave the Depressed Classes reserved seats... but they were to be voted in by the general electorate" — this phrasing scores well.

**Q47.** straightforward thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[1]

Which of the following correctly describes the outcome of the Poona Pact of 1932?

- (A) Dalits were given a completely separate electorate to vote independently for their own candidates.
- (B) Dalits received reserved seats in legislative councils but were to be voted in by the general electorate.
- (C) The demand for reserved seats was dropped entirely in exchange for increased social rights.
- (D) Ambedkar agreed to merge the Depressed Classes Association with the Indian National Congress.

- A Dalits were given a completely separate electorate to vote independently for their own candidates.
- B Dalits received reserved seats in legislative councils but were to be voted in by the general electorate.
- C The demand for reserved seats was dropped entirely in exchange for increased social rights.
- D Ambedkar agreed to merge the Depressed Classes Association with the Indian National Congress.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

**(B)** Dalits received reserved seats in legislative councils but were to be voted in by the general electorate.

**Explanation**

The Poona Pact (September 1932) was a compromise between Ambedkar and Gandhi. Ambedkar dropped the demand for separate electorates; in return, the Depressed Classes got reserved seats in provincial and central legislative councils, but voting for these seats was done by the general electorate — not a separate dalit electorate. Option A describes what Ambedkar originally demanded (and what the British had granted before Gandhi's fast), not the final Pact.

**Q48.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[3]

After the Non-Cooperation–Khilafat Movement declined, what specific developments caused a large section of Muslims to feel alienated from the Congress, and how did this affect their participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

After the Non-Cooperation–Khilafat Movement declined, the Congress and Muslim political interests began to drift apart. Communal riots broke out in several places, and many Muslim leaders felt the Congress favoured Hindu interests. The growth of movements like the Hindu Mahasabha increased communal tension. As a result, a large section of Muslims grew suspicious of Congress-led nationalism and felt politically alienated.

Consequently, Muslim participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement (1930) was notably limited, as the sense of common nationalist purpose built during the Khilafat era had weakened considerably.

*Source: Chapter 2 (The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China / Nationalism in India), Section 3.2 and Conclusion*

---

### Explanation

- The source passages do not explicitly detail the specific Muslim alienation post-Khilafat, but the Conclusion mentions that "unity within the movement often broke down" and Congress struggled to prevent demands of one group from alienating another — this is the textbook basis.
- Examiners expect you to mention: decline of Khilafat issue, communal tensions/riots, and the resulting limited Muslim participation in Civil Disobedience Movement.
- Keep your answer focused on **cause** → **effect** structure for full 3-mark credit.
- Avoid over-elaborating; ~70–80 words is ideal here.

**Q49.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[3]

The Congress was reluctant to support 'no rent' campaigns by poor peasants during the Civil Disobedience Movement. Why did this reluctance exist, and what does it reveal about the Congress's broader strategy of building a unified anti-imperial movement?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:00 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Congress was apprehensive that supporting 'no rent' campaigns would upset rich peasants and landlords, who were important pillars of the movement. Poor peasants (small tenants) wanted rent remitted to landlords, but this demand directly threatened landlord interests. Since rich peasants and landlords were key supporters, Congress chose not to alienate them by backing the poorer peasants' radical demands.

This reveals that Congress prioritised maintaining a **broad anti-imperial coalition** over addressing class-based economic grievances. It deliberately avoided internal class conflicts to keep diverse groups — landlords, rich peasants, industrialists — united under one nationalist banner, even at the cost of leaving poor peasants uncertain and insufficiently represented.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 – How Participants saw the Movement

---

### Explanation

The examiner looks for **two parts**: (1) the specific reason — fear of alienating rich peasants/landlords — and (2) what it reveals about Congress's strategy — maintaining unity across classes for anti-imperial goals. Quoting or closely paraphrasing the textbook phrase "*apprehensive of raising issues that might upset the rich peasants and landlords*" shows source-grounding. Avoid long elaboration; at 3 marks, two tight paragraphs are sufficient.

**Q50.** medium thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[2]

Rich peasant communities like the Patidars and Jats were enthusiastic supporters of the Civil Disobedience Movement when it was launched, but many refused to participate when the movement was relaunched in 1932. Explain the reason for this change.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Rich peasant communities like Patidars and Jats initially joined the Civil Disobedience Movement as they were hard hit by falling prices and wanted the government's revenue demand reduced. However, when the movement was called off in 1931 without any revision of revenue rates, they were deeply disappointed. So when the movement was relaunched in 1932, many refused to participate.

Source: *How Participants saw the Movement*, Chapter 2

### Explanation

The examiner wants you to clearly state **two things**: (1) why they joined initially — high revenues and trade depression; (2) why they refused in 1932 — disappointment over movement being withdrawn in 1931 without the revenue issue being resolved. Both points are necessary for full marks. Stick to the textbook reasoning; do not add outside information.

**Q51.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[5]

Both industrial workers and rich peasants suffered under colonial economic policies, yet their engagement with the Civil Disobedience Movement took very different forms. Analyse the specific reasons why each group participated in — or withdrew from — the movement, and what these differences reveal about the limitations of the Congress's mass mobilisation strategy.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Rich Peasants:** Wealthy peasant communities like the Patidars of Gujarat and Jats of UP enthusiastically joined the Civil Disobedience Movement because falling prices during trade depression wiped out their cash income, making it impossible to pay colonial revenue demands. For them, swaraj meant reduction of revenue rates. However, when the movement was called off in 1931 without revenue revision, they felt deeply betrayed. When the movement relaunched in 1932, many refused to participate.

**Industrial Workers:** Workers largely stayed aloof from the movement. As industrialists drew closer to the Congress, workers distanced themselves. The Congress refused to include workers' demands — like better wages and conditions — fearing this would alienate industrialists. Some workers selectively participated (e.g., Nagpur region, Chotanagpur tin mine workers), but they were not actively mobilised.

**Limitations Revealed:** These differences exposed a fundamental contradiction in Congress strategy — it tried to unite industrialists and workers, rich peasants and poor tenants simultaneously. By prioritising anti-imperial unity, it suppressed class-based grievances, causing participation to remain incomplete and conditional rather than sustained.

Source: *How Participants saw the Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect **both groups addressed separately** with specific reasons, then a concluding analytical point on Congress's limitations.
- Key facts to include: Patidars/Jats, trade depression, revenue demand (rich peasants); workers staying aloof, Congress protecting industrialist interests (workers).
- The "limitation" point earns analysis marks — show the **contradiction** in Congress's balancing act.
- Avoid padding; stick to cause → action → outcome for each group.

**Q52.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[3]

Women participated in large numbers in the Civil Disobedience Movement, taking on roles such as picketing liquor and cloth shops and marching in protest. To what extent did this mass participation challenge or reinforce the Congress's traditional view of women's role in public life? Explain with evidence.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Women's mass participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement both challenged and reinforced the Congress's traditional view of women.

**Challenged:** Thousands of women left their homes for the first time to picket liquor and foreign cloth shops, march in protests, manufacture salt, and court arrest — entering public life on a large scale.

**Reinforced:** However, this did not bring any radical change. Gandhiji believed women's primary duty was to look after home and hearth and be good mothers and wives. The Congress was reluctant to give women positions of authority and sought only their **symbolic presence** in the organisation.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 — How Participants Saw the Movement*

---

### Explanation

- The question is **two-sided** — "challenge OR reinforce" — so you must address **both** to get full marks.
- The key evidence from the passage: women entered public spaces in large numbers (challenge), but Congress wanted only symbolic presence and Gandhi held traditional views on women's role (reinforce).
- Avoid writing only one side; examiners expect a balanced answer here since the question uses "or."
- Use the phrase "**symbolic presence**" — it appears directly in the source and impresses examiners.

**Q53.** deep thorough-understanding § 3.3 The Limits of Civil Disobedience

[5]

The Congress feared that including the demands of industrial workers in its programme would 'alienate industrialists and divide the anti-imperial forces.' Do you think this reasoning was justified? Use evidence from the behaviour of business groups during the Civil Disobedience Movement to support your answer.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Congress's reasoning was **partially justified but ultimately flawed**.

**Evidence supporting the fear:** Business groups like Purshottamdas Thakurdas and G. D. Birla actively supported the Civil Disobedience Movement — giving financial assistance, refusing to buy or sell imported goods, and forming bodies like FICCI (1927). They saw swaraj as freedom from colonial trade restrictions. Including workers' demands could have threatened industrialists and caused them to withdraw this crucial support.

**However, the reasoning was not fully justified:** Business groups were already losing enthusiasm after the Round Table Conference failure. They grew worried about militant activities, business disruption, and growing socialist influence in Congress — factors unrelated to workers' demands. Their support was never unconditional. Furthermore, by excluding workers' demands, Congress alienated a large section of the population, meaning the "unity" it preserved was narrow and incomplete. Workers participated only in limited ways and in select regions like Nagpur.

Thus, Congress prioritised elite unity over genuine mass unity, which weakened rather than strengthened the movement in the long run.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 3.2 – How Participants saw the Movement*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) a clear stand on whether the reasoning was justified, (2) specific evidence from business groups' behaviour (FICCI, Birla, financial help, boycott of imports), and (3) a counter-argument showing the limitations of Congress's logic. Avoid vague generalisations — name the industrialists and organisations mentioned in the textbook. The conclusion should tie back to the question about "anti-imperial unity."

**Q54.** medium thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging**[3]**

What did the spinning wheel at the centre of the Swaraj flag designed by Mahatma Gandhi symbolise, and why was that particular symbol chosen for a nationalist flag rather than, say, a weapon or a crown?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

By 1921, Gandhiji designed the Swaraj flag — a tricolour (red, green and white) with a **spinning wheel** at its centre. The spinning wheel represented the **Gandhian ideal of self-help**: it symbolised productive labour, economic self-reliance, and the Swadeshi spirit of making one's own cloth rather than buying British goods.

A weapon would have implied violence, which contradicted Gandhi's principle of non-violence. A crown would have represented monarchy and authority — the very colonial power Indians were resisting. The spinning wheel, by contrast, united all Indians as common people engaged in dignified labour, making it a powerful symbol of peaceful defiance and national solidarity.

Source: Chapter 2, Section 4 – The Sense of Collective Belonging

---

**Explanation**

- The textbook explicitly states the spinning wheel represented "the Gandhian ideal of self-help" — use this exact phrase.
- The second part (why not a weapon/crown) is not directly in the passage, so use **logical inference** from context: Gandhi's non-violence + anti-colonial struggle = weapons and crowns are inappropriate.
- Examiners award marks for: (1) identifying the symbol, (2) its meaning from the text, (3) a reasonable contrast with alternatives.
- Don't over-explain; 3 marks = 3 clear points in ~75 words.

Q55. medium thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[3]

Nationalist historians in late-nineteenth-century India began writing about ancient India's achievements in science, philosophy, art and trade. What political purpose did this retelling of the past serve for Indians living under colonial rule, and what were its limitations?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Nationalist historians wrote about India's glorious past in science, philosophy, art and trade to **instil pride** among Indians and counter the British claim that Indians were backward and incapable of self-rule. This encouraged people to struggle against colonial rule and change their miserable conditions under British domination.

**Limitation:** When the glorious past celebrated was largely Hindu, with imagery drawn from Hindu iconography, people of other communities — Muslims, lower castes — felt excluded. This undermined the goal of forging a united national identity across all communities.

Source: *The Sense of Collective Belonging, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects two clear parts: (1) the political purpose — boosting national pride and inspiring resistance to colonial rule; and (2) the limitation — the Hindu-centric glorification alienated non-Hindu communities. Both points are directly stated in the textbook passage. Quoting or paraphrasing the source (e.g., "backward and primitive, incapable of governing themselves") strengthens the answer. Keep it tight — 3 marks = ~75 words.

**Q56.** deep thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[3]

The two depictions of Bharat Mata — one as a calm, ascetic, spiritual figure and another armed with a trishul standing beside a lion and elephant — convey very different ideas about the nation. What does this difference reveal about how the concept of nationalism can be interpreted in multiple ways by different groups?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The two images of Bharat Mata reflect different interpretations of nationalism. Abanindranath Tagore's Bharat Mata — calm, ascetic, and spiritual — represents a peaceful, cultural nationalism rooted in Indian spirituality and heritage. The second image — armed with a trishul, beside a lion and elephant — projects an assertive, militant nationalism emphasising power and strength.

This difference reveals that nationalism is not a single, unified idea. Different groups — political, religious, or social — shape it according to their own aspirations and ideologies. However, when nationalist symbols draw heavily from one religion's iconography (as in Hindu imagery), people of other communities may feel excluded, showing that nationalism can unify some while marginalising others.

Source: Chapter 2, *The Sense of Collective Belonging*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner expects you to **identify both images clearly** and explain what idea each represents.
- The key insight (worth marks) is that **nationalism can be interpreted differently** — peaceful vs. assertive — and that **religious symbolism in nationalist icons can be exclusionary**.
- The textbook explicitly warns: "*When the past being glorified was Hindu... people of other communities felt left out.*" Include this for full marks.
- Don't just describe the images — **analyse what the difference reveals** about the nature of nationalism.

Q57. medium thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[3]

Nationalist leaders and scholars across India in the late nineteenth century engaged in collecting and preserving folk songs, ballads, myths and legends from ordinary people. Why did nationalists place such great importance on this cultural activity, and how did it contribute to building a sense of shared national identity?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Nationalists placed great importance on collecting folk songs, ballads, myths and legends because they believed these gave a **true picture of traditional culture** that had been corrupted and damaged by outside forces. Preserving folk tradition was seen as essential to discovering national identity and restoring pride in the past.

This activity contributed to national identity in two ways:

- It highlighted a **shared cultural heritage** belonging to all ordinary people across regions.
- It helped people see themselves as part of one nation with a common past worth protecting and celebrating.

For example, Rabindranath Tagore collected ballads, nursery rhymes and myths in Bengal, while Natesa Sastri published a four-volume collection of Tamil folk tales, calling folklore "the most trustworthy manifestation of people's real thoughts and characteristics."

Source: *The Sense of Collective Belonging*, Chapter 2

### Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) the reason — folk tradition showed true culture, damaged by colonialism, and needed revival, (2) the link to national identity — shared heritage unified diverse people, and (3) a specific example (Tagore/Natesa Sastri). At 3 marks, one solid reason + one example + the identity connection is enough. Avoid writing a long essay; keep it focused and factual, using terms from the textbook like "folk revival" and quoting Natesa Sastri if possible — it shows direct textbook knowledge.

**Q58.** medium thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[3]

The Swadeshi-era tricolour flag incorporated both a crescent moon and eight lotuses. What two communities or entities did these symbols represent, and what does the deliberate inclusion of both on a single flag tell us about the strategy nationalists used to build collective identity?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The eight lotuses on the Swadeshi-era tricolour represented the **eight provinces of British India**, while the crescent moon represented **Hindus and Muslims** together.

The deliberate inclusion of both symbols on a single flag shows that nationalists consciously adopted an **inclusive strategy** — using imagery drawn from multiple communities to forge a shared collective identity. Rather than privileging one religion or region, they designed symbols that could unite diverse groups under one banner, making the nation's cause feel relevant to all.

Source: *The Sense of Collective Belonging, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

- The textbook explicitly states: "eight lotuses representing eight provinces of British India, and a crescent moon, representing Hindus and Muslims."
- Note: the crescent represented **both** Hindus and Muslims, not just Muslims — this is a common error; don't write "Muslims only."
- For the 3rd mark (strategy), examiners look for the idea of **deliberate inclusivity** — nationalists used symbols to bridge communal/regional divides and build a pan-Indian identity.
- Keep the answer concise; two factual marks + one analytical mark = no need for lengthy elaboration.

Q59. deep thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[5]

A nationalist historian writing in the late nineteenth century describes how ancient Indians once conquered distant lands, but now 'a few soldiers from a tiny island far away are lording it over the land of India.' Explain how this style of historical writing could both strengthen nationalist feeling and, at the same time, risk deepening communal divisions within Indian society.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Strengthening Nationalist Feeling:

The passage from Tarinicharan Chattopadhyay glorified ancient India's power — Hindus conquering Tartar, China and distant lands — and contrasted it sharply with the humiliation of British colonial rule ("a few soldiers from a tiny island far away are lording it over the land of India"). This contrast stirred pride in a glorious past and aroused anger against colonialism. As the textbook notes, nationalist historians urged readers to "take pride in India's great achievements in the past and struggle to change the miserable conditions of life under British rule," making such writing a powerful tool for mobilising people against colonial oppression.

#### Risk of Communal Divisions:

However, when the glorious past celebrated was specifically Hindu ("Arya vamsa," Hindu conquests), people of other communities — Muslims, Christians, and others — could feel excluded. The textbook explicitly warns: "When the past being glorified was Hindu, when the images celebrated were drawn from Hindu iconography, then people of other communities felt left out." This selective glorification risked dividing Indians along religious lines rather than uniting them against British rule.

Source: *The Sense of Collective Belonging, Chapter 2*

---

#### Explanation

Examiners expect **both sides** addressed: (1) how the contrast between past glory and present subjugation fuelled anti-colonial nationalism, and (2) how framing that glory in exclusively Hindu terms alienated non-Hindu communities. Cite Source E directly ("Arya vamsa," the tiny island quote) and link it to the textbook's warning about Hindu iconography causing communal exclusion. Balanced treatment of both aspects is essential for full marks.

**Q60.** deep thorough-understanding § 4 The Sense of Collective Belonging

[5]

Indian nationalism developed not only through organised political movements and mass agitations but also through cultural processes. Why was it necessary for nationalism to capture people's imagination through culture and symbols? What were the strengths and limitations of using cultural processes to build national identity?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:01 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Nationalism needed to capture people's imagination through culture because India was a vast, diverse country with different languages, religions, and regions. Political movements alone could not unite all groups; cultural symbols created an emotional bond that crossed these barriers.

#### Cultural processes used:

- **Bharat Mata** — the image of the motherland (by Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay and Abanindranath Tagore) gave nationalism a visual identity people could feel devoted to.
- **Folklore and songs** — Tagore collected ballads and folk tales to revive pride in India's cultural past.
- **Flags and symbols** — the Swaraj flag with the spinning wheel united people in a shared ideal of self-help.
- **Rewriting history** — glorifying India's ancient achievements inspired pride and the will to resist colonialism.

**Limitations:** When symbols drew heavily from Hindu iconography or glorified only Hindu history, people of other communities — Muslims, lower castes — felt excluded. This created tension and sometimes deepened divisions rather than uniting everyone.

Source: Chapter 2 — *The Sense of Collective Belonging*

---

### Explanation

Examiners look for: (1) why culture was necessary alongside politics, (2) at least 3–4 specific cultural examples with brief explanation, and (3) at least one clear limitation (the Hindu-centric nature of many symbols). Naming Bharat Mata, folklore revival, flags, and history reinterpretation covers the breadth expected. The limitation point about exclusion of minorities is explicitly stated in the passage and must be included for full marks.

Q61. deep thorough-understanding § Conclusion

[3]

The Congress continuously tried to ensure that the demands of one group did not alienate another, yet unity within the national movement repeatedly broke down. Explain why managing this balance was so difficult, using evidence from at least two different social groups whose aspirations came into conflict during the movement.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

Managing the balance between different social groups was difficult because each group had its own definition of *swaraj*, making a unified agenda nearly impossible.

**Rich peasants vs. Congress leadership:** Rich peasants like the Patidars joined the Civil Disobedience Movement to get revenue rates reduced. When the movement was called off in 1931 without revision of revenue, they refused to rejoin — showing that unmet economic demands broke their loyalty.

**Workers vs. Industrialists:** The Congress refused to include workers' demands (better wages, conditions) in its programme because it feared alienating industrialists who funded the movement. So workers largely stayed away, while industrialists too grew apprehensive after the Round Table Conference failed.

As the textbook states, "freedom from colonial rule meant different things to different people," making it impossible to satisfy all groups simultaneously without losing others.

Source: *The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China / Nationalism in India, Chapter 2, Section 3.2*

---

**Explanation**

- The examiner wants **two specific social groups in conflict** with evidence — rich peasants + workers/industrialists is the strongest pair from the passage.
- Always quote or paraphrase the textbook conclusion: "freedom meant different things to different people" — this directly answers the "why" of the question.
- Avoid vague statements; name the groups (Patidars, FICCI, workers) to show textbook knowledge.
- 3 marks = roughly 3 points: one group, second group, concluding reason — keep it tight.

Q62. medium thorough-understanding § Quit India Movement

[3]

The Quit India Movement is described as a 'truly mass movement.' What evidence supports this claim, and how did the British government's response ultimately affect its outcome?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Quit India Movement (1942) was a truly mass movement as it brought thousands of ordinary people — students, workers, and peasants — into its fold. People observed hartals, demonstrations, and processions across the country, almost bringing the state machinery to a standstill in large parts of India. Leaders like Jayprakash Narayan, Aruna Asaf Ali, and women such as Matangini Hazra and Kanaklata Barua actively participated. However, the British responded with great force, and despite widespread participation, it took more than a year to suppress the movement, preventing it from achieving immediate independence.

Source: *Quit India Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

- The question has two parts: **evidence** of it being a mass movement + **British response and its effect** — address both.
- Key facts to mention: hartals/processions, ordinary people (students, workers, peasants), named leaders and women, state machinery near standstill.
- The "outcome" point: British used force but took **over a year** to suppress it — show both the resilience of the movement and its ultimate suppression.
- Examiners look for specific names and facts from the passage, not vague statements.

Q63. medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

Both the Non-Cooperation Movement (1921) and the Civil Disobedience Movement (1930) involved boycotts, yet historians consider the Civil Disobedience Movement a more advanced stage of the national struggle. What was the fundamental difference in what the two movements asked people to do, and why did this make the later movement more radical?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

**Model Answer**

**Non-Cooperation Movement (1921):** People were asked to *withdraw* from colonial institutions — surrender titles, boycott schools, courts, councils, and foreign goods. The focus was on **refusing to participate** in the existing system.

**Civil Disobedience Movement (1930):** People were asked to actively **break colonial laws** — Gandhi began by violating the Salt Law at Dandi. Citizens became law-breakers, not merely non-participants.

This made CDM more radical because passive withdrawal was replaced by direct, deliberate defiance of British authority. Non-cooperation aimed to make the colonial system unworkable; civil disobedience challenged its very legitimacy by openly violating it, inviting arrest and confronting the law head-on.

Source: Chapter 2 — *Why Non-cooperation?, Towards Civil Disobedience*

---

**Explanation**

Examiners want you to identify the **core difference clearly**: one = withdrawal/boycott; the other = active law-breaking. Then explain *why* that distinction makes CDM more radical — the shift from passive to active defiance is the key conceptual leap. Don't list events; focus on the **nature of the action**. A 3-mark answer needs a clear distinction + one well-explained reason.

**Q64.** deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Trace how the idea of 'swaraj' was understood differently by at least FOUR distinct social groups across the national movement. What does this variety of meanings reveal about the nature of Indian nationalism?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

Different social groups understood 'swaraj' in distinct ways during the national movement:

1. **Peasants** (like those in Awadh) saw swaraj as freedom from high rents, forced labour (begar), and landlord oppression. They hoped Gandhi Raj would end their economic exploitation.
1. **Plantation workers in Assam** understood swaraj as the right to move freely in and out of tea gardens. Under the Inland Emigration Act of 1859, they were bound to plantations; swaraj meant returning to their native villages and owning land.
1. **Tribal communities** (like the Gudem rebels) linked swaraj to freedom from restrictions on their forest rights and colonial interference in their way of life.
1. **The educated middle class/Congress leadership** understood swaraj as self-rule — political independence from British colonial authority.

**What this reveals:** As the textbook states, "freedom from colonial rule meant different things to different people." Indian nationalism was not a single, uniform idea but a coalition of varied grievances united by anti-colonialism. The Congress tried to channel these diverse aspirations into one movement, though this unity often broke down due to conflicting interests.

*Source: Chapter 2 — The Nationalist Movement in Indo-China; sections 2.3 (Swaraj in the Plantations) and Conclusion*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect **four distinct groups** clearly identified — name them, then give their specific vision of swaraj in 1–2 lines each.
- The concluding inference about nationalism being **multi-vocal and coalition-based** is essential for full marks on a "what does this reveal" question.
- Avoid vague statements like "everyone wanted freedom" — differentiate each group's grievance clearly.
- The passage explicitly supports peasants, plantation workers, tribals, and the Congress/middle class; use these for safe, textbook-grounded answers.

**Q65.** medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

The Congress leadership was uncomfortable with the way both the Awadh peasant movement and the Gudem tribal movement developed, even though both groups were fighting against colonial or semi-colonial oppression. What was the common reason for the Congress's discomfort in both cases?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The Congress leadership was uncomfortable with both movements because they took forms that went **beyond the Congress's ideology of non-violence and constitutional methods**, threatening to alienate powerful groups whose support the Congress needed.

In **Awadh**, peasants attacked the houses of talukdars and merchants, looted bazaars, and seized grain hoards — violent actions the Congress could not approve.

In the **Gudem Hills**, Alluri Sitaram Raju led a militant guerrilla movement, attacking police stations and killing British officials, asserting that India could be liberated only by force, not non-violence.

In both cases, the common reason for Congress's discomfort was that the movements **turned violent**, contradicting Gandhi's principle of non-violence, which was central to the national movement.

*Source: Chapter 2, Section 2.2 — Rebellion in the Countryside*

---

### Explanation

- The examiner wants ONE common thread — **violence/departure from non-violence** — identified and supported with evidence from BOTH movements.
- Don't just list what happened; explicitly state the common reason.
- The Awadh and Gudem examples must both appear to score full marks.
- Avoid writing that Congress feared losing landlord support for Awadh — that's a secondary point. The primary, *common* reason across both is the turn to violence against Congress's non-violent programme.

**Q66.** medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[1]

[mcq] Which of the following best explains why Mahatma Gandhi chose salt as the symbol for launching the Civil Disobedience Movement in 1930?

- ((A)) Salt was a commodity exclusively imported from Britain, making its boycott a direct economic blow to British trade.  
((B)) Salt was a universal necessity consumed by every Indian regardless of caste, class or region, so a tax on it united all sections of society against colonial exploitation.  
((C)) The salt industry was the largest employer in India, and targeting it would maximise disruption to the colonial economy.  
((D)) Salt had deep religious significance across all Indian communities, making it the most powerful symbol for a movement seeking Hindu-Muslim unity.

A Salt could only be produced by the British government, making its manufacture an easy act of defiance for trained satyagrahis alone.

B Salt was consumed by every Indian regardless of class, caste or religion, and the state monopoly over it visibly symbolised colonial exploitation of ordinary life.

C Foreign cloth boycotts had already achieved their goal of halving imports, so a new grievance was needed to sustain momentum.

D The Viceroy had specifically refused to negotiate on salt taxes, making it a ready-made point of confrontation with the government.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Answer: (B)

Salt was consumed by every Indian regardless of class, caste or religion, and the state monopoly over its production visibly symbolised colonial exploitation of ordinary life.

Source: *The Salt March and the Civil Disobedience Movement, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The passage directly states: "*Salt was something consumed by the rich and the poor alike... The tax on salt and the government monopoly over its production... revealed the most oppressive face of British rule.*" This makes Option B the correct match — it captures both the universality of salt and the symbolic power of the monopoly. The other options in the question stem are incorrect: salt was not exclusively imported from Britain (A), not the largest employer (C), and its selection was not primarily about religious significance (D). In the MCQ options given, A wrongly restricts defiance to trained satyagrahis, C and D introduce facts not supported by the passage. Examiners look for the two key ideas: *universal consumption* and *colonial monopoly as exploitation*.

Q67. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

Mahatma Gandhi called off both the Non-Cooperation Movement in 1922 and signed the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in 1931 to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement. Critics argued that each withdrawal undermined the movement. Using evidence from the chapter, explain the specific trigger and Gandhi's reasoning in each case, and assess whether the two situations had a common underlying concern.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

#### Non-Cooperation Movement (1922):

The trigger was the **Chauri Chaura incident** (February 1922), where a violent mob clashed with police and burned a police station, killing several constables. Gandhi called off the movement immediately. His reasoning was rooted in **satyagraha's core principle**: non-violence was not merely a tactic but the moral foundation of the struggle. A movement built on violence would lose its legitimacy and corrupt the people's character.

#### Civil Disobedience Movement (1931):

Gandhi signed the **Gandhi-Irwin Pact** to suspend the movement. The trigger was ongoing government repression and a political stalemate. Gandhi negotiated to secure the release of political prisoners and participate in the Round Table Conference, prioritising dialogue over confrontation at that moment.

#### Common Underlying Concern:

Both withdrawals reflected Gandhi's conviction that **the moral integrity of the movement mattered more than immediate gains**. Whether facing popular violence or state repression, he believed an uncontrolled or unprincipled movement would ultimately weaken rather than advance the cause of swaraj.

Source: Chapter 2, Sections 1.1, 3.2, and timeline

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect you to identify the **specific trigger** for each withdrawal (Chauri Chaura for 1922; Gandhi-Irwin Pact/repression for 1931) — don't merge them.
- The key conceptual link is Gandhi's **philosophy of satyagraha** — non-violence as a moral absolute, not just a strategy.
- Note from the timeline: NCM withdrawal = February 1922; CDM suspension = March 1931. Mentioning dates shows precision.
- The "assessment" part of the question only needs 2–3 lines; do not over-elaborate.

**Q68.** medium thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

The dalit community and large sections of Muslims both remained at the margins of the Civil Disobedience Movement, yet for very different reasons. Explain the distinct concern that kept each group from wholehearted participation.

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

**Dalits:** Dalit participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement was limited because their leaders, especially Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, believed political empowerment was the real solution to their social disabilities. They demanded separate electorates and reserved seats in legislative councils. Ambedkar's Depressed Classes Association focused on these goals rather than on a Congress-led movement that had long ignored dalit interests to avoid offending upper-caste Hindus.

**Muslims:** Large sections of Muslims stayed away because they felt alienated from the Congress after the decline of the Non-Cooperation–Khilafat Movement. From the mid-1920s, the Congress became visibly associated with Hindu religious groups, leading to communal riots and deepening distrust. Muslims feared their culture and identity would be submerged under Hindu majority dominance, making wholehearted participation in the movement difficult.

Source: *The Limits of Civil Disobedience, Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

The examiner expects **two clearly distinct reasons**, one per community. For dalits, the key idea is **political empowerment vs. social integration**—they distrusted Congress's agenda and wanted separate electorates. For Muslims, the key idea is **alienation and fear of minority identity being lost** after communal tensions grew. Mention Ambedkar and the communal riots briefly to show contextual awareness. Do not mix up the two groups' reasons.

Q69. deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[5]

A student argues: 'Symbols like the Bharat Mata image, the Swaraj flag and rewritten national histories all served the same purpose — they gave Indians a shared emotional identity to replace the fragmented loyalties of caste, region and religion.' Using evidence from the chapter, evaluate this argument. To what extent did these cultural tools actually succeed in uniting all Indians?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The student's argument is **partially valid** but oversimplifies the reality.

**Supporting evidence:** The Bharat Mata image, created by Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay and later painted by Abanindranath Tagore, gave Indians a personified motherland to feel devotion towards. The Swaraj flag (1921) with its spinning wheel united people around the ideal of self-help, and "carrying it aloft became a symbol of defiance." Rewritten nationalist histories encouraged pride in India's glorious past, countering British claims of Indian backwardness.

**Limitations:** The textbook explicitly states: "*When the past being glorified was Hindu, when the images celebrated were drawn from Hindu iconography, people of other communities felt left out.*" Source E glorifies only the "Arya vamsa," excluding non-Hindu communities. The conclusion also notes that unity "often broke down" and India emerged as "a nation with many voices."

**Conclusion:** These cultural tools stirred nationalism among many but could not fully bridge divisions of religion, caste, and region.

Source: *The Making of a Global World, Section 4 – The Sense of Collective Belonging; Conclusion – Chapter 2*

---

### Explanation

- Examiners expect you to **evaluate** (not just describe), so always present both sides.
- Quote or closely paraphrase the textbook — the line about Hindu iconography leaving others out is key evidence against the argument.
- The conclusion from the chapter ("nation with many voices") is a strong closing point.
- Avoid padding; 5 marks = ~5 focused points, which these paragraphs deliver.

**Q70.** deep thorough-understanding § (whole-chapter synthesis)

[3]

[short\_answer] Both the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army (HSRA) and the Gudem tribal uprising under Alluri Sitaram Raju rejected Gandhi's principle of non-violence, yet their reasons for doing so were rooted in different contexts. What fundamental disagreement about how colonial power could be challenged did each represent, and what does this reveal about the limits of Gandhian strategy as a universal method?

◆ Nationalism in India

Generated by claude-sonnet-4-6 · 2026-06-26 15:02 · grounding rag

### Model Answer

The **HSRA** (Bhagat Singh's group) believed that colonial power rested on state force, and only organised revolutionary violence could effectively counter it — appealing to the conscience of oppressors was naive against a regime that recognised only power.

The **Gudem tribals** under Alluri Sitaram Raju rejected non-violence because their immediate, local grievances — forest rights, forced labour — demanded urgent direct action; guerrilla tactics were the only practical tool available to them.

This reveals that Gandhian satyagraha, while powerful as a unifying idea, assumed oppressors could be morally persuaded — a premise that did not hold universally across different social and political contexts.

Source: Chapter 2, *Nationalism in India*

---

### Explanation

The examiner wants two distinct, contextually grounded reasons — not just "both used violence." Key contrast: HSRA = ideological/political disagreement with non-violence; Gudem = practical/local compulsion. The final line must draw a conclusion about Gandhian strategy's limits — that's what the "what does this reveal" part of the question is testing. Keep each point tight and don't repeat the same idea for both groups.

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>

Available for free from:

<https://cbsegrade10studyguide.com>

<https://github.com/orgs/cbse-free-resources/repositories>