

UPSC CSE 2019 MAINS PAPER B SEPTEMBER 28, 2019 ENGLISH COMPULSORY LANGUAGE QUESTION PAPER

**ENGLISH****( COMPULSORY )****Time Allowed : Three Hours****Maximum Marks : 300****QUESTION PAPER SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS**

*Please read each of the following instructions carefully before attempting questions :*

*All questions are to be attempted.*

*The number of marks carried by a question is indicated against it.*

*Answers must be written in **ENGLISH** only.*

*Word limit in questions, wherever specified, should be adhered to and if answered in much longer or shorter than the prescribed length, marks will be deducted.*

*Any page or portion of the page left blank in the Question-cum-Answer Booklet must be clearly struck off.*

**Q1. Write an essay in about 600 words on any one of the following topics : 100**

- (a) Indian universities are Indian in their geographical locations only
- (b) Journalism has been rendered into sensationalism
- (c) Information is not knowledge
- (d) Even a layman can transform a society



**Q2. Read carefully the passage given below and write your answers to the questions that follow in clear, correct and concise language : 15×5=75**

History has a great variety of definitions and applications. In the broadest sense, it considers every action and every thought that man has had since his first appearance and records every significant advance or recession. It attempts to evaluate all the developments in science, in art, in literature, in philosophy, in architecture, in sociology, in politics, in war, in religion, and in law. It sketches as complete a picture as possible of everything that has influenced man directly or indirectly.

History, more than any other subject, has been enslaved and distorted for selfish purposes. Members of the clergy have used it to glorify and to promote the interests of the church, statesmen have utilized it to sway masses, and writers have distorted facts to substantiate their conclusions. War spirit has been kindled through undue emphasis upon facts, if not falsification of them. The historian is likely to exaggerate the history of his own country — sometimes unintentionally — because of his environment, and sometimes in order to facilitate the sale of his book. In all countries, there are zealots in responsible positions who cannot bear to have their fatherland criticized. Truth is frequently sacrificed at the altar of patriotism. Henry C. Lea, an outstanding American historian, declared that history should be “a serious attempt to ascertain the severest truth as to the past and set it forth without fear or favour.” Michelet, a famous French historian, believed that “sacrilege and the mocking of false gods are the historian’s first duty, his indispensable instrument for re-establishing the truth.”

The slight progress that we have made in the direction indicated by Lea and Michelet is rather discouraging, but there is a trend toward a broader and more inclusive point of view in the writing and teaching of history. World history, correctly interpreted, puts the individual state in the proper perspective and lessens the dangers of excessive nationalism. History has become more than war and politics. To make the story complete, the historian of the new school makes use of the work of the ethnologist, the anthropologist, the geographer, the archaeologist, the geologist, the psychologist, the astronomer, the zoologist, the biologist, the chemist, the sociologist, and the economist. He is concerned with man’s cultural advances and his society, as well as with charters, constitutions, and wars.

There are dangers, as well as virtues, in the vast scope of the “new history”. Overpopularization and underspecialization tend to cheapen history



and to destroy some of its qualities as a basic and sober study. There are decided advantages in the comprehension of the broad scope of history, but, in addition, the student should be able to appreciate the depth of the subject. Years of research have been spent and volumes have been written on a single topic. Without these specialized works, surveys would be of no particular value. However, some of the historians of the “new history” have sacrificed important fundamental facts in order to make a chronicle of heroic persons and romantic occurrences. They have overstepped the point where history and fiction should meet. The historian should make his description of the past lifelike, hence, he should include grim realities as well as romantic incidents.

One of the important aspects of the “new history” is the emphasis upon man’s cultural developments, popularly termed *civilization*. Civilization is difficult to define and evaluate. Just where it began and where man’s actions and thoughts became human is impossible to determine. Man, like animals, has senses but some are less acutely developed; man has emotions, most of which are present, but latent, in animals. Comfort seems to be the chief goal of the lower forms of animal life, but man pushes beyond that toward something that he has difficulty in defining. This intangible something may be called civilization. Professor Lynn Thorndike believes that civilization “is the product of our higher qualities as exercised first by original and superior individuals and then accepted or followed by a sufficient number of human beings to make it a social fact.” Buckle held that moral and intellectual progress is the basis of civilization. Emerson believed that civilization is progress, and Bertrand Russell, a modern philosopher, thinks that it is the progress and predominance of science. Perhaps we can agree that knowledge of nature, progress in art, an ethical code, a government, and a degree of material prosperity are essential in any form of civilized society. Civilization became possible when chaos and insecurity were minimized. Curiosity and constructiveness were encouraged when fear was overcome and man turned his attention toward the understanding and embellishment of life.

### **Questions :**

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (a) Why does the author consider history an all-inclusive area of study ?   | 15 |
| (b) According to the author, how has history suffered distortions and why ? | 15 |
| (c) How does the author describe the new school of historians ?             | 15 |
| (d) What are the dangers associated with “new history” ?                    | 15 |
| (e) Why is it difficult to define and evaluate civilization ?               | 15 |



- Q3. Make a précis of the following passage in about one-third of its length. Do not give a title to it. The précis should be written in your own language.**

75

In *Hind Swaraj* (1909), a text which is often privileged as an authentic statement of his ideology, Gandhi offered a civilisational concept of Indian nation. The Indians constituted a nation or *praja*, he asserts, since the pre-Islamic days. The ancient Indian civilisation — “unquestionably the best” — was the fountainhead of Indian nationality, as it had an immense assimilative power of absorbing foreigners of different creed who made this country their own. This civilisation, which was “sound at the foundation” and which always tended “to elevate the moral being”, had “nothing to learn” from the “godless” modern civilisation that only “propagated immorality”. Industrial capitalism, which was the essence of this modern civilisation, was held responsible for all conflicts of interests, for it divorced economic activities from moral concerns and thus provided imperatives for imperial aggression. Indians themselves were responsible for their enslavement, as they embraced capitalism and its associated legal and political structures. “The English have not taken India; we have given it to them.” And now the railways, lawyers and doctors, Gandhi believed, were impoverishing the country. His remedy for this national infliction was moral and utopian. Indians must eschew greed and lust for consumption and revert to village based self-sufficient economy of the ancient times. On the other hand, parliamentary democracy — the foundational principle of Western liberal political system and therefore another essential aspect of modern civilisation — did not reflect in Gandhi’s view the general will of the people, but of the political parties, which represented specific interests and constricted the moral autonomy of parliamentarians in the name of party discipline. So for him it was not enough to achieve independence and then perpetuate “English rule without the Englishmen”; it was also essential to evolve an Indian alternative to Western liberal political structures. His alternative was a concept of popular sovereignty where each individual controls or restrains her/his own self and this was Gandhi’s subtle distinction between self-rule and mere home rule. “Such swaraj”, Gandhi asserted, “has to be experienced by each one for himself.” If this was difficult to attain, Gandhi refused to consider it as just a



“dream”. “To believe that what has not occurred in history will not occur at all”, Gandhi replied to his critic, “is to argue disbelief in the dignity of man.” His technique to achieve it was *satyagraha*, which he defined as truth force or soul force. In more practical terms, it meant civil disobedience — but something more than that. It was based on the premise of superior moral power of the protesters capable of changing the heart of the oppressor through a display of moral strength. Non-violence or ahimsa was the cardinal principle of his message which was non-negotiable under all circumstances.

It is not perhaps strictly correct to say that Gandhi was rejecting modernity as a package. Anthony Parel notes in his introduction to *Hind Swaraj* that this text is presented in the genre of a dialogue between a reader and an editor, “a very *modern* figure”, with Gandhi taking on this role. Throughout his career he made utmost use of the print media, editing *Indian Opinion* during his South African days, and then *Young India* and *Harijan* became the major communicators of his ideas. And he travelled extensively by railways while organising his campaigns. Yet, by offering an ideological critique of the Western civilisation in its modern phase, Gandhi was effectively contesting the moral legitimacy of the Raj that rested on a stated assumption of superiority of the West.

It will be, however, misleading to suggest that Gandhi was introducing Indians to an entirely new kind of politics. And so far as mass mobilisation was concerned, the Home Rule Leagues of Tilak and Annie Besant prepared the ground for the success of Gandhi’s initial satyagraha movements. Indeed, when in 1914, Tilak was released from prison and Annie Besant, the World President of the Theosophical Society, then stationed in Madras, joined the Congress, they wanted to steer Indian politics to an almost similar direction. But although Tilak was readmitted to Congress in 1915 due to Besant’s intervention, they failed to reactivate the party out of its almost decade-long inertia.

Gandhi succeeded in uniting both the moderates and extremists on a common political platform. In the divided and contestable space of Indian politics, he could effectively claim for himself a centrist position, because he alienated neither and tactically combined the goal of the moderates with the



means of the extremists. He adopted the moderates' goal of swaraj, but was "delightfully vague" (to borrow Nehru's expression) about its definition, as any specific definition, he knew, would alienate one or the other group. So each group could interpret it in their own ways. His method of satyagraha looked very much like the passive resistance of the extremists; but his insistence on non-violence alleviated the fears of the moderates and other propertied classes, apprehensive of agitational politics. There was also a rift in the Muslim community around this time, between the Aligarh old guards and the younger generation of Muslim leaders. Gandhi aligned himself with the younger leaders by supporting the khilafat issue. He highlighted its anti-British aspects and underplayed its pan-Islamic tendencies, and thus for the first time united the Hindus and the Muslims in a combined battle against the British.

(882 words)

- Q4. (a) Rewrite the following sentences after making necessary corrections. Do not make unnecessary changes in the original sentence.**

**1×10=10**
- (i) The manager was angry upon the employee.

1
- (ii) One of the answer was wrong.

1
- (iii) You should buy new furnitures for your house.

1
- (iv) They pitched the tent besides the lake.

1
- (v) The wood-cutter was falling the trees in the forest.

1
- (vi) The hens had stopped lying eggs.

1
- (vii) The mother sings until the child does not go to sleep.

1
- (viii) There was no one to look at the children in the hostel.

1
- (ix) The reply is awaited for.

1
- (x) The chairman flew the flag.

1
- (b) Supply the missing words :**

**1×5=5**
- (i) Hard work is telling \_\_\_\_\_ your health.

1
- (ii) The book is hard to come \_\_\_\_\_ .

1
- (iii) The lady is the heir \_\_\_\_\_ a large estate.

1
- (iv) I was disgusted \_\_\_\_\_ his behaviour.

1
- (v) He did not agree \_\_\_\_\_ my proposal.

1



- (c) **Use the correct forms of the verbs given in brackets :** **1×5=5**
- (i) The child (steal) the show last evening. 1
- (ii) The man (read) the newspaper when I entered the room. 1
- (iii) The teacher said that the sun (be) stationary. 1
- (iv) You might (ask) her name. 1
- (v) He (suffer) from fever for five days. 1
- (d) **Write the antonyms of the following :** **1×5=5**
- (i) Noble 1
- (ii) Loyal 1
- (iii) Straight 1
- (iv) Partial 1
- (v) Sterile 1

- Q5. (a) Rewrite each of the following sentences as directed, without changing the meaning :** **1×10=10**
- (i) The old man said, "I have been visiting this temple for many years."  
(Change into indirect speech) 1
- (ii) Allow the pilgrims to pass.  
(Change into passive voice) 1
- (iii) No sooner had she heard the news than she fainted.  
(Use 'as soon as') 1
- (iv) He was not intelligent. He was not industrious.  
(Rewrite the sentence using 'neither ... nor') 1
- (v) When the dog is sleeping, let it lie peacefully.  
(Turn into a simple sentence) 1
- (vi) He only laughed. He did not do anything else.  
(Rewrite the sentence using 'but') 1
- (vii) The evil practice will continue if the government does not adopt stringent measures.  
(Use 'unless') 1
- (viii) He was allowed to go so that he might see his ailing mother.  
(Use 'in order that') 1
- (ix) The burden was too heavy for the old man to carry.  
(Remove 'too') 1
- (x) She was frightened by the man's glaring eyes.  
(Turn into a complex sentence) 1



- (b) Use the following words to make sentences that bring out their meaning clearly. Do not change the form of the words. (No marks will be given for vague and ambiguous sentences.)  $1 \times 5 = 5$
- |       |            |   |
|-------|------------|---|
| (i)   | Disdain    | 1 |
| (ii)  | Contagious | 1 |
| (iii) | Stagger    | 1 |
| (iv)  | Insular    | 1 |
| (v)   | Didactic   | 1 |
- (c) Choose the appropriate word to fill in the blanks :  $1 \times 5 = 5$
- |       |   |   |
|-------|---|---|
| (i)   | He remained _____ to his seat. (glowed/glued)                       | 1 |
| (ii)  | You should wear _____ garments in summer. (lose/loose)              | 1 |
| (iii) | He _____ before the boss. (coward/cowered)                          | 1 |
| (iv)  | The player was crying _____. (foul/fowl)                            | 1 |
| (v)   | The chief was _____ of the latest development. (apprised/appraised) | 1 |
- (d) Use the following idioms/phrases in sentences of your own to bring out their meaning clearly. Do not change the form of the words.  $1 \times 5 = 5$
- |       |                |   |
|-------|----------------|---|
| (i)   | With a view to | 1 |
| (ii)  | Go berserk     | 1 |
| (iii) | Cut adrift     | 1 |
| (iv)  | At sea         | 1 |
| (v)   | Ins and outs   | 1 |