

PSIR Answer Writing Module 2023**Test 6****Time Allowed: 1 Hour 30 Minutes****Max Marks: 120**Name: Astha JainTest Submission Date: 17 / Feb / 2022

Email Address: _____

Instructions:

1. All questions are compulsory.
2. All questions are for **15 marks** each.
3. Word limit for each question is **200 words**.
4. Answers must be written in the medium authorized in the admission Certificate, which must be stated clearly on the cover of the booklet in the space provided.
5. Content of the answer is more important than its length.
6. Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-Cum-Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.
7. All parts of the question should be written at one place itself.
8. **Filling all the details in BLOCK LETTERS is mandatory.**

Q. No.	Marks	Q. No.	Marks
Q1		Q5	
Q2		Q6	
Q3		Q7	
Q4		Q8	
Total Marks:		Evaluator Code:	

For any issue related to PSIR Test Series, write only at testseries@shubhrranjan.com



SHUBHRA RANJAN

Always Ahead

25, Pusa Road, Karol Bagh, Delhi 110005. ☎ 011 45612719

	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Understanding of Questions					
Structure & Flow					
(a) Introduction					
(b) Conclusion					
(c) Overall					
Subject Knowledge					
Presentation					
(a) Underline					
(b) Paragraph					
(c) Overall					

Overall Remarks:

Dear Student,



Q.1

What are the various components of modern Indian political thought? Do you think there is more of a continuity than change?
(200 words, 15 Marks)

Modern political thought arose in the backdrop of British Colonialism in India. Leaders like Surendro Ghosh, Dadabhai Naoroji, Gandhi etc focused on the evils of foreign rule and vision of India as a nation.

Modern pol. thoughts can be traced back to the social reformers of 19th century such as Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Jyotiba phule etc. Their main thrust was on reforming redundant and harmful customs & traditions and improve the situation of women and lower caste.

with est of congress, Nationalism came to the forefront of Modern pol. thinkers.



Britishers held that India is not a nation but just a geographic entity.

Moderates leaders like Surendranath Banerjee accepted that India is not a nation but 'a nation in making'.

This idea didn't pacified youths and extremist leaders. Aurobindo Ghosh gave cultural theory of Nationalism and held that India is always a nation.

Bhikhu Parekh held that Indian pol. thought from ancient to modern times reflects more of a continuity than change. The essence of both correlate in many sense. Ancient and modern thinkers reflect ethos of 'Vasudev Kutumbkam' reflecting cosmopolitanism and values of 'Saratan Dharma' - religion of humanity.



Most of them are critic of utilitarian tradition and imperialist british. They all reflect the "spiritual way of life."

"Dharma" is the overarching concept from ancient to modern Indian philosophy.

None is above "Dharma" which means right conduct or natural laws. Be it Gandhi or Ghosh, they upheld ideals enshrined in Vedas and ancient Indian text.

As V.R. Mehta suggested, Indians don't see things in dichotomous categories. There is no clear separation b/w Religion and state, individual and society. Thus it's more of a continuum of Indian way of life.



Que.2

The social thought in ancient India not only assures certain fundamental principles of morality but also seeks to direct the material life as well. Comment? (200 words, 15 Marks)

Max Muller, a admirer of Indian texts, held that no where in the world, human mind have dealt with various issues of life - as in India. Even though, Britishers & west deny the existence of 'Ancient political thought', it's undenyable that Ancient Indian thoughts are a repository of rich values in both material and spiritual sense.

acc. to Bhiku Parekh, Indian traditions can be classified into Hindu and Buddhist tradition. Both of them are a rich source of social life in ancient India. Vedas such as Rig Ved mentions about moral code of conduct for humans and various aspects of

material life. Manusmriti, a monumental work of Manu, talks about 4 ashramas of life — Dhram, Kam, Arth, Moksh.

This reflects a blend & balance of moral and material aspect (Arth & Kama) of life.

Human life has 4 aspects — Brahmacharya, Grashti, Vanaprasth and Niksha :

Thus, Hindu way of life tells about moral values needed to achieve good material life.

Similarly, Kautilya in Arshashastra also talks about importance of 'Arth' to attain good material life. He tells that most important duty of King is to ensure & expand material wellbeing of ~~nat~~ citizens. He also talks about lackling ~~corruption~~ in administration and ways to enhance material wellbeing.



Moral life is directed by the value encompassing 'Dharma'. No one is above Dharma, everyone has to follow the law of one's being. Even in material life, people has to honour their varna ashram and dharma. In the society, division of labour is present & everyone's material goal is definite.

Social thoughts of ancient India has touched diff. aspects of life such as work, duty, right conduct, punishment etc. They are still followed in modern Indian society. Due to the richness of thoughts, MacIntyre said that ignorance of Indian thoughts will lead to impoverishment of west.



Manusmriti is the storehouse of knowledge in social, political in judicial field of ancient India. Elucidate? (200 words, 15 Marks)

Manusmriti, is the most important text guiding the social-pol. life of Hindus from ancient to modern times. It's the codification of cosmic laws as given by 'Brahma' and codified by Manu. He is regarded as the first lawgiver of India. Manusmriti has touched upon diff. aspects of social, political and judicial field of ~~life~~ society.

Manusmriti comes under the 'Dhramshashtra' where 'Dhram' is the overarching concept, although 'Danda' is also present.

In the [social sphere], it talks about 4 ashramas of humans — Dhram, Arth, Kama, Moksh.

Society is divided into Varnas, where people are segregated into different categories based on occupation by birth. It's a hereditary and hierarchical division. The 4 varnas are — Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras. Each ~~varna~~ varna has definite sphere of work and everyone's duty is to uphold varna system.

The political sphere is also governed by varna system, king belong to kshatriya varna and his duty is to ensure adherence to Varna System. The origin of state is based on quasi contractual theory of contract b/w man and God. king is viewed as divine personality but he is also under 'Dharma'. It also talks about expansionist foreign policy and taxation system.



The judicial system is governed by the principle of 'Higher the caste lower the punishment and vice versa'.

Ambedkar is the foremost critic of Manusmriti and suggested to put 'Dynamite' on it because it gives lower status to Shudras. Vivekanand also held it as obsolete. But many praised it as well — Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, Max Muller etc.

Although, in comparison to present standards, Manusmriti can be seen as redundant. But it's rich repository of the social & pol. life of ancient India.

Que.4

What are fundamental principles of order and justice mentioned in Arthashastra? (200 words, 15 Marks)

Arthashastra is the masterpiece in the field of statecraft and geopolitics, written by Kautilya in ancient times. It's a classic evidence of strategic and realist thinking of Indians. Due to his realist and strategic approach, Kautilya is regarded as one of the fathers of offensive realism and geopolitics.

In Arthashastra, Kautilya has dealt with various aspects of administration, king's duty, foreign policy etc. He talks about the duty of the king — to maintain Dharma and Varna system and to secure and enhance material wellbeing of his people. He said —
"In the happiness of people, lie the happiness of king."



To secure material wellbeing of his kingdom, King has to increase his power by strengthening 7 elements of state - Amatya, Durg, Kosh etc. He has to follow expansionist foreign policy to increase wealth (land). He gives Saptang theory and Mandala Sindhanta to guide king in his expedition/war.

He advice the king 'to follow Sain, Dam, Danda, Bhed to secure national interest. Thus, he is compared with Machiavelli. But his king is not above law or Dharma. The fundamental principle of order & justice in society is to observe Dharma - righteousness.

In internal administration, he explains 40 ways of embellishment (corruption) and ways to tackle them by punishment.

He advises king to respect Brahmins, take care of women, orphans & destitutes. He subscribes to Manusmriti in the matter of justice as per varna system.

Arthashastra thus deals with a vast variety of social, political, administrative and geopolitical issues and gives very minute advice to run a orderly and just state.



Sir Syed Ahmed Khan a seminal figure of nineteenth century India continues to surface in all major debates on nationalism, the fate of minorities and democratic values. Discuss (200 words, 15 Marks)

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan is the wellknown figure, who is the prominent leader in Muslim renaissance, educational empowerment and reforms. He is regarded as the 'talent leader' of Muslim community in Indian subcontinent.

Khan is often Regarded as 'Anti National' and contributor of 'Two Nation Theory' which resulted into the formation of Pakistan. Khan's approach was pragmatic and according to the situation. He has seen the downfall of Muslim and retrogressive situation of Muslims. Thus, he focused on educational empowerment of Muslims.

He knew muslims need to 1st focus on their socio-edu. upliftment and thus, they need state support. He knew, there is no benefit of opposing British, rather they can be used to promote education.

He was no against communal harmony in India. He once said, "Muslims and hindus are 2 beautiful eyes of the bride India." But the language controversy in Swadh over replacing urdu with hindi, disheartened him. He said that in the coming times, more issues will emerge b/w them, thus it's better to stay away.

Regarding the fate of Democracy in India, his views are somewhat similar to Ambedkar. He also held



that democracy can't survive in India if values of harmony, equality and fraternity is not nurtured in society.

Syed Khan was the foremost leader of scientific and educational empowerment of largest minority community in India, Muslims. Muslims need a leader like him to reemerge as educational and social empowered community. He has inspired many leaders in South Asia like Iqbal, Abul Azad. His biggest contribution is the est. of Aligarh Muslim University.



Que.6

Do you subscribe to Ambedkar's characterization of Gandhi as mere polemic? (200 words, 15 Marks)

Ambedkar and Gandhi are the greatest leaders of India, both of them shaped the destiny of future of independent India. They both were concerned with improving the conditions of untouchables in India and giving them a life of dignity. Gandhi's constructive programmes and Ambedkar's struggle for dalit rights helped to uplift their status. However, both differed in many ways.

Ambedkar criticised Gandhi when he didn't supported Nahad Satyagrah which aimed at opening public wells for all. Gandhi said that for now, Satyagrah to be used against british only. Similarly he said Gandhi never kept a fast for



Dalits and their cause. But Gandhi knew people may not respond much. Ambedkar demanded seperate electorate for dalits but Gandhi kept fast unto death against it. This led to Poona Pact.

Ambedkar also didn't like the word 'Harijan' for untouchables because it create false consciousness. They are not God's children but most oppressed. He also disapproved Gandhi's Harijan Sevak Sangh.

In the matter of religion as well, both differed. Ambedkar criticises Varna System & called for annihilation of caste. Gandhi disapproved caste but not varna. Ambedkar went for religion conversion which Gandhi didn't support. He

called Hinduism as madness but Gandhi was a religious man.

In the matter of India's policy for Dalit upliftment, Ambedkar supported State led approach while Gandhi was against state. He didn't favour panchayat Raj but Gandhi strongly supported it.

Both were right in their own manner, the difference was of priorities. For Gandhi national interest was prior, for Ambedkar Dalit upliftment. They both shaped the destiny of modern India.

e.7

Aurobindo was a poet of patriotism, prophet of nationalism and the lover of humanity. Explain. (200 words, 15 Marks)

"World will come to know the essence of India through the writings of Aurobindo." — Rabindranath Tagore

Aurobindo was the foremost proponent of Indian nationalism. He has given the strong and cultural theory of Indian Nationalism by taking inspiration from Herder (German nationalism), Vivekanand (Vasudev Kutumbkam) & Bankim Chatterjee (Bharat Mata).

Aurobindo's theory came in context of criticism of Moderates in series of articles named 'New Lamps for Old'.



Moderates accepted Britishers' theory that India is not a nation. Surendra Nath Banerjee said India is a 'nation in making'. But this didn't inspired youths who needed bold theory of nationalism. Thus, Aurobindo Synthesised cultural nationalism with Indian idea of cosmopolitanism & unity in Diversity, and put forward the view that 'India is always a nation'.

He further explained, using Hegel's idea, that universal spirit and laws of history are in favour of India and India has to give message of 'spirituality' to the world. To lead the world, India can't remain in foreign slavery. Thus, he vouched for 'POORNA SWARAJ'.



The world should support the rise of India as India is on the right side of history. His views were not exclusivist as he favoured 'Unity in Diversity'. He also inspired youth by spiritualising Indian nation as mother.

Aurobindo's contribution in Indian freedom struggle is immense, the foremost being Swadeshi Movement, 1905 where thousands of people participated. His nationalism was second to none, thus he is rightly called as 'Prophet of Indian Nationalism'.

Que.8

M. N Roy's role in freedom movement unearths astonishing similarities and stark differences between him and Gandhi.
Comment. (200 words, 15 Marks)

M.N. Roy is regarded as 'Remarkable failure' by Sudipto Kaviraj. He was a man of great intelligence, original ideas, widely respected around the world for his contribution to Marxism. Yet, he didn't gain the status he deserved in India.

In his ideational journey, he moved from being ardent nationalist to marxist, then to critic of marxism and sympathiser of Gandhi, then again criticised Gandhi and proposed his theory of Radical Humanism.

For both Gandhi and M.N. Roy, human emancipation was main agenda. They both had cosmopolitan vision.



M.N. Roy recognised Gandhi's contribution in the upliftment of masses. They wanted to give maximum freedom to people. M.N. Roy joined Congress and realised the contribution of Gandhi in India. In 1948, he wrote about martyrdom of Gandhi and said that greatest respect to Gandhi can be paid by following his ideals.

M.N. Roy, despite praising Gandhi, had many difference with Gandhi & remained a major critique of Gandhi. He called Gandhi as man of medieval thinking who is mixing religion into politics. He favored industrialisation and scientific development to modernise India, while Gandhi was against it. M.N. Roy called Gandhi as 'weak watery man' and



working for Indian bourgeoisie. He blamed Gandhi for misguiding masses. He also criticised Quit India Movement as 'Mad Venture of Gandhi.' Ray was not convinced with too much focus on religion, metaphysics & God.

Despite the differences, both can be said as great leaders of Indian freedom movement. Both focussed on Spiritual freedom of man. Gandhi's greatness was praised by his major critic, M.N. Roy. This shows his reverence towards Gandhi.