

**Q1. How did the knowledge of ancient texts help the reformers promote new laws?**

**Ans.** The reformers like Rajaram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and others used the ancient texts, as a tool to promote new laws. These reformers quoted the ancient texts to challenge those practices that were outdated, decadent and anti-social. For instance Raja Ram Mohan Roy suggested that widow burning had no religious sanctions at all. This suggestion was adopted by British officials and in 1829 sati was officially banned.

**Q2. What were the different reasons people had for not sending girls to school?**

**Ans.** From the remote past girl child has always been the victim of social prejudice. Girls were treated as inferior and bad luck for the family. A girl always lived within the four walls and parents were very much conservative in sending them to schools because they feared:

- That the schools would take away girls from home and prevent them from doing domestic duties.
- That sending girls away to the school will dilute their chastity.
- That the girls would adopt western ways and erode family values.

**Q3. Why were the Christian Missionaries attacked by many people in the Country? Would some people have supported them too? If so, for what reasons?**

**Ans.** The coming of Christian missionaries was portrayed by Britishers as a civilizing mission as they tried to liberalise India from the shackles of old,

barbaric and decadent customs. However of the society, new opportunities emerged that include:

1. Schools were opened where children from low caste and tribal groups could get education.
2. Jobs were created for the people irrespective of caste and creed which boosted the economic life of poor and low caste people.
3. By enacting new laws, the low castes were given social identity and were protected from the oppression by upper castes.

**Q4. How did Jyotirao the reformers justify their criticism of caste inequality in society.**

**Ans.** The social reformers criticized caste inequalities and they organized movement to demand justice and social equality. They justified their criticism of caste inequality by referring to ancient sacred texts and some orthodox sections of the society opposed the Christian missionaries as they felt these Christian missionaries would rode their family values, customs, tradition culture etc. further they feared that their religion was also in danger.

However, low caste and down trodden people responded positively as Christian missionaries tried to uplift them by providing some basic facilities like education, health service, jobs etc and prevented them from any social discrimination.

**Q5. In the British Period, what new opportunities opened up for people who came from castes that were regarded as “Low”.**

**Ans.** With the coming of British rule the fates of Social equality and justice were opened not only for upper castes but lower and down trodden people as well. For the lower and suppressed section proclaimed that religion has never promoted any sort of discrimination among humans it were upper sections of the society who misused religion for their narrow interests.

**Q6. How did Phule dedicate his book Gulamgiri to American movement to free slaves?**

**Ans.** Jyotirao phule was the staunch critic of Brahmin domination of society. He proposed that shudras and other lower sections of the society should unite to challenge the caste discrimination. The Civil rights movement in America helped in ending slavery and racial discrimination. Hence, phule dedicated his book “Gulamgiri” to the movement.

**Q7. What did Ambedkar want to achieve through the temple entry movement?**

**Ans.** Dalits were not allowed to enter into the temples. It was like denying them of the basic rights i. e, freedom of access to a public place. By organizing the temple entry movements, Ambedkar wanted to regain equality and self respect for the Dalits.

**Q8. Why were Phule and Ramaswamy Naicker critical of the National Movement? Did their criticism help the National struggle in anyway?**

**Ans.** Both Phule and Ramaswamy Naicker were critical of national movement as they believed that the nationalist leaders and the colonialist were one and the same. They were outsiders who used power to subjugate local

and indigenous people. J phule believed that the upper cast nationalist leaders were using low caste people to serve their interests. Similarly, Naickers experience showed him that national movement was not free from casteism. The criticism did lead to rethinking and self criticism among nationalist leaders.