11A/12A

India, 1857–1948 The Raj to Partition

Answer <u>BOTH</u> questions.

Study Source 1 before you answer this question.

1. (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the achievements of Lord Curzon as Viceroy in the years 1898–1905?

   Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context. (10)

(Question 1(a) = 10 marks)

Source 1: From an article in *The Brisbane Courier* newspaper, published in Australia, 27 July 1901. This report from the *Courier*'s correspondent in India focused on an assessment of Lord Curzon's first three years as Viceroy. Australia was given the status of a self-governing federation within the British Empire in 1900.

Lord Curzon is full of energy, and has plunged his Administration into a whirlwind of reforms involving almost every branch of the Government. Foremost among these reforms are measures directed to removing excessive bureaucracy and to reducing the movement of officials which had weakened the influence of officers in their own districts. He is encouraging legislation to cope with agricultural debts. He has been reducing the monopoly of the telegraph companies. He is attempting to destroy police corruption, to stimulate irrigation projects to prevent famine, to reorganise the finance of railway projects, and to change the Indian educational system from encouraging sedition into encouraging the arts and crafts.

His predecessors had the same problems to solve, but they were ignorant of India, and were held back from reform by preserving traditions. It has been left to Lord Curzon to formulate an amazing number of measures that he believes will be beneficial.

Meanwhile, some of Lord Curzon's earlier reforms are showing useful results. The country has gone through a terrible famine without finances becoming disordered or progress on railways and canals being stopped.

***** Exam continues on the next page *****

Study Source 2 before you answer this question.

1. (b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into General Dyer's handling of the protests at Amritsar in April 1919?

   Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(Question 1(b) = 15 marks)

Source 2: From the *Report of the Disorders Inquiry Committee*, published 1920. The Committee of seven members, including three Indians, was led by Lord Hunter. Here it is reporting its conclusions on General Dyer's actions at the *Jallianwala Bagh* in April 1919.

> The Committee criticises General Dyer for two reasons, (1) that he opened fire without warning, and (2) that he went on firing after the crowd had begun to disperse. On the first point, the Committee point out that General Dyer does not suggest that there was an emergency which justified his decision to fire on the crowd without warning. He stated that his mind was made up that, if his orders were disobeyed, he was going to fire at once. The Committee thinks it unlikely that the crowd would have dispersed without being fired on. Nevertheless, they say that a warning would have given an opportunity for people to leave. It is also the Committee's opinion that General Dyer committed a grave error in continuing to fire as long as he did, even after the crowd had begun to disperse. However, they consider that he honestly believed that he was called upon to take this step in the discharge of his duty.
>
> The Committee finds further that it was his intention to create a moral effect throughout the Punjab and they condemn this as a mistaken conception of his duty. In conclusion, the Committee does not accept the view that General Dyer's action saved the situation and prevented a rebellion on a scale similar to the Mutiny.

END