

*(b) (i) Use Sources 13, 14 and 15 and your own knowledge.

Do you agree with the view that in the years 1900–14 there was serious opposition to British control of India?

Explain your answer, using Sources 13, 14 and 15 and your own knowledge.

(40)

SOURCE 13

(From Percival Spear, *A History of India*, published 1965)

By 1900, the Indian middle class and the government were gradually moving apart.
20 We should beware however of attaching too much weight to the Congress as a whole. Indian nationalism was still a movement rather than a force. It was still confined to the westernised middle class. Then, in 1905, Bengal was partitioned. The whole middle class, and, in Bengal, the people as well, had been deeply stirred.

SOURCE 14

(From Dane Kennedy, *Britain and Empire 1880–1945*, published 2002)

Conciliation marked the Liberal approach to India. Under the Imperial vicerealty
25 of Lord Curzon, the moderate Indian nationalist movement had grown more restive and violent, especially in reaction to Curzon's decision to partition Bengal along sectarian lines. When the Liberals came to power they sought to repair the damage this caused. They granted Indians greater participation in government with the Morley–Minto reforms in 1909, and they reversed the partition of Bengal in 1911.
30 Their efforts eased tensions, thus advancing Imperial aims.

SOURCE 15

(From an address by Gopal Krishna Gokhale to the Imperial Legislative Council about its proposals for reforms, 1 November 1907)

If it was expected by the Council that the publication of Lord Minto's scheme would calm the discontent in the country in any degree, there was bound to be disappointment. The scheme is neither large nor generous and is in some respects
35 not a scheme for reform at all. Disappointment has intensified the prevailing feeling of discontent. As though this was not enough, the language used in explaining the proposals is unnecessarily offensive to certain classes.