

UNIT- I(II SEM)
LESSONS FROM THE PAST
PART 1
IMPORTANCE OF THE PAST
READING:

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY – DAVID CRABTREE

Verbal Ability (Meanings): Page: 97

1. Enshrouded : Covered
2. Oppressive : Tyrannical
3. Infallible : Perfect
4. Compassionate : Kind
5. Perspective : View
6. Chronicle : Record
7. Origin : Genesis
8. Incompatible : Irreconcilable
9. Legitimacy : Legality
10. Émigré : Migrant
11. Devastating : Destructive
12. Testify : give evidence
13. Inconsistencies : Contradictions
14. Inexplicable : Unexplainable
15. Resolvable : Can be solved or explained
16. Plausible : believable
17. Conjecture : guess
18. Coherent : logical
19. Preconceived : predetermined
20. Reaffirmation : confirmation
21. Jettison : discard

COMPREHENSION:

Answer the following questions:

1. *What is the status of history in modern times?*

A. History is important. In centuries past this statement would have seemed self-evident. Ancient cultures devoted much time and effort to teaching their children family history. It was thought that the past helps a child understand who he is. Modern society, however, has turned its back on the past. We live in a time of rapid change, a time of progress. We prefer to define ourselves in terms of where we are going, not where we come from.

2. *Why do people in modern times discard history?*

A. Ancient cultures devoted much time and effort to teaching their children family history. It was thought that the past helps a child understand who he is. Modern society, however, has turned its back on the past. We live in a time of rapid change, a time of progress. We prefer to define ourselves in terms of where we are going, not where we come from. Modern society thinks that our ancestors hold no importance for us. They lived in times so different from our own that they are incapable of shedding light on our experience. Man is so much smarter now than he was even ten years ago that anything from the past is outdated and irrelevant to us. Therefore the past, even the relatively recent past, is, in the minds of most of us, enshrouded by mists and only very vaguely perceived. These are the reasons of people in modern society leading to discard history.

3. *What is the main reason, according to the author, for our ignorance of the past?*

A. Man is so much smarter now than he was even ten years ago that anything from the past is outdated and irrelevant to us. Therefore the past, even the relatively recent past, is, in the minds of most of us, enshrouded by mists and only very

vaguely perceived. Our ignorance of the past is not the result of a lack of information, but of indifference. We do not believe that history matters.

4. *What example does the author give to prove his point about the importance of history?*

A. It has been said that he who controls the past controls the future. Our view of history shapes the way we view the present, and therefore it dictates what answers we offer for existing problems. In 1917, the communists took control of Russia. They began to exercise control over how the history of their country ought to be told. They depicted the tsar as oppressive and cruel. The leaders of the revolution were portrayed in a very positive light. The Communist government insisted that these leaders, and in particular Lenin, understood more clearly than anyone else what Russia needed and what course of action the government ought to follow. In the 1970s and 80s, several things happened to shake people's confidence in this view of history. One was the publication of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*. This work was the product of years of historical research by the author. He interviewed scores of prisoners and did extensive research to chronicle the genesis and dotted the Soviet Union. His book described the cruelty and injustice of the system in great detail. Finally, the most important of all, he was able to show that Lenin and Stalin were active and knowing participants in the formation of this brutal institution.

5. *What does the author mean by 'official history'?*

A. According to the official history, Lenin made no mistakes and he passed his virtually infallible understanding on to the other leaders of the party. The official history presented Lenin and Stalin as kind, compassionate, wise, nearly divine leaders. Solzhenitsyn's depiction of the leaders Lenin and Stalin as active and knowing participants in the formation of brutal institution was incompatible with the official history. If the official history was wrong, the legitimacy and justification for Soviet rule was all brought into question. *Gulag Archipelago* was the product of years of historical research of Solzhenitsyn. He interviewed scores of prisoners and did extensive research to chronicle the genesis and development of the chain of labour camps that dotted the Soviet Union. The difficulties that people in the Soviet Union experiences were all attributable to capitalism. The nation's economic backwardness, the need for a massive military and tight security, and domestic crime were all ultimately tied to the influence of capitalistic countries.

SPEAKING:

1. *He who controls the past controls the future.*

Independent India struggles with its recent history. Take the issue of minority, read Muslim, empowerment. The backwardness of the Muslims has been officially well documented since the late 19th Century. So few from that community in British India made it to school and still fewer saw the portals of a college or found jobs in government. Most Muslims lived in deep and numbing poverty and near absolute female illiteracy.

Predictably, to appeal to its Hindu support base in a communally structured electoral process, the Congress when it came to power in much of British India in 1937 had no programme for Muslim upliftment. Even in the Upper Provinces, where it was in control, it went back on a pre poll agreement and denied Jinnah and the Muslim League a share in governance claiming then, as now, that it was by itself inclusive party that had the interest of the Muslim community at heart.

Long before the Sachar Committee (2006), the Muslims themselves had been highlighting the community's severe backwardness vociferously, not the least Sir Syed Ahmed Khan — the founder of the College that went on to become Aligarh Muslim University — and Jinnah as well.

The latter was, as records indicate, possibly the best bet for the whole of British India, including its Princely States, to emerge as a unified secular state which would acknowledge the general backwardness of Muslims and do something about it. It was only after he had been repeatedly spurned first by Gandhi and then by Nehru, that Jinnah made his pitch for a separate State.

Even that is now widely regarded as hard posturing for a better deal for the Muslims. Well known historian Ayesha Jalal made this point eloquently sometime back in *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan*.

Congress' flawed approach

Presuming for a moment that no one else except Jinnah was responsible for the Partition, we have yet to get a credible reason why Maulana Azad's plea to keep India one was ignored by Nehru and the Congress Party, which also suppressed other Muslim voices against a break up.

The Maulana was understandably bitter about that and stated as much in *India Wins Freedom*.

Though the Constituent Assembly debated the backwardness of the Muslims, reservations ended up as an essentially Hindu-focused initiative, never mind that the Muslim communities in most parts of India were no less backward than the historically discriminated Hindu castes.

Years after its release, the Sachar Committee Report remains a political balloon, very much up in the air with no one willing to bring it down and help a community to pull itself up from backwardness.

A primary cause for this is the Congress Party's approach to India's largest religious minority. From Mahatma Gandhi to Rajiv Gandhi, the Congress party has been adept at appealing to the most retrograde sections of the Muslim community whether it was to promote the Khilafat movement — strongly opposed by Jinnah — or rush through a bill to nullify the Supreme Court's judgement in the Shah Bano case.

We also need to recall that the founder of Jan Sangh and a leading member of the Hindu Mahasabha, Syama Prasad Mookerjee was a key minister in Nehru's first cabinet.

Downplaying or suppressing reports of communal conflicts has been a cornerstone of Congress's cover up strategy and one that the BJP has consistently and conveniently acquiesced to.

Amongst several others, the mass killings which followed the takeover of Hyderabad State by India in 1948 — over 50,000 Muslims lost their lives making it by far the single largest massacre of Muslims since independence — brought out by the still officially suppressed Pandit Sunderlal Committee report, to the communal riots of Ahmedabad (1969) and Nelli (1983), as well as the Sikh massacres of 1984, Congress governments have attempted to hide or downplay them all.

Complicit BJP

Unsurprisingly, the BJP — except in the case of the Sikh massacres of 1984 — is complicit by its quiet suppression of these mass killings under Congress watch -- simply by never inviting attention to any of them even when gravely provoked as it has been in the case of the 2002 Ahmedabad riots. This also explains why the BJP has so far not been able to hold power for any length of time — excluding the Vajpayee period and that too only as part of the coalition.

The fact is the Congress party has done a great job of appearing to be secular, while only thinly concealing its very Hindu underpinnings. Nehru might have protested, but he did nothing to stop a Hindu fanatic such as Purushottam Das Tandon from becoming President of the Congress nor did he dissuade President Rajendra Prasad from making a religiously loaded visit to Somnath.

If one looks at the origins of the Babri Masjid controversy, one can see a Congress hand behind it, not the least Rajiv Gandhi's. The Congress has always been a party that stood by Hindus. Is it any surprise then that it has run the country for much of the period since 1947?

Sometime ago, a highly regarded Swedish academic of Pakistani origin, Professor Ishtiaq Ahmed concluded a talk at Bangalore's Centre for Contemporary Studies — in which he was as hard on Pakistan as he was on Jinnah — by challenging his Indian counterparts to do likewise for India.

It is time we took up Professor Ahmed's challenge and gave our people a more credible 'warts and all' account of our recent past.

George Orwell famously observed that 'He who controls the past controls the future. He who controls the present controls the past'. The Congress assumed ownership of our history for a long time and controlled it with astonishing finesse.

OR

The meaning of this statement is that someone can redefine who they are and, in fact, what a society is by being able to change the perception of how the past is configured. For example, dictatorships are very passionate in the idea of "rewriting history." You can see this in Milan Kundera's excellent book, *The Book of Laughter and Forgetting*. We can also see this in history. When Communist rule was at its zenith of power, governments were driven to recreating history in a manner that coordinated with the current government's goals. In doing this (controlling the perception of the past), more credibility is given to the current, present day policies. The Khmer Rouge government in Cambodia, after they wrestled power away from European control, declared a "Year Zero" where they made the argument that the past is the present. By controlling the means of reading the past, they were able to fortify their control of the present. This is also seen in the French Revolution. After the French Monarchy was overthrown, they instituted a new view of history where the past was considered immoral and evil, lending greater credibility to the present.

I think you want to focus on the idea that people understand their present and future in how they conceptualize and comprehend the past. If someone in the position of power can change how the past is viewed, they have a greater chance of controlling the present in that they are able to link the two together.

2. THE VALUES OF TEACHING HISTORY OR HISTORY TEACHES VALUES

A large number of values emerge out of teaching History. These are based on reality and are the outcome of the lessons of History through ages. The teacher of History should be conscious of these values and try to realize them through his activities in the classrooms.

All these values are classified into the following nine types:

- (1) Pedagogical or educational value,
- (2) Informative or knowledge value,
- (3) Intellectual disciplinary value,
- (4) Cultural value,
- (5) Political or citizenship value,
- (6) Vocational value,
- (7) Ethical value,
- (8) Nationalistic value and

(9) Internationalist value.

(1) Pedagogical Value

History is the Science of human progress and development. Its scope is very vast and embraces all subjects in one form or other. Science, arts, language, literature, mathematics and geography all have historical background and attempts are made to relate the present conditions as well as status of these subjects with the past developments while teaching the subjects. The principle of correlation so much emphasized by the exponents of Basic education has immense pedagogical values.

According to this principle, all the subjects are correlated conveniently and History can easily be treated as the central or core subject. History is the rich store of interesting and illuminating stories in different subjects and can effectively be utilized in the classrooms for teaching various subjects.

(2) Information Value

History is called the "a veritable mine of experience" and "a store house of knowledge". It describes origin and development of different civilizations and culture. It contains useful knowledge regarding art, science, architecture, education, industry and so on.

It records the life and struggles of different peoples of the world through ages. This information helps the individuals to solve the problems faced from time to time Bacon has, therefore, rightly said, "Histories make man wise".

(3) Intellectual Values

It goes without saying that teaching of History improves the child's powers of imagination, reasoning and judgment. It facilitates his capacity for gathering information, analyzing, interpreting and arriving at conclusions. All these promote the intellectual development and discipline of the students.

Various mental faculties are nicely exercised and developed by the inter-play of facts and figures, information and inferences relating to the different historical events and anecdotes.

(4) Cultural Value

History shows the cultural development of various peoples through years. It reveals the origin, evolution and problems for cultures. It imparts to the students how a culture is transmitted from generation to another with changes and modifications. That is why, study of history develops patience, tolerance, mutual exchange of ideas and liberal attitudes towards various problems of the society. This helps promote national integrity and international understanding.

(5) Citizenship Education

Political lessons are better imparted by history than any other subject. History is rightly called the root of political science and political science is held as the fruit of history.

Knowledge of history-its political development, constitutional evolution and democratic growth helps students to train them in citizenship. Adequate understanding & attitudes developed through the study of history facilitates democratic citizenship and training.

(6) Vocational Value

The study of history helps students to appear at the competitive examinations like IAS, IPS, OAS and OPS etc. more confidently. It also prepares persons for occupying the posts of political leaders, curators, journalists, teachers and personnel for State Archives. In short, history enables students to choose suitable vocations.

(7) Ethical Values

History is full of living examples. It is said "examples are better than precepts" and "history is philosophy teaching by examples". These examples reveal the stories of great men who did sacrifice their lives for truth, justice and goodness.

History has recorded the laudable actions and achievements of the individuals who experienced untold sufferings for the sake of the lofty ideals and great moral values. Students are inspired to live a life of truth, justice and sacrifice and motivated by the bright examples of history.

(8) Nationalistic Values

The history of one's country is the story of its national development. It depicts the life of heroes and martyrs who suffered and sacrificed for the sake of their mother land either for depending on their country or for fighting out their enemies. Love one's own country is good and should be fostered through the study of history. But blind love and biased attitude towards one's country is bad and to be discouraged.

(9) Internationalists Value

Modern history particularly world history describes the various national struggles, revolutions and incidents with international bearings and implications. Most of these events have common repercussions in many countries and show the common endeavours for the general welfare and universal brotherhood.

The spirit of "one world" and international understanding is promoted through the study of these events and occurrences. Students of history are led to believe that no nation can thrive in isolation and all should live in peace and happiness together.

3. The Unofficial History of America

The unofficial history of America, which continues to be written, is not a story of rugged individualism and heroic personal sacrifice in the pursuit of a dream. It is a story of democracy derailed, of a revolutionary spirit suppressed, and of a once-proud people reduced to servitude.

By Kalle Lasn

The history of America is the one story every kid knows. It's a story of fierce individualism and heroic personal sacrifice in the service of a dream. A story of early settlers hungry and cold, carving a home out of the wilderness. Of visionary leaders fighting for democracy and justice, and never wavering. Of a populace prepared to defend those ideals to the death. It's the story of a revolution (an American art form as endemic as baseball or jazz) beating back British Imperialism and launching a new colony into the industrial age on its own terms.

It's a story of America triumphant. A story of its rise after World War II to become the richest and most powerful country in the history of the world, "the land of the free and home of the brave," an inspiring model for the whole world to emulate.

That's the official history, the one that is taught in school and the one our media and culture reinforce in myriad ways every day.

The unofficial history of the United States is quite different. It begins the same way -- in the revolutionary cauldron of colonial America -- but then it takes a turn. A bitplayer in the official history becomes critically important to the way the unofficial history unfolds. This player turns out to be not only the provocateur of the revolution, but in the end its saboteur. This player lies at the heart of America's defining theme: the difference between a country that pretends to be free and a country that truly is free.

That player is the corporation.

The United States of America was born of a revolt not just against British monarchs and the British parliament but against British corporations.

We tend to think of corporations as fairly recent phenomena, the legacy of the Rockefellers and Carnegies. In fact, the corporate presence in prerevolutionary America was almost as conspicuous as it is today. There were far fewer corporations then, but they were enormously powerful: the Massachusetts Bay Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, the British East India Company. Colonials feared these chartered entities. They recognized the way British kings and their cronies used them as robotic arms to control the affairs of the colonies, to pinch staples from remote breadbaskets and bring them home to the motherland.

The colonials resisted. When the British East India Company imposed duties on its incoming tea (telling the locals they could buy the tea or lump it, because the company had a virtual monopoly on tea distribution in the colonies), radical patriots demonstrated. Colonial merchants agreed not to sell East India Company tea. Many East India Company ships were turned back at port. And, on one fateful day in Boston, 342 chests of tea ended up in the salt chuck.

The Boston Tea Party was one of young America's finest hours. It sparked enormous revolutionary excitement. The people were beginning to understand their own strength, and to see their own self-determination not just as possible but inevitable.

The Declaration of Independence, in 1776, freed Americans not only from Britain but also from the tyranny of British corporations, and for a hundred years after the document's signing, Americans remained deeply suspicious of corporate power. They were careful about the way they granted corporate charters, and about the powers granted therein.

Early American charters were created literally by the people, for the people as a legal convenience. Corporations were "artificial, invisible, intangible," mere financial tools. They were chartered by individual states, not the federal government, which meant they could be kept under close local scrutiny. They were automatically dissolved if they engaged in activities that violated their charter. Limits were placed on how big and powerful companies could become. Even railroad magnate J. P. Morgan, the consummate capitalist, understood that corporations must never become so big that they "inhibit freedom to the point where efficiency [is] endangered."

The two hundred or so corporations operating in the US by the year 1800 were each kept on fairly short leashes. They weren't allowed to participate in the political process. They couldn't buy stock in other corporations. And if one of them acted improperly, the consequences were severe. In 1832, President Andrew Jackson vetoed a motion to extend the charter of the corrupt and tyrannical Second Bank of the United States, and was widely applauded for doing so. That same year the state of Pennsylvania revoked the charters of ten banks for operating contrary to the public interest. Even the enormous industry trusts, formed to protect member corporations from external competitors and provide barriers to entry, eventually proved no match for the state. By the mid-1800s, antitrust legislation was widely in place.

In the early history of America, the corporation played an important but subordinate role. The people -- not the corporations -- were in control. So what happened? How did corporations gain power and eventually start exercising more control than the individuals who created them?

The shift began in the last third of the nineteenth century -- the start of a great period of struggle between corporations and civil society. The turning point was the Civil War. Corporations made huge profits from procurement contracts and took advantage of the disorder and corruption of the times to buy legislatures, judges and even presidents. Corporations became the masters and keepers of business. President Abraham Lincoln foresaw terrible trouble. Shortly before his death, he warned that "corporations have been enthroned . . . An era of corruption in high places will follow and the money power will endeavor to prolong its reign by working on the prejudices of the people . . . until wealth is aggregated in a few hands . . . and the republic is destroyed."

President Lincoln's warning went unheeded. Corporations continued to gain power and influence. They had the laws governing their creation amended. State charters could no longer be revoked. Corporate profits could no longer be limited. Corporate economic activity could be restrained only by the courts, and in hundreds of cases judges granted corporations minor legal victories, conceding rights and privileges they did not have before.

Then came a legal event that would not be understood for decades (and remains baffling even today), an event that would change the course of American history. In *Santa Clara County vs. Southern Pacific Railroad*, a dispute over a railbed route, the US Supreme Court deemed that a private corporation was a "natural person" under the US Constitution and therefore entitled to protection under the Bill of Rights. Suddenly, corporations enjoyed all the rights and sovereignty previously enjoyed only by the people, including the right to free speech.

This 1886 decision ostensibly gave corporations the same powers as private citizens. But considering their vast financial resources, corporations thereafter actually had far more power than any private citizen. They could defend and exploit their rights and freedoms more vigorously than any individual and therefore they were more free. In a single legal stroke, the whole intent of the American Constitution -- that all citizens have one vote, and exercise an equal voice in public debates -- had been undermined. Sixty years after it was inked, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas concluded of *Santa Clara* that it "could not be supported by history, logic or reason." One of the great legal blunders of the nineteenth century changed the whole idea of democratic government.

Post-Santa Clara America became a very different place. By 1919, corporations employed more than 80 percent of the workforce and produced most of America's wealth. Corporate trusts had become too powerful to legally challenge. The courts consistently favored their interests. Employees found themselves without recourse if, for example, they were injured on the job (if you worked for a corporation, you voluntarily assumed the risk, was the courts' position). Railroad and mining companies were enabled to annex vast tracts of land at minimal expense.

Gradually, many of the original ideals of the American Revolution were simply quashed. Both during and after the Civil War, America was increasingly being ruled by a coalition of government and business interests. The shift amounted to a kind of coup d'état -- not a sudden military takeover but a gradual subversion and takeover of the institutions of state power. Except for a temporary setback during Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal (the 1930s), the US has since been governed as a corporate state.

In the post-World War II era, corporations continued to gain power. They merged, consolidated, restructured and metamorphosed into ever larger and more complex units of resource extraction, production, distribution and marketing, to the point where many of them became economically more powerful than many countries. In 1997, fifty-one of the world's hundred largest economies were corporations, not countries. The top five hundred corporations controlled forty-two percent of the world's wealth. Today corporations freely buy each other's stocks and shares. They lobby legislators and bankroll elections. They manage our broadcast airwaves, set our industrial, economic and cultural agendas, and grow as big and powerful as they damn well please.

Every day, scenes that would have seemed surreal, impossible, undemocratic twenty years ago play out with nary a squeak of dissent from a stunned and inured populace.

At Morain Valley Community College in Palos Hills, Illinois, a student named Jennifer Beatty stages a protest against corporate sponsorship in her school by locking herself to the metal mesh curtains of the multimillion-dollar "McDonald's Student Center" that serves as the physical and nutritional focal point of her college. She is arrested and expelled.

At Greenbrier High School in Evans, Georgia, a student named Mike Cameron wears a Pepsi T-shirt on the day -- dubbed "Coke Day" -- when corporate flacks from Coca-Cola jet in from Atlanta to visit the school their company has sponsored and subsidized. Mike Cameron is suspended for his insolence.

In suburban shopping malls across North America, moms and dads push shopping carts down the aisle of Toys "R" Us. Trailing them and imitating their gestures, their kids push pint-size carts of their own. The carts say, "Toys 'R' Us Shopper in Training."

In St. Louis, Missouri, chemical giant Monsanto sics its legal team on anyone even considering spreading dirty lies -- or dirty truths -- about the company. A Fox TV affiliate that has prepared a major investigative story on the use and misuse of synthetic bovine growth hormone (a Monsanto product) pulls the piece after Monsanto attorneys threaten the network with "dire consequences" if the story airs. Later, a planned book on the dangers of genetic agricultural technologies is temporarily shelved after the publisher, fearing a lawsuit from Monsanto, gets cold feet.

In boardrooms in all the major global capitals, CEOs of the world's biggest corporations imagine a world where they are protected by what is effectively their own global charter of rights and freedoms -- the Multinational Agreement on Investment (MAI). They are supported in this vision by the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC), the European Round Table of Industrialists (ERT), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and other organizations representing twenty-nine of the world's richest economies. The MAI would effectively create a single global economy allowing corporations the unrestricted right to buy, sell and move their businesses, resources and other assets wherever and whenever they want. It's a corporate bill of rights designed to override all "nonconforming" local, state and national laws and regulations and allow them to sue cities, states and national governments for alleged noncompliance. Sold to the world's citizens as inevitable and necessary in an age of free trade, these MAI negotiations met with considerable grassroots opposition and were temporarily suspended in April 1998. Nevertheless, no one believes this initiative will remain suspended for long.

We, the people, have lost control. Corporations, these legal fictions that we ourselves created two centuries ago, now have more rights, freedoms and powers than we do. And we accept this as the normal state of affairs. We go to corporations on our knees. Please do the right thing, we plead. Please don't cut down any more ancient forests. Please don't pollute any more lakes and rivers (but please don't move your factories and jobs offshore either). Please don't use pornographic images to sell fashion to my kids. Please don't play governments off against each other to get a better deal. We've spent so much time bowed down in deference, we've forgotten how to stand up straight.

The unofficial history of America™, which continues to be written, is not a story of rugged individualism and heroic personal sacrifice in the pursuit of a dream. It is a story of democracy derailed, of a revolutionary spirit suppressed, and of a once-proud people reduced to servitude.

Excerpted from *Culture Jam: The Uncooling of America™* (Kalle Lasn, William Morrow / Eaglebrook, 1999)

GRAMMAR: (Cause and Effect)

Make sentences with each cause-effect pair using appropriate cause-effect expressions:

1. Due to Global warming, glaciers will melt consequently.
2. Owing to development in mass media, the information can be spread effectively.
3. Better city infrastructure leads to the expansion of tourism industry.
4. Owing to inflation, there is a rise in the prices of goods consequently.
5. Population is increasing, hence resources are crunched.

2 Marks Questions:

*1. What is the theme of the publication **Gulag Archipelago**?*

A. The author interviewed scores of prisoners and did extensive research to chronicle the genesis and development of the chain of labour camps that dotted the Soviet Union. The author described Lenin and Stalin as active and knowing participants for cruelty and injustice and in the formation of brutal institution.

2. Why it is important to study the past?

A. An enquiry into the past is undertaken so that we may understand how society evolved and thus equip ourselves to make the world a better place to live in.

3. What is the status of history in modern times?

A. History is important. In centuries past this statement would have seemed self-evident. Ancient cultures devoted much time and effort to teaching their children family history. It was thought that the past helps a child understand who he is.

Modern society, however, has turned its back on the past. We live in a time of rapid change, a time of progress. We prefer to define ourselves in terms of where we are going, not where we come from.

4. *'He who controls the past controls the future'. Give the reason.*

A. Our view of history shapes the way we view the present, and therefore it dictates what answers we offer for existing problems. In an example, the official history presented Lenin and Stalin as kind, compassionate, wise, nearly divine leaders. But in the publication of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, the author described Lenin and Stalin as active and knowing participants for cruelty and injustice and in the formation of brutal institution.

5. *What is true according to professional historians as well as students?*

A. According to Professional historians as well as students, the new generation can learn from the history if they are willing. If they do not, they will learn nothing from the past.

6. *'History teaches values'. Justify?*

A. If it is true history, it teaches true values; if it is pseudo-history, it teaches false values. The history taught to our children is playing a role in shaping their values and beliefs- a much greater role than we may suspect.

7. *How the past is audible?*

A. The past speaks in a voice audible to those who want to hear and to listen attentively. Establishing what really happened at a given point in history is much like establishing the guilt or innocence of an accused criminal in a courtroom trial.

8. *What is an official and unofficial history?*

A. In Official history, the leaders of the revolution were portrayed in a positive light. According to Official history, Lenin made no mistakes and he passed his virtually infallible understanding on to the other leaders of the party. In Unofficial history, the work is the product of years of research by the author. According to Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, Lenin and Stalin were described as active participants for cruelty and injustice.

9. *Why Soviet people began to doubt the official history?*

A. In 1979, a Soviet émigré, after having read the book of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago*, commented that the impact of this book will be far more devastating to Soviet power than an atomic bomb.' After knowing the unofficial history of the leaders, people began to doubt the official history.

10. *What is the main reason, according to the author, for our ignorance of the past?*

A. Man is so much smarter now than he was even ten years ago that anything from the past is outdated and irrelevant to us. Therefore the past, even the relatively recent past, is, in the minds of most of us, enshrouded by mists and only very vaguely perceived. Our ignorance of the past is not the result of a lack of information, but of indifference. We do not believe that history matters.

Objective:

1. *Who is the author of The Importance of History?*

A. David Crabtree

2. *What according to man is outdated and irrelevant to us?*

A. To learn from the past.

3. *How the man has remembered the past in their minds?*

A. Teaching the family history from the ancient times.

4. *What do you mean 'ignorance of the past'?*

A. People do not believe that history matters.

5. *In which year, the communists took control of Russia?*

A. 1917

6. *Who is the author of the publication Gulag Archipelago?*

A. Solzhenitsyn

7. *In which year, the book Gulag Archipelago was published?*

A. 1970.

8. *What is the origin of the word 'history'?*

A. The word history is derived from the Greek word 'istoria' meaning 'enquiry'.

9. *What is an official history?*

A. The leaders of the revolution were portrayed in a positive light. Eg. Lenin, Stalin

10. *What is an unofficial history?*

A. The work is the product of years of research by the author. Eg. Lenin, Stalin

PART II

LEARNING FROM THE PAST

MATCH THE FOLLOWING:

Field of Study	Meaning
1. Archaeology	Study of living and extinct species of apes(3)
2. Paleogeography	Study of ancient DNA(5)
3. Primatology	Study of human society through artefacts(1)
4. Evolutionary Studies	Study of the earth's geography in the past(2)
5. Archaeogenetics	Study of evolution of life(4)

THE MOTHER OF MODERN CORPORATISM

VERBAL ABILITY: (MEANINGS)

1. Anticipate=Prefigure

2. Bringing in = Usher in

3. Charity= Philanthropy

4. Colonial=imperial

5. complete domination=monopoly

6.enmity=hostility

7. exploitation=plunder

8. future=posterity

9. in brief=pithily

10. investing in business based on guesswork about the state of the market=financial speculation

11. inward crash=implosion

12. leftover=relic

13. loss of memory=amnesia

14. merciless=remorseless

15.misconduct=malpractice

16. peculiarity=oddity

17.reduce in importance=resurgence

18. revival=resurgence

19. search=quest

20. storing illegally= boarding

21. unimportant= peripheral

Objective Questions: pg-101

1. The first war of Indian independence is called as Indian mutiny.

2. India will be also marking the 250th anniversary of the fateful battle of Plassey.

3. The East India Company was first established on New Year's Eve 1600.

4. Now, India is seen as a global economic star, confidently shaking of its imperial past.

5. The East India Company was controversial in Britain for the monopoly control it had over all trade with Asia.

6. Nick Robins is the author of the 'mother of Modern Corporation.'

7. Bengal Bubble is caused by the increasing over valuation of the East India Company stock between 1757 and 1769.
8. 'Conquered India to make money out of it' is written by Karl Marx.
9. GDP means Gross domestic product.

Two Marks Questions:

1. Why does the author call the East India Company as “mother of the modern corporation”?

A. The author call the East India Company as mother of the modern corporation because India is often the place where corporate practise is seen at its most extreme, whether at union carbide’s Bhopal factory or Enron’s Dhabhol Power Project, or now with Wal-Mart entering India’s Retail markets, it is useful to see how the East India Company twisted the region’s economy in the first Era of corporate globalisation.

2. What was at the core of the East India Company’s motives?

A. From the beginning, the controversial in Britain for the Monopoly control it had over all trade with Asia .Its closeness with court often spilled over into naked corruption.

3. How does the author use statistics to demonstrate the exploitative nature of the East India Company?

A. when the East India Company was first established on New Year’s Eve 1600, Mughal India commanded 22 percent of global GDP, with Britain producing less than a tenth as much. By the time Brita in finally departed India’s shores three and a half centuries later, its national income was more than 50 percent greater than its former colony.

4. What are the modern day corporates that are seen as being similar to the East India Company?

A. Modern Multinational companies are similar to the East India Company.

5. How did the East India Company exploit India?

A. The rise and fall of the East India Company exploited on a global stage, a level of malpractice that terrified its contemporaries and prefigured today’s crisis of market power, financial speculation and evasion of accountability. Again the company crashed the implosion of the 'Bengal bubble' on the London stock market in 1769. In the same year 10 million Bengalis starved in a cruel famine made worse by the company's hoarding of limited grain stocks and its decision to raise the rate of taxation to maintain its revenues.

6. Who were the critics of the East India Company?

A. Adam Smith, Karl Marx and Edmund burke were the critics of the East India Company.

7. How did people from other colonies react to the East India Company?

A. In 1773, the poet Richard Clarke wrote, ‘will do justice to the oppressed of India and will hand down the memory of the oppressors to the latest posterity’. And, of course, it was East India Company tea that was dumped by American patriots in Boston harbour in December 1773, with 'the most powerful trading company in the universe', an institution 'well-versed in tyranny, plunder, oppression and bloodshed.' The uprising that eventually led to America's independence was sparked as by hostility to corporate monopoly as it was to taxation without representation.

8. What does the author mean by “corporate accountability”?

A. The East India Company demonstrates that the quest for corporate accountability is a perpetual exercise in controlling the energies of merchants and entrepreneurs so that their private passions do not undermine the public interest.

9. What is the emphasis of our histories usually?

A. Our histories still focus on the actions of states and individuals, politics and culture, rather than on corporations, their executives and the consequences of their activities.

10. What are the lessons that the legacy of the East India Company can teach contemporary India and modern corporates?

Ans: The Company’s story provides vital lessons on both the role of corporations in world history and the steps required to make global business accountable today. First the company is an economic agent. how the financing of the corporation is a powerful factor in determining its behaviour. Second is the issue of scale-the problem of the larger the organisation. The third is technology-its military technology and shipping technology. Fourth is regulation. There was a collusion of state power and corporate power in the company's case. So, how can we avoid that and how can regulation be used to ensure public accountability.

Grammar – If Conditionals

Complete the following sentences with 'If Conditionals'.

1. If I were the Captain of the Indian cricket team, I would win the match.
2. If it rains today, I will postpone my trip.
3. If they had rushed him to the hospital immediately, he would have lived.
4. I would have studied well, if my mother hadn't fallen ill.
5. We would be glad, if we found the ancient manuscript.

Essay writing: ESSAY ON SOCIAL IMPACT OF MODERN CORPORATE CULTURE pg:104

INTRODUCTION: The culture within an organization can make or break how productive and how responsive the business operates. Organizational culture is the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives, thinks about, and reacts to its various environments, (Kinicki, A. and Kreitner, R., 2009). With that being said it becomes important to set values that you want everyone to work by. This will help when new employees are added to the team and will also help ensure that the behaviors within the organization are acceptable and beneficial to the overall outcome of the business. The culture should be determined right from the start so the right employees are hired. It becomes important to make sure that you have a way of identifying the people that truly allow your company to be successful and not just hire the superstar, (Morgan, H., 2008). Not everyone will fit in to all of the different type of organizational cultures.

SUBJECT MATTER: Today, pioneering enterprises integrate social entrepreneurship into their core activities by actively channeling their research-and-development capabilities in the direction of socially innovative products and services. The research indicates that social capital is an essential asset in a contemporary business world where timely information, proactive adjustment to the market changes and flexibility are the main competitiveness factors. Here we find that the attitudes to the significance of equal rights principle characterize the society and its culture. A significant consideration is the orientation of these attitudes to democratic and humanistic values.

Most organization scholars and observers recognize that organizational culture has a powerful effect on the performance and long-term effectiveness of organizations. Empirical research has produced an impressive array of findings demonstrating the importance of culture to enhancing organizational performance.

Based upon research, it is generally accepted that culture defines the core values, assumptions, interpretations and approaches that characterise an organization. Competing Values Framework is extremely useful in helping to organize and interpret a wide variety of organizational phenomena. The four dominant culture types:

1. Hierarchy 2. Market 3. Clan 4. Adhocracy emerge from the framework. Most organizations develop a dominant cultural style. Those that do not have a dominant culture type either tend to be unclear about their culture, or they emphasize nearly equally the four different cultural types.

The Hierarchy Culture

Sociologist Max Weber, proposed seven characteristics that have become known as the classical attributes of bureaucracy (rules, specialization, meritocracy, hierarchy, separate ownership, impersonality, accountability). The organizational culture compatible with this form is characterized by a formalized and structured place to work. The long-term concerns of the organization are stability, predictability and efficiency. Formal rules and policies hold the organization together. Key values center on maintaining efficient, reliable, fast, smooth-flowing production.

The Market Culture

The market culture is focused on transactions with external constituencies including suppliers, customers, contractors, licensees, unions, regulators and so forth. The core values are competitiveness and productivity. Competitiveness and productivity in market organizations are achieved through a strong emphasis on external positioning and control. The basic assumptions in a market culture are that the external environment is not benign but hostile, consumers are choosy and interested in value, the organization is in the business of increasing its competitive position.

The Clan Culture

Typical characteristics of clan type firms were teamwork, employee involvement programs and corporate commitment to employee. Some basic assumptions in a clan culture are that the environment can best be managed through teamwork and employee development, customers are best thought as partners, the organization is in the business of developing a humane work environment. The clan culture type organization is held together by loyalty and tradition. The organization emphasizes the long-term benefit of individual development with high cohesion and morale being important.

The Adhocracy Culture

A major goal of an adhocracy is to foster adaptability, flexibility and creativity where uncertainty, ambiguity and/or information over-load are typical. An important challenge of these organizations is to produce innovative products and services and to adapt quickly to new opportunities. A high emphasis on individuality, risk taking and anticipating the future exists as almost everyone in an adhocracy becomes research and development and so forth.

Culture and Corporate Social Responsibility

According to some of the latest research, "social responsibility" is part of organizational culture and a value in the organizational culture environment. Development of social responsibility is a change in values orientation, whose task is shaping the attitudes, transformation of the personal position so that it matches individual and public interests.

CONCLUSION: In the final analysis, social responsibility implies a public posture toward society's economic and human resources and a willingness to see that those resources are used for broad social ends and not simply for the narrowly circumscribed interests of private persons and firms.

In the 1990s the concept of corporate social performance stream emerged. At that time the Corporate Social Responsibility Model identified four main components: economic, legal, ethical and voluntary (discretionary). The economic aspect is concerned with the economic performance of the company; while the other three categories – legal, ethical, and discretionary – address the societal aspects of Corporate Social Responsibility, leading to the claim that there is strong empirical evidence supporting the existence of a positive link between social and financial performance.