

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2010

GCSE History 6HI02 D

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus.

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024084

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Introduction

General comments

Within this option, a significant number of candidates were able to achieve marks at Level 3 or above in all assessment objectives, offering a considered analysis of the given source evidence, focused towards the demands of the questions, allied to strong contextual understanding and with effective deployment of well-selected own knowledge. It was pleasing to see that many of the issues raised in previous sessions which had hampered candidate performance were reduced, with skills in handling evidence generally being demonstrated in relation to the specific issues raised. That said, certain common errors were apparent, in some cases, where candidates appeared to be attempting to apply source skills in a manner not appropriate to the questions. Therefore, this report attempts to set out certain areas in which future responses could be improved, whilst also illustrating different levels of response across the various questions.

A questions

In January it was suggested that the most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively, and that, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. Fewer examples of this issue were found this time around, although there is still a correlation between the degree to which candidates examine the content of the sources, considering the detail within in the context of both the provenance and the issues raised by the question, and the degree to which the subtleties of the sources are explored towards a successful response. Together, the sources offer a range of views, and the majority of candidates were adept at identifying and developing from these. However, the evidence provided by individual sources often has certain ambiguities which can be developed in different ways, and some otherwise sound responses fail to consider this. The following reasons seem to account for some of these limitations:

1. Some responses took sources taken at face value, or seem to ignore the information given in the source header.
2. Whilst most candidates seek to evaluate the sources, some tend towards generic or stock responses which fail to really engage consideration of provenance with the specifics of what the sources have to say. Although many candidates are able to draw upon taught approaches to provenance, nature and the like, it is those who are able to balance this with independent thought who tend to produce the strongest analysis.
3. Most candidates were able to cross-reference successfully. However, a significant minority of candidates still conduct a sequenced trawl through the sources. Such responses thus focus too heavily describing the sources and/or drawing inferences from them, resulting in a limited summative comparison.
4. Some responses still tend to deal with reliability as a separate issue, either sequentially, or as a comparison of the reliability of the three sources.

In the main, candidates seemed well prepared concerning the issue of the application of contextual understanding for question A, an issue highlighted in January. Many candidates were able to consider evidence in the light of historical context, using this to consider discrepancies between sources or towards giving weight to the evidence. However, a small minority still seem to desire to go beyond this, offering an explanation of the issues in the question in

depth, with limited reference to sources. Such responses at best became sidetracked, and in the more extreme cases failed to address the demands of the question, which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources in order to reach a judgement.

A small minority of candidates were hampered by time management issues, in terms of devoting too long to the a) question at the expense of the subsequent question. This was often where candidates had described the content of individual sources at length.

B questions

Candidates were, on the whole, focused on the question with many at least attempting analysis. However some responses offered relevant and in many cases well detailed factual knowledge that they did not always link to arguments in the given sources. The sources provide viewpoints on issues or stated factors that candidates can utilise, offering an analysis of these drawing on contextual knowledge. A number of candidates engaged with sources with clear conceptual understanding but failed to support their answer with sufficient contextual detail. These disappointingly relied on the sources too much, without showing their ability to balance the presentation or argument, although this was not in itself a barrier to the higher levels. On the other hand, a significant minority of responses were both well detailed and with a very secure connection between own knowledge and the sources. The best candidates synthesised sources and knowledge to develop a clear line of reasoning and to test the validity of the views provided using their knowledge. Such answers were able to reach Level 4 in both assessment objectives by offering a balanced analysis, integrating contextual knowledge with source material.

There was some overall improvement in candidates' handling of evidence within the part b) question, with greater focus towards the demands of AO2b. However, there is still a minority of candidates who attempt to address issues of the provenance and reliability of secondary evidence in answers. Whilst reasoned and focused consideration of historiographical issues can obviously play a role in the analysis and evaluation of the given views at the highest levels, this at times tended towards doing so for the sake of it. Speculative comments regarding the authorship of one source being twenty years after another, or assertions based on the title of the book it is from does little to help candidates engage with the views and interpretations. At best this means candidates are wasting time and at worst it became a substitute for valid argument and analysis. Many candidates addressed the question as they might a part a), by simply analysing the sources and commenting on the provenance. Stronger responses often clearly identified the views within the given evidence as a starting point, analysing these through interrogation and corroboration using their own knowledge, exploring the relationship between and relative strengths of the different views, offering judgement on their overall strength and validity, or aspects of these.

One further aspect in which candidates could develop their work is through considering the specific demands of particular questions and what higher level analysis would be for these. Where a question has essentially asked which is the most important factor in bringing about an outcome, the majority of responses are well able to identify these from the sources and own knowledge, offering a mainly focused response with some analysis. However, fewer candidates offer real explicit awareness and development recognising that factors are often interrelated. Similarly, many candidates reach Level 3 by broadly examining success and failure on such questions, without weighing up the relative merits in order to judge whether successes outweighed failures. The given evidence often gives consideration to these issues, either individually or as a set; whilst students are clearly free to reach alternative judgements, students giving careful consideration to these in the first place are more likely to achieve the highest levels in both

Question 1

Generally candidates understood the basic message of these sources and it was pleasing to note that the majority were able to make some links to the question focus and few failed to reach level 2. On the other hand, it is disappointing to note that a significant number of candidates are still working through the sources in turn, paraphrasing the content and treating the sources as information rather than evidence. Better responses were able to make the connections between economic issues and religious and social divides and to develop their arguments fully. Many candidates did use the provenance to add weight to their arguments, although there were others who merely re-stated it or extended it marginally using their own knowledge, such as stating that Michael Davitt was a founder of the Land League, without dealing with the implications of this information. In the case of a number of candidates there was some uncertainty about precisely what constituted 'economic issues' this meant that they did not equate land ownership with economic issues, seeing them as mutually exclusive.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) It can be viewed that in the later nineteenth century unrest in Ireland was mainly caused by economic issues because of evidence given in sources 1, 2 and 3.

Source 1 is a personal account of the hardship those living in Ireland were suffering at this time. Michael Davitt describes how when he was 5 he was evicted, left with no food and threatened by his father going to prison. This family were clearly poor and received no help from the state. This is evidence of those living in Ireland becoming unhappy.

He goes on to say that when joining the land league many years later he denounced high rents as things still hadn't improved. If the English had looked more into Ireland and made things better for the people financially, unrest may not have occurred.

Source 2 is a report on Belfast riots and resentment between Protestants and Catholics. This source describes how the poor are separated from the rich and hostility has grown between those supporting different faiths. This source doesn't support the view that unrest was caused by economic

((a) continued) issues. This source blames religion for causing unrest.

Source 3 is from a book written by a founder of the Gaelic League. This source states that through language Ireland will always be separated from the British Empire. The source is against Protestants and blames them for problems in Ireland. The source goes on to state that part of Ireland's problems are absentee landlords living abroad who own most of Irish land.

So source 3 agrees that economic issues have led to unrest in Ireland due to the English gaining lots of money in rent off the Irish.

Therefore sources 1 and 3 support the view that economic issues have led to unrest in Ireland through English control of land. Yet source 2 doesn't support the view as it sees religion as a much bigger cause of the unrest.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response illustrates the approach taken by many candidates who produce a level 2 response. It works through the sources one at a time, making some links to the focus of the question and including a conclusion that attempts very briefly to engage in cross referencing. Some assertions are made regarding the provenance, but this information is not used as part of a consideration of the weight that the source can bear.

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options. Almost all candidates made good use of source 7 and source 8. They clearly understood that these two sources represented contrasting views and were able to develop these using their own knowledge and integrating these together, often very successfully. The standard of the own knowledge was extremely variable - from the truly impressive to the almost non-existent. Some weaker candidates lapsed into extensive descriptions of the Easter Rising. Some candidates did find it difficult to incorporate source 9 into their answer and therefore did not consider it at all. A minority of answers relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources, with little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to their own knowledge. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) Do you agree with the view that the main cause of the Anglo-Irish war conflict was nationalist extremism?

Plan	Anglo-Irish war
extremism	nationalism
Home rule	Culture/honour
republic	

Nationalist extremism certainly caused a lot of problems in Ireland, extremist groups like the Fenians and IRA/IRB, were the main culprits. Some Irish freedom fighters were prepared to go to any lengths to make sure Ireland gained freedom, the lengths they went to in turn, caused the Anglo-Irish conflict. Source 1 agrees ~~also~~ some 8 agree ~~also~~, I agree but from my own knowledge another reason which could be argued to be the main cause of the conflict could be the rise of nationalism in Ireland, rise of nationalism could have sparked the thought of war to gain independence. ~~Source~~

According to source 1 it could be argued that nationalist extremists caused the conflict, the source states that 'the threats of armed resistance in 1914 gave the more extreme nationalists their first opportunity'. This points out that

((b) continued) Extreme nationalists ~~and~~ were the cause of the conflict, it also sounds like the nationalists have been waiting for the chance of cause chaos in Ireland. Source 8 agrees with the statement, it states that the prime minister Lloyd George said in a statement that the Irish Extreme nationalists could not be trusted. This could have caused tension between both countries.

Source 1 talks about wartime military conscription, this was when some Irish citizens were made to fight in the war according to my knowledge, some agreed to fight in the war hoping for home rule to be granted in return, the war went on for a long time, men were dying, so some people could have thought enough was enough. However according to my knowledge, extreme nationalists saw this as an opportunity to start a conflict in order to gain a republic.

On the other hand, from my knowledge, it could be argued that the rise in non-extreme nationalism caused the conflict. Some Irish people were starting to embrace their culture, Gaelic football was promoted, athletics, and even the speaking of the language was also

((b) continued) encouraged. So it could be argued that maybe their freedom was next and because the English rulers weren't prepared to give it to them, it was time to start a conflict.

Source 9, ~~does~~ although doesn't state any extreme views, it mentions the 'state of war' between Ireland and England which in the source it says 'can never be ended until the English military evacuates our country' this from my knowledge sounds like an extreme view also bearing in mind that it was written by an Irish journalist. The source also suggests that it wasn't at all extreme ~~separatist~~ nationalists who made the conflict happen. It could be that the ~~war~~ Anglo-Irish conflict was something waiting to happen. The source suggests that it wasn't going to be sorted out unless the English army evacuates Ireland.

From my knowledge it could be argued that apart from ~~extreme~~ nationalist extremism it could be the treatment of the Irish by the English. Certain people east, west and south. It could be argued that they were oppressed and treated unfairly. Land was taken away, tithes & rents were ~~also~~ introduced. Also the treatment of the poor exiles on the day of the

((b) continued) the easter rising.
In conclusion, according to the sources, it could be said that the Anglo-Irish conflict was caused by nationalist extremists but it could also be argued that other reasons for example rise of non-extreme nationalism and the treatment of the Irish people caused the war.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

In approach this is very similar to the example for 1bi. The candidate uses a source by source approach. There is an attempt to offer some alternative explanations, but none of this is well developed. There is very little specific own knowledge; the candidate mainly generalises from points that have been made in the sources. This was level 2 in both AO1 and AO2

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options. Answers to this question were generally effective. Most responses were able to use sources 5 and 6 effectively, with stronger responses integrating them and using detailed own knowledge to develop the arguments derived from the sources. Weaker candidates tended to lapse into narrative about Gladstone's "mission to pacify Ireland." This sometimes meant that they left themselves with insufficient time to consider Asquith's premiership. The response to source 6 was more mixed, with some candidates failing to really grasp the Ulster issues at all, whereas others confidently used Ulster issues as a way of developing a range of relevant arguments. A minority of answers relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources, with little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to their own knowledge. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) The question is highly interesting; and perhaps the answer is obvious - English politicians attempted for years to solve the Irish question, yet so many failed. Surely one understood the Irish question - Gladstone appeared to have an affinity with it. There are of course other issues to consider, probably the most prominent are the question of Ulster.

Source 4 is taken from a letter by Benjamin Disraeli to Queen Victoria, after his resignation as Prime Minister due to his election defeat.

In his letter, Disraeli clearly presents to the Queen his inability to grasp the Irish question.

'One man says it is a physical question'. This would refer to the clear divide in Ireland at the time, between the North and South. The North of Ireland, and in particular the ~~county~~ province of Ulster, were in support of a union between Great Britain and Ireland. This made it particularly

((b) continued) testing for English politicians to keep everyone happy. 'another a spiritual one' - Disraeli refers here to the divide between the mainly Protestant North, and Catholic south. The Protestants wished for union, and the majority of Catholics in the south wished for Home Rule.

Although Disraeli argues that there is no one 'clear' Irish question, I would not agree this is due to a lack of understanding - There were of number of difficult issues to be resolved in Ireland. The problem, particularly for English politicians, was the difficult task of pleasing everybody. This is hard to do with such a clear divide in Ireland.

Many solutions to the Irish question were sought, such as constructive unionism - making unionism seem more appealing. Councils were introduced and there was further reformation of the Land Acts. However, due to such a clear divide in beliefs in Ireland, solutions were difficult to think of. However, this is not to say that English politicians

((b) continued) 'I did not understand' Ireland. Ireland was often regarded as a secondary issue, put behind issues at home.

~~Source 5 is from A. Wood's 'Nineteenth~~
Source 4, nonetheless, is a private letter from Disraeli, and he therefore is more likely to express his true feelings on the Irish question: confusion.

Source 5 is from A. Wood's 'Nineteenth Century Britain' published in 1960.

Source 5 briefly focuses on the tactics of coercion, by Salisbury's government. The policy of coercion was clearly ineffective, a policy of 'wait and see' would suggest apprehensiveness or misunderstanding.

Gladstone famously said, on being appointed Prime Minister, 'My mission is to pacify Ireland'. This A deeply religious man, he often focused on 'the right thing to do'. Gladstone, of all the English politicians arguably had the greatest involvement in the Irish question. Gladstone had ~~see~~ overseen two Land Acts, observing reformation of the system after

((b) continued)

1870. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill occurred in 1880. Surely, if his mission was to 'pacify Ireland' then this would indicate a clear understanding of the Irish question. As the source suggests, the two Land Acts allowed Gladstone to develop his understanding and he observed the limitations of the tactic of coercion.

Gladstone argued that English government in Ireland could never be truly great, true, or 'consistent' if Westminster continued to be in control. Gladstone seemed to suggest that Ireland could handle her own affairs. However, as the source suggests, such a view was not widely accepted by many. Perhaps Gladstone did understand the Irish question, but lacked the support needed from Westminster.

Indeed, a further issue in the Irish question was the differing views of political parties in Westminster. Many reforms that could possibly have aided Ireland were refused. None

((b) continued)

Home Bills were denied by the House of Lords.

Source 3 is from R. G. S. Jones's 'England 1870-1914', published in 1963.

The source focuses on the question of Ulster. It focuses on the fact that English politicians failed to see it as an issue until 1880. This would perhaps cite a lack of understanding or planning.

The north and south of Ireland were savagely divided in opinion. In the north, who became aware of itself as a 'separate entity' due to the debate over Home Rule, and the immense propaganda of English unionists, wanted union for economic benefit. The south wished for Home Rule, and independence, the majority of whom were Catholic. This presented a clear obstacle: There was a divide between Catholic and Protestants - Religion. A hatred for one another began to develop, resulting in increased militancy, the IUF and UVF were born.

((b) continued) formed. However, such diplomacy from English politicians could have refused the situation? But Asquith's policy of 'wait and see' was disastrous. He, as the source puts it, refused to challenge his nationalist allies. Bona Law saw political benefit in appealing to the voters, demonstrated in his speech at Breinchen palace in 1915.

In summary, English politicians did not necessarily fail to find a clear solution to the Irish question due to lack of understanding, but had different views, and saw opportunity to gain political benefit perhaps compromising their true motives.



This is an interesting response that demonstrates both strengths and weaknesses. It broadly approaches the question source by source. This is unlikely to be an appropriate way to tackle any question as the sources should be approached as a set. The candidate does clearly have quite a good knowledge base and they use this to develop the points that are made in the sources and to link those points to the focus of the question, engaging in some effective analysis at points. For this reason the candidate does achieve level 3, but with more effective planning and organisation of the sources and own knowledge there was the potential to move higher.

This was the less popular of the two questions, although it was tackled by a significant minority. Many candidates found it a difficult question to attempt, although there were also some outstanding answers. Some candidates did not fully appreciate the question focus and simply relied on substantial paraphrasing of the sources one by one, with very little evidence of own knowledge. It is important that candidates support their interpretations by reference to developed own knowledge. Although source 16 prompted candidates to consider the period before 1914, many only used the material in the source and did not go beyond it with own knowledge to a wider consideration of this earlier part of the period. Most candidates then moved on to source 18 and considered the impact of World War II; remarkably few considered the competing financial demands of the Welfare State. Source 17 caused problems for some candidates as they did not recognise it as evidence of an alternative interpretation. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) Sources 10, 11, 12 main responsibility for the failure of the Cabinet Mission 1946 lay with Jinnah & Muslim League.

Source 10 strongly agrees with this statement in that the failure of the Cabinet Mission lay with Jinnah. The source gives evidence of Jinnah's "arrogant" and "immovable" nature, ~~that~~ which infers that he was never really willing to co-operate. Furthermore Jinnah's lack of commitment to the resolution of unity between the two parties can be seen in his lateness to the meetings, "always five minutes late". Source 12 partly agrees with this statement, as it ~~is~~ also implies that Jinnah was incapable of seeing past the needs of the Muslim League, "The only tribunal is the Muslim nation".

On the other hand, Source 12 could also be seen as disagreeing with the statement, in that it gives evidence to suggest that Jinnah did put effort into compromise and negotiation. Source

((a) continued) 12 implies that Cabinet Mission actually failed because Jinnah's "constitutional methods" were not received or listened to by Nehru. The source goes as far to say that Jinnah was "exhausted" with efforts to be negotiated with Nehru. Furthermore, Source 11 ~~also~~ strongly agrees that it was in fact Nehru and Congress that hindered the Cabinet Mission's success. It talks of Congress¹ having a superior attitude towards Jinnah, that Congress not matter how good an argument ~~Nehru~~ ^{Jinnah} presented Congress would determine the outcome "as it thinks best, to its advantage. This implies that the Cabinet Mission was on the course of failure as Congress was not willing to negotiation.

~~As it would appear that source 10~~ Although To conclude, although source 10 does give overwhelming evidence to suggest that it was Jinnah's "arrogant" and "unmoving" personality that resulted in the failure of the Cabinet Mission, the nature of the source ~~must~~ be explored. Firstly, the source was written "many years later" in 1974 which

((a) continued) considerably deters its accuracy. ~~So~~ ~~andly~~ the In comparison source 12 was written by Jinnah himself in 1946. of ~~course~~ at the time. Of course the fact that Jinnah wrote it may mean the content is exaggerated, but it can be assumed that the sentiments are real. That when he said that the Muslim League made a solid effort to negotiate, using "constitutional efforts" ~~in~~ ~~these~~ these were his true feelings. ~~So~~ So considering the nature of the sources I feel that actually the Cabinet Mission failed due to Jinnah and the Muslim League, is a false statement. The Cabinet Mission failed because Jinnah's efforts were not received fairly by Congress.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) Do you agree with the view that in the years 1919-39 the British worked consistently to create

Do you agree with the view that in the years 1900-47 British attitudes toward Indian independence were dictated by B economic needs, 16, 17, 18

1940 Lohore Declaration
 1946 Fail Cabinet Mission
 1945 WW2
 1948 Direct Action
 Cripps Federal Executive
 No more Pakistan

1905 - Morley Minto half hearted
 1935 - Government of India "Half way house"
 1918-27 Decline of India
 Rowlatt Acts - Amritsar Massacre

Source 16 1914 helpful
 1905 - Morley Minto NO Independence
 - Rowlatt Acts

- Amritsar Massacre
 - Montagu-Chelmsford 1916
 Source 18 (partly) War WW2 Debt → More helpful
 Lahore → Cripps → USA Cripps
 However Source 19 other factors growing of the Muslim League Direct Action 1946
 Source 17 - not money

((b) continued)

Source 16 1900

Raj empire
booming

helpful No Independence

Half hearted

[Morley memo
Amritsar
Rowlatt ActEconomic
needsSource 18 party agree
1918-27 decline
of India* so more
independence

WAR? Lahore C/P

If however

Source
Although

Other factors - US

Source 17 no money but
still stayed

((b) continued)

On the whole I do mostly agree with the statement that British attitudes towards Indian independence was dictated by economic needs in 1900-47. In the years 1900-1927 the Indian Raj was booming, and made up a significant amount of Britain's trade partner, and so it would make sense that Britain would be reluctant to let go submit to Indian calls for independence. This is supported by source 16, and partly source 18. ^{Furthermore, 1927 when India declares independence} On the other ^{hand} it must also be considered ^{that with} ~~there were other factors that kept~~ maybe Britain never really held any economic needs in India, as suggested in source 17 and that there were other reasons for its fluctuation in interest in Indian interdependence such as American involvement, as suggested in parts of source 18.

Finally, source 106 talks of the sheer amount of investment that Britain included in India, "£400 million" by 1914 and "a fifth of their entire investment overseas".

((b) continued) These figures, Lord Curzon implied said were "a lot to lose". This not only shows Britain's great economic need in India in the early 1900's, but also explains why such strict measures were placed on India in 1900. Firstly, the Rowlatt Act 1919 March were introduced because Britain had reason to believe that there were conspiracies amongst Indians about Independence, the main areas targetted were Bombay, Bengal and the Punjab. So worried were Britain of an uprising that wartime restrictions were placed on Indians, imprisonment without trial, censorship and curfews. Furthermore, it was General Dyer felt that the Non-cooperation movement announced in response to the Rowlatt Acts, was such a threat to the British control that in April 1919 he felt it necessary to kill 379 Indians in the Amritsar Massacre. General Dyer was seen as a hero in Britain, "the saviour of the Punjab", it seems that this behaviour would not have been necessary if the loss of India would have "threatened the entire strategic network of trade."

(b) continued) Similarly, although a lot earlier, the Moley-Minto Reforms of 1905 were seemingly half-hearted and deliberately ensured that India independence was scarce. For example, only rich Indians were able to vote. The reforms also encouraged communalism, which enraged the INC, and could have been a deliberate attempt to swash union within the Congress. Furthermore source 18 also gives evidence to agree with the statement, in that by 1945 as India no longer it shows that in 1945 India no longer posed any economical benefit to Britain. The source talks of India actually imposed a heavy burden^{up} on Britain. This knowledge, complies with the much more lenient and kinder reforms that followed in 19480's. For example, the Lahore Declaration was the beginning of talks for some form of autonomy to protect the Muslims in west Bengal.

On the other hand, source 18 gives reason to believe that India was never a economic benefit to Britain. "Despite

((b) continued) the legends that persisted. . . . the prospect of making easy money in Calcutta and Bombay was no longer a realistic one. ⁹. So it can be assumed that other reasons, ~~such as the growth of the Muslim~~ that Britain was actually more interested in India because of the status it provided the Empire with. So factors such as the Muslim League, and the entry of the USA were more plausible reasons. The ~~US~~ pressure from President Roosevelt was why the Cripps Mission was introduced in 1942, as America was a strong believer in independence. "Direct Action" imposed by Jinnah.

To conclude, looking at the reforms and behavior of the British in the early years of 1900s (determined to hold on to India), and comparing this to the later years where acts such as the Government of India Act 1935, ~~were~~ were much more helpful. ~~That is~~ Comparing this to the economic state of India, India it was economic benefits.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer begins quite strongly with an introduction that has some question focus. However it loses its focus and starts to paraphrase the sources and describe aspects of Indian history with only limited links being made to the question. The fact that these links do exist and that they engage in some evaluation means that AO1 is just at low level 3. However the use of the sources is less effective; the candidate selects from them but does not analyse them; so for AO2, this answer is level 2.

Question 2

This was an accessible question and candidates were able to understand the basic message of all the sources and link them to the focus of the question. Source 10 was well-handled with most students able to pick up on the credibility issues. Equally sources 11 and 12 were dealt with generally effectively. There was the tendency, which has not been so apparent in past examinations, to include own knowledge to supplement source content; this cannot be credited. Many candidates were able to draw comparisons from the sources, with some finding detailed comparisons. Many candidates were able to identify valid points relating to the provenance, although there was some confusion about Olaf Caroe's nationality. Some candidates failed to realise that source 12 was a response to source 11. It is disappointing to note that there is still a significant number of candidates who are working through the sources in turn, paraphrasing the content and treating the sources as information rather than evidence.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) The failure of the cabinet mission is ~~often~~ ~~the~~ can be seen to be the responsibility of the Muslim League, others however, perceive that the Congress has to take responsibility along with the All India Muslim League.

To an extent source 10 can show ~~the~~ reasoning as to why Jinnah and the Muslim League were responsible and that the failure of the Cabinet Mission was partially down to Jinnah's nature of being "very arrogant and very immovable" which would make it hard for others to share views on a course of action as Jinnah's strong personality meant that he believed himself right thus giving Jinnah the responsibility of failure.

Source 12 can be seen to support the view held in source 10 of Jinnah's strong personality ~~being~~ ~~being~~ resisting the freedom for others to work together to decide. In the statement calling for direct action day in 1946 shows that at this point Jinnah was set on a divide claiming "The only tribunal is ~~or~~ the Muslim Action" and so setting aside ~~others~~ ~~and~~ shows his responsibility in ^{to the} ~~the~~ failure, and as a result of his leadership the All India Muslim League shared the responsibility.

((a) continued) Source 11 to an extent suggests that the Indian National Congress had little responsibility by suggesting they "had only agreed only to participate in the Constituent Assembly" which can be seen as saying the responsibility was not theirs for their partial participation in and so suggesting the Muslim League and not they had caused the failure of the Cabinet Mission.

However, sources 10 to 12 can also be seen to in some ~~ways~~ way support the opposing argument that the Muslim League and Jinnah were not entirely responsible. Source 10 also talks of "Nehru's arrogance" and so if Jinnah's is to be taken into account for the failings then it is only right that Nehru's is also. This suggests that perhaps the power struggle between the two leaders Jinnah and Nehru's was a aspect which pushed the ~~2~~ groups apart so they could not support each other and so causing the failure of the cabinet mission. Source 11 supports the view that perhaps Congress was equally to blame as Nehru claims that Congress felt it was "free to change or modify the Cabinet Mission's plan" this is a clear statement from Nehru taking responsibility for the plan surely he is ~~there~~ therefore also responsible for its failure. Source 12 also takes the responsibility away from the ~~Muslims~~ Muslim League by suggesting they had little choice to separate from ~~the~~ Congress as they have been "exhausted all reason" and driven away from the ~~Constitutional~~

(a) continued) methods" and so claims responsibility to congress as they have merely been subject to these actions and driven to the views and direction they now follow.

The evidence given in source 10 can be seen as useful in the understanding of who was responsible as "Olaf Curce" shows that he both leaders "Jinnah and Jawaharlal Nehru well" and so suggesting he would be informed but this ~~was~~ personal relationship would possibly cause a strong opinion or friendship to end this and the "many years later" weakness its reliability and usefulness.

Source 11 has first hand information taken from Nehru as does source 12 from Jinnah but both are speaking to the public with the agenda to win support and so limiting its truthfulness for their own personal gains.

It is therefore ~~say~~ that to an extent the failures of the cabinet mission can be blamed on the Muslim league due to their set decision for independence however, the clash of the leaders failed this and both congress and the Muslim league ~~are~~ take equal responsibility as their main weakness was lack of support and ~~believe that they were right and had the~~ where



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response engages in a range of cross referencing that is completely tied to the question focus and demonstrates an understanding of the issues raised and the sources and leads the candidate to a clear judgement about the issue. Provenance is considered, but it is largely as part of a bolt-on paragraph at the end, rather than being integrated in the course of the argument. For this reason although the answer reaches level 4, it is low in the level.

This was the more popular question. It was generally well tackled. Candidates were able to use source 13 as a springboard to look at both the positive movements towards independence as well as the regressive elements. Source 14 referenced a range of actions by the British that most candidates were able to pick up on. Source 15 was handled less confidently generally, with some weaker candidates using it as the basis from which to develop a narrative of the life of Gandhi with few links being made to the question. Weaker answers also frequently demonstrated a very limited range of own knowledge beyond what was available in the sources. The very best answers clearly focused on the 'consistently' as well as the 'peaceful' aspects of the question. Some responses spent a considerable part of the answer in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Candidates need to be aware that it is AO2b that is tested in this section of the paper; provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b) i) Between the years of 1919 and 1939, much work was done in terms of the fight for independence in India. ~~The~~ The British ~~had~~ made various reforms and alterations to their rule of India but much of the evidence goes to suggest that India was not granted much in the way of true Swaraj, - or self-rule. Many believe that the British were simply aiming to hold on to their 'jewel in the crown' at the Indians expense through appeasement tactics and simultaneously strengthening their hold, for the British benefit.

Source 14 sums up many of the changes or reforms brought into India between 1919 and 1939. It mentions the "system of 'Dyarchy'" whereby "government is shared" from the Government of India Act of 1919. This could be seen as a great leap for the nationalist

((b) continued) movement and a recognition of the Indians' right to rule their nations. Seen through generous British eyes, granting the Indians their share in government, allowing control of irrigation and many other localised decision-making areas, such as education. However, others see this as an effort to appease a growing momentum of nationalist opposition to the British Raj. The critics of Dyarchy see it as giving Indians superficial and irrelevant powers, leaving Britain still able to dominate foreign affairs and other important areas of ruling.

Source 14 also ~~say~~ mentions the "round table conferences" with Indian representatives. Of the 3 conferences, aimed at producing an Indian constitution, Indian attendance was minimal and certainly Indian opinion and representation was overridden. Gandhi,

((b) continued) who attended the 2nd conference, was unhappy with the results and furthermore the 3rd Round Table Conference had no Indian ~~influence~~ representation, showing clear British domination, undermining claims of any dual-rule.

Source 15 highlights the domination of the British in India. Crucially, it recognises the "lack of trust", which was crucial in opposition to the Raj; the British were exploiting the Indians, their agriculture, produce, raw materials. Right from the start of the 20th century, the British exploitation of India was clear, and any attempts to create a sense of ~~the~~ development and British help was merely a facade, according to many nationalists, and according to source 15 "was the reason for Indian non-co-operation". The example provided in this source clearly shows this exploitation and lack of

((b) continued) trust from the fact that the British "took 300 million Indians to war without asking a single one of them". This shows how the British didn't care for protecting and nurturing India, but when in need of help, India could readily be used as cannon-fodder for the British war effort, despite opposition from the Indian sepoys, shown from the Singapore mutiny where 850 sepoys rebelled against their British commanders.

This exploitation ~~and~~ was the case by 1830 and little had changed since the Amritsar Massacre of 1919, where the ugly-head of British imperialism was raised and showed the world their brutal domination of India, aside from the goal of lending a helping hand. Following the Rowlatt Acts of 1919, a peaceful opp. protest was to

((b) continued) illegally staged at Amritsar, with thousands of men, women and children attending. General Dyer, seeing it as the only way to remain in control and prevent further violence, ~~opened fire~~ ^{ordered} ~~allowed~~ his troops to open fire at the crowds without warning, killing hundreds. This shows the British brutal rule over India, allowing no divergence from their rule and undermined all sense of the British aiming to create a "peaceful, self-governing India".

Source 13 overlooks the many examples of British brutality, determining these events as little more than "rough and tumble" when the British "lost sight" of their goal of "leading India on the way to self-government". Some agree with this view of the Raj "leading India to swaraj", allowing it to progressively move towards self-rule, from Dyer's to ~~self~~

((b) continued) dominion status, which was offered to the Indians at ~~var~~ various points. ~~to~~

however, the British cannot claim to have India's self-rule and swadeshi, self-sufficiency on their ~~own~~ priorities, in reality. Despite allowing some powers of localised control to the Indians, the British did not only ignore, but often ~~but~~ brutally crush the nationalist protest movement against the Raj. for example, the Salt-Marches of 1931, led by Gandhi as part of his peaceful protest against the British salt-laws and exploitation of the Indian people and nation. Instead of negotiation ~~or~~ or consideration of these protests, the British ordered troops to ~~stand~~ stand their ground and beat the protestors as they approached. ~~for~~ From this evidence, the reality of the British Raj was clear in its purpose of ruling

((b) continued) India for the British benefit. Indeed, it wasn't until after the 2nd World War, when India was more of a nuisance than ~~Ben~~ benefit to the British, when independence was finally granted. Therefore, the claims of source B ~~led~~ leading India to self rule seem more than a little dubious.

In conclusion, ^{bulk of the} the evidence goes to suggest that Britain did not work for a 'peaceful, self-governed India' and that the reality of the situation was far from this, of British domination and exploitation of the Indian nation.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A sustained argument is evident in this response which is clearly level 4 in both assessment objectives. The candidate integrates the sources with well developed own knowledge and uses the evidence of the sources to drive the analysis.

Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	35	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US024084 June 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

