

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2011

### GCE History 6HI02 D

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results

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](http://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 contact our History Subject Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on [HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk).

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

## ResultsPlus

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](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

January 2011

Publications Code US026453

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## Introduction

There were many good responses seen in this examination series, with many candidates achieving marks at Level 3 or above in all of the assessment objectives. Such candidates generally offered 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. Some of the issues raised in the summer report had been addressed. The purpose of these comments is to help to achieve further improvements in the levels of attainment.

1. There are three specific assessment objectives that are tested in this examination and it is important that candidates understand how these should be tackled in their responses to particular sections of the examination.

Question a requires the application of AO2a. This requires candidates to analyse, cross-reference and evaluate source material.

Question b requires the application of both AO1 (the selection and deployment of historical knowledge) and AO2b (the analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context).

An understanding of what each assessment objective tests would help candidates to focus their comments more securely. For example, candidates who spend considerable amounts of time exploring the provenance of sources in question b may very well be addressing AO2a which is not rewarded in this question.

2. Although there was a significant improvement in the understanding of the sources for question a, there remains a minority of candidates who would benefit from spending more time reading the sources to ensure that they understand both the content and the provenance fully. Many candidates have understood the requirement to cross reference, although they do not universally understand exactly how to do it. For some candidates it amounts to little more than merely asserting similarity or difference or matching up quotes from the sources.

3. In question b, many responses were characterised by a strong understanding of the sources and the issues that they related to. Examiners were impressed by the extent of own knowledge that a number of candidates brought to their arguments so that well argued responses were seen. It is important that candidates remember to integrate the sources and their knowledge and not to treat them discretely. There were however a number of scripts which demonstrated no knowledge beyond what was offered in the sources. Where this material was well used, it was possible to achieve top level 2 in AO1, but in many cases it was linked to limited understanding of the sources.

4. In both a and b questions, candidate should be encouraged not to approach their answers on a source by source basis. Where candidates take this approach in question a, they are unlikely to have engaged in substantial cross referencing throughout their answer. Where this approach is taken in part b, candidates may have addressed the key issues within the approach, but it is unlikely to be the most effective approach in enabling them to fully engage in an argumentative and analytical response, and thus is unlikely to achieve the top level.

### Question 1 (a)

Candidates were able to demonstrate a generally good understanding of the skills that are required in their responses to this question. The sources were generally well understood with only a few misinterpreting source 3. Weaker responses however struggled to appreciate what was meant by the 'Shadow Cabinet' in source 1, often regarding Bonar Law as the Prime Minister. Weaker responses also often did not appear to know who John Redmond was and this affected their ability to comment on the provenance. There were however some strong answers to this question with better responses engaged in developed cross referencing, especially with regard to the differences between the sources and able to use the provenance effectively to examine the weight which the sources could bear.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in 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 is clear from both sources 1 and 2 that the Curragh Mutiny was indeed engineered by opponents to Home Rule, although source 3 states that they 'were all sick of Home Rule', it contradicts the above sources, by stating the mutiny was a consequence of poor War Office leadership.

The first point to note is that source 1 states that the army shall not 'interfere with any step' taken by Ulster against Home Rule, thus suggesting that the Tory opposition supported Ulster's armed resistance against Home Rule. Furthermore, source 1 corroborates with evidence in source 2 that the mutiny was deliberately stirred by ~~opponents~~ opponents as it states the mutiny was stirred up through social contacts and political links, thus implying a Tory-Unionist alliance ~~and~~ ~~providing evidence that the~~ suggested in source 1, where it is claimed that the army will not be used until the present Parliament <sup>has</sup> ~~has~~ been dissolved, therefore showing that the Curragh mutiny was engineered by the opposition party to destroy the Liberal government. Source 1 is useful for showing

The views of Tony party, although this lessens its reliability as they would be against the government and be attempting to destabilize them, thus elements of hyperbole may be present in source 1.

In addition to this, source 2 states that

((a) continued) The 'Orange plot' had been revealed, therefore implying the mutiny was or designed by opponents of Home Rule. Hence, source 2 links with evidence in source 1, which claims no military intervention will be used until a new mandate secured through a General Election occurs, here thus showing that the Curragh mutiny was completely political and not spontaneous. Something which contradicts source 3, which says the Mutiny was a result of 'a bolt from the blue', therefore implying the Mutiny was not an 'Orange Plot'. However, caution must be used when analysing source 2. It is useful for ~~highlighting~~ highlighting the nationalist views of the Mutiny, but it lacks on reliability as Redmond may have wanted to improve his parliamentary position, therefore elements may have exaggerated.

Now On the other hand, source 3 describes how the Mutiny was a result of unexpected orders and not a political plan by opponents of Home Rule. For ~~example~~, example the source states that the army will be used for 'law and order and nothing else', therefore implying it will not be used for political purposes, and ~~thus thus contradicting the evidence in source 1 that~~ supporting the evidence in source 1 that it will not be 'used for in Ulster'. Moreover, source 3 states that it is not simply

away by political passion', ~~being~~ <sup>thus</sup> suggesting that they knew that there was 'an appearance of a fight' as mentioned in source 3. However, source 3 says that the crisis was not due to political passion, therefore it was not stirred up by political opponents to Home Rule. Source 3 is useful for showing

((a) continued) The view of an officer at Curragh, thus it has the added ~~reliability~~ reliability of being an eyewitness account. Moreover, it is a private letter, therefore, less likely to be false, although he may have made the situation seem worse by exaggerating in order to not appear a deserter, hence its reliability is one that lessened.

In summary, from sources 1, 2 and 3 it can be suggested that the Mutiny was stirred up by both political opponents and a genuine will on behalf of the soldiers not to fight Ulster.



## ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is an example of a strong level 4 response which engages in sustained cross referencing and an examination of the weight the evidence will bear in order to reach reasoned judgements.

### Question 1 (b) (i)

This was by far the more popular of the two questions. The best responses were able to differentiate effectively between 'too little and too late'. The sources were used in order to drive the argument and were supported with own knowledge that was often impressive in its range and depth. Weaker responses tended to fall into one of two approaches. They either slipped into narratives of Gladstone's actions in Ireland with little focus on the question or they depended very heavily on the sources with limited supporting evidence and frequently paraphrased the sources rather than focusing directly on answering the question. In the former approach, there was some tendency to lose sight of the chronological parameters of the question.

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

\* (b) When looking sources 4, 5 and 6 as a whole, it can be argued that Gladstone offered too little, but that it was not too late. For example, the first Land Act of 1870 failed to address many of the problems Irish peasants had to deal with, even though he subsequently addressed these problems with later acts. Source 4 and 5 describe how what Gladstone offered was too little, whereas source 6 highlights what Gladstone intended to do, yet it is with further knowledge that one can fully evaluate source 6 and come to the conclusion that Gladstone's reform was always too little.

The first point to note is that source 6 states all problems in Ireland are 'growing from the same trunk, which is called the Protestant Ascendancy', thus it can be suggested Gladstone believed destroying the Ascendancy would solve all Ireland's problems. Furthermore, Gladstone states that 'the poor Church of Ireland is one problem faced by the Irish. In order to address this, Gladstone's Church of Ireland Act removed land from the Protestant church of Ireland, and distributed it amongst peasants, it also meant that Catholics would no longer have to pay tithes. However, this did little to destroy the Ascendancy, which as source 5 states was 'both Protestant and of English extraction', thus agreeing with

source 4 that the Ascendancy was indeed mostly Protestant. Furthermore, Gladstone attempted to destroy the Ascendancy through various Land Acts, for example, source 3 states that the Land Act of 1870 'limited the landlord's power of arbitrary eviction', although in actual fact the

((b) continued) evictions clauses of the 1870 Land Act did little to protect tenants, as their landlords would merely place them outside the terms of the act by putting tenants on longer leases. This therefore, shows that Gladstone's reform was indeed too little, but it was targeting the Ascendancy as required in source 4. ~~Moreover~~ Source 4 is useful for showing how Gladstone intended to solve the Irish question, yet its reliability is lessened as it comes from an election speech, thus some elements may be exaggerated.

Source 5, is useful for providing an overview of the whole period as it has the benefit of hindsight, as it comes from a text book, although it must rely on other sources to come to a judgement, thus its reliability is lessened. Source 5 corroborates with source 6, in the fact that Gladstone's <sup>reforms</sup> did not do little to act until forced to do so. For example source 5 states that 'Gladstone's first administration' did little to improve the 'degrading system of land', thus contributing to the 'agricultural stagnation' mentioned in source 6. Furthermore, all sources agree that land was a major problem in Ireland. Hence so many Acts were devised to solve the

land question. For instance, source 6 states that 'on 7 April 1881', Gladstone brought in his 'second great measure of Irish land reform', thus implying the second Land Act of 1881, which ~~so~~ defeated the Land League and ended the Land War by securing the 'three F's'. To illustrate, fair rents were fixed for 15 years and

((b) continued) decided by Land Courts, and tenants could not no longer be evicted so long as they paid rent, hence security of tenure had been provided. Thus it can be argued that Gladstone's act did not offer too little as it provided everything they needed for, hence source 6 provides evidence that ~~agrees~~ that of source 5, which states 'tenants' <sup>in</sup> ~~were~~ ~~not~~ ~~wishes~~ was not to be compensated'. ~~as~~ This can be argued because it was one of the Land League's final ~~needs~~ ~~for~~ ~~their~~ ~~campaign~~ against the British during the Land War 1879-1881. However, source 6, ~~as~~ like source 5 comes from a book, thus, although it has the benefit of hindsight, it lacks a contemporary view as it must rely on other sources to come to its own judgement.

However, it could be argued that Gladstone's reform was too little. ~~To~~ To illustrate, source 5, refers that the 'education of Ireland' needed to be ~~so~~ fixed. Yet the Universities Bill of 1873 failed as it ~~was~~ did not get through concerns and Trinity College refused to cooperate with Catholic Colleges, which were not funded by the State.

Moreover, the Coercion Act mentioned in source 6 failed to improve the Irish situation, an 'in fact' caused an 'unparalleled challenge' from the Land League, in response the imprisonment of Davitt and the expulsion of 36 MPs from Westminster.

Nevertheless, all sources are in agreement that Gladstone's key target was and for Ireland was land reform. For example, Gladstone's major policy of the period involved solving the land question, what Gladstone believed

((b) continued) would pacify Ireland. In addition to this, Gladstone believed he had been chosen by providence to solve the Irish question and had set out on a moral crusade to pacify Ireland.

In conclusion, after taking into account from all the evidence from all the sources, it is clear that Gladstone's primary aim was to to destroy the 'Protestant Ascendancy' through 'Irish Land Reform'. As mentioned in source 6, the complexity of the 2nd Irish Land Act 'astonished Irish and English' politicians, yet it failed to solve problems of Irish extremist nationalism. ~~Thus~~ Thus, it can be argued that Gladstone's reform was ~~at best~~ consistently too little, but it was always introduced when it was required, therefore it was not 'too late'.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response uses the sources to drive the argument and supports these arguments with sound own knowledge. It is a secure level 4 response for both assessment objectives.

### Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was far less popular than question 1bi. Some excellent responses were seen to this question where candidates had used the sources to construct an argument which was supported with impressive contextual knowledge. There were however also a number of weaker responses to this question. These generally tended to paraphrase the content of the sources with very limited additional contextual knowledge and sometimes with some issues regarding understanding e.g. some candidates appeared not to know that Lloyd George was the British Prime Minister. This made it difficult to access the message of source 7.

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

\* (b) Do you agree with the view that personal conflicts among the Irish political leaders were the main cause of the violence that accompanied the birth of the Irish Free State in 1921-1922?

During 1921, the British offered the Irish a treaty in order to put a stop to the ongoing violence and increasing tensions between Britain and Ireland. This, however, caused even more tension despite essentially making Ireland a Free State. Lloyd-George and de Valera were not the best of friends and the sources comment on how differences in the Irish camp against Lloyd George led to violence.

Sources 8 and 9 ideally depict the differences in the Irish camp. Source 8 argues that while the Irish negotiators did not want to sign the treaty, they were forced to 'under threat of immediate and terrible war from Lloyd-George'. This suggests that Britain threatened Ireland in order to make the treaty happen, also commenting on the possible strength of Irish resistance as to why they signed the treaty.

Source 9 comments on the job the negotiators did in signing the treaty. Brugha, was reportedly very jealous of Michael Collins, and who was a negotiator. This could have influenced the decision to disagree with the negotiators so furiously, stating that if the treaty

((b) continued) were to be accepted by him, he would be committing 'national suicide'. Source 9 attacks the views of source 8, claiming that they have 'voluntarily admitted to becoming British subjects'. This ideally underlines the fragile relationship between Irish MP's. Source 7, however, is in accordance of source 8, placing the blame on the British rather than the Irish who signed the treaty. It shows a picture of Edward George ~~was~~ naming 'not Irish freedom dominion', contrasting the whole idea of Irish freedom. This suggests despite the treaty, Britain was still looking to have a hold over Ireland.

At last Sources 7, 8 and 9 highlight the differences in the Irish camp, with source 9 underlining many Irish people's opinion that Ireland should never succumb to England and sources 7 and 8 arguing the case that there is nothing the Irish could do other than appease the British, with source 8 talking about 'the weakness of the IRA volunteers' and putting forward the argument that Ireland didn't have the power to stand up to Britain at that point in time.

Overall, I believe that the sources go a long way to highlighting the differing opinions of the Irish, as well as the personal conflicts, and which was a huge factor in the violence that accompanied becoming a free state.

((b) continued) Therefore, I do agree with the view that personal conflicts were the main cause of violence in 1921-22

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

In this response the candidate uses the sources well to drive an argument and achieves a secure level 3 for A02b. There is some understanding of the focus of the question but there is very little contextual knowledge, so it is low level 3 for A01.

**Question 2 (a)**

Candidates were able to demonstrate a generally good understanding of the skills that are required in their responses to this question. The sources were generally well understood. Although some impressive answers were seen, many candidates were not able to draw out the more complex arguments contained in the sources. This was particularly true of source 11. Some candidates struggled to understand the meaning of the statistics and virtually no candidate commented on the provenance of the source. Candidates should be aware that inferences should be rooted in what is in the sources; to infer an event of 1898 from source 10, as one candidate did, cannot be sustained. Better responses focused on the antagonism of source 12 towards Gandhi with relevant explanation.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in 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) In the years 1900-1920 Indian nationalism and the desire for constitutional change looked like it was confined to an educated elite, for instance in Source 10, Sir Michael O'Dwyer says "It is clear that the demands (for constitutional reforms) come not from the mass of the people, whose interests are at stake, but from an educated and self-interested minority naturally eager for power and position." This shows that the British people in India saw the educated Indians as the ones causing problems and wanting constitutional reforms. Sir Michael O'Dwyer was situated in India so he could've seen what was happening in India and know who were causing problems but because he was British himself, it makes the source less reliable because his view maybe very bias towards British rule in India.

The table from Source 11 shows that there were ~~more~~ mostly educated people in Congress.

and over time there are increases in the amount of educated people in Congress, but the Indian National Congress wasn't the only people desiring constitutional change and many

((a) continued) civilians wanted it also. Indian National Congress was mainly confined to an ~~educated~~ educated elite but that doesn't mean that Indian nationalism and the desire for constitutional change were also.

In Source 12, Sir Dinshaw Edulji says "the vast unthinking multitude seem to be quite mad in following." This shows that people were supporting and desiring Indian nationalism and that it wasn't just confined to the educated people in India. The source was a letter written to a colleague of Sir Dinshaw Edulji's so this shows that it was supposed to be private and because he was a member of Congress it shows that he knew what was happening in India.

During the years 1900-1920 the ~~east~~ educational elite did want constitutional change but the Indian public were also supporting them so they wasn't silent.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is an example of how some candidates approach question a. It paraphrases each source in turn, making some links to the focus of the question and some simple comments on provenance. There is no attempt made at any point, not even in the conclusion to engage in cross referencing. This is a typical mid level 2 response.

### Question 2 (b) (i)

This was the less popular of the two questions and very few good answers were seen. Almost all responses to this question relied heavily or exclusively on the material that was in the sources. This was used with varying degrees of success and understanding. Responses to this question often made extensive use of AO2a in the absence of any factual detail; this cannot be credited. Some candidates were able to make use of contextual knowledge to offer some clever and appropriate twists, but these were the exception.

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

\*(b) i These <sup>three</sup> sources show mixed views about economic developments in India, and whose needs it was most tailored to.

Source 13 itself holds two ~~of~~ opposite arguments. ~~Firstly~~ <sup>The first argument</sup> shows that from an Indian point of view, economic development was directed by British needs. This is mostly evidenced ~~when it says~~ <sup>when it says</sup> that ~~the~~ India's economy was based on a "dependence on agriculture, tailored to British needs." The first half of the source also displays this view: "Too much was spent on railways." (This was <sup>very</sup> ~~much~~ a British need, being ~~designed~~ <sup>designed, used and controlled</sup> by British people) "not enough on irrigation, education or famine prevention." (These things are very much in ~~an~~ Indian interests, their economy being "[dependent] on agriculture") This source also says that "The wealth of India was being drained into [foreigners' pockets]." ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> can infer that this transfer of wealth

was because of the economic development of India, that was indeed (according to the same source) "tailored to British needs."

((b) continued) Source 14 agrees with this argument, expressing that Indian interests were ignored, those interests being a desire for industry: "Under a proper economic system the entire population can be made productive." The source also agrees with the point made in source 13 that the British wanted to keep the agricultural dependency - "[The population] is only ~~excess~~ <sup>excessive</sup> for a predominantly agricultural community". From 1914 (source 13) to 1956 (source 14) there was no great change to the dependency of agriculture according to the viewpoints displayed in this source. British needs had been fulfilled, by concentrating on their own interests and ignoring Indian ones.

Source 15 ~~also~~ further evidences the Indian desire for industry against agriculture. It also clearly says that the British could not give it to them by saying "no foreign power could impose such measures [rapid industrialisation]" and "only an Indian Government could make [changes]."

These three viewpoints in the sources clearly support the argument that

((b) continued) economic development in India was suited to British needs. From my own knowledge, I know that there was an industrial revolution in Britain ~~starting~~ <sup>mainly</sup> during the Nineteenth century. They were capable of doing the same in India, but instead limited their growth to agriculture, and "drained the wealth of India into their pockets" while leaving the population without wealth.

Contrary to this argument, Source 13 also displays a second opinion. It says that British rule helped pump millions of pounds worth of investment into India and ~~that~~ that Indians would not be prosperous ~~better off~~ under Indian rulers: "It was hardly self evident that people would have been better off under Indian rulers". The source describes how the British helped India, but its unreliability comes with the lack of detail. Firstly, it says, "Britain had invested over \$400 million in India by 1914". It does not say ~~when~~ since, and could be seen as quite a small amount if ~~over~~ <sup>over</sup> a very large amount of time. It

((b) continued) also says that Britain 'created a coal industry'. It does not say how big this industry was, or whether it satisfied Indian desires for industry.

In conclusion, the sources do offer a mixed view on economic development, but the ~~British viewpoint's~~ <sup>argument from the British viewpoint</sup> argument is quite ~~unreliable~~ <sup>unreliable</sup> and ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> strongest and most evidenced argument is that of the Indian viewpoint, that economic development in India between 1900 and 1947 was directed at British needs rather than Indian interests.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response has used the sources fully to try to develop a response to the question, so it is a secure level 3 in AO2b. It lacks very much in terms of specific own knowledge, although it does try to focus on the terms of the question. It is therefore at the level 2/level 3 margin.

**Question 2 (b) (ii)**

This was the more popular question on this section of the paper. It tended to be more successfully answered than question 2bi although it is a concern that there was still an overall lack of contextual knowledge and an over-reliance on the sources by a number of candidates. There were however a number of responses where the candidates used much contextual knowledge to help explain the sources material and drive the answer towards a judgement. In these cases, candidates were able to bend what they had learned to the question.

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

"(b) I agree to a great extent that in the years from 1900-1945 political hostility between Hindus & Muslims was created & and maintained by ~~the~~ British Influence. Hostility was induced by the British many times for an array of things like the "Indian Councils Act of 1909" (source 16) and how they maintained hostility by not intervening to dissolve the hostility but "Watched with a King of bemused bewilderment, mixed with satisfaction" (source 17) Furthermore Jinnah himself stated how Gandhi declared "Settlement can only come after independence" (source 18) meaning that Hindu-Muslim relations can only be settled by the departure of the British which signified that they were a cause for hostility between the two majorities in India

Hostility between Hindus and Muslims was created very early on when Lord Curzon, Viceroy for India until 1905, wanted to the partition of Bengal. In his eyes it was seen as being efficient as it was a very large province and administration of the province was proving very difficult indeed. However Hindus viewed this as in a completely

different light they inferred from partition that it was "a policy of divide and rule" source 16

((b) continued) which induced great tensions between Hindus and Muslims although Muslims were happy with a Muslim majority province. From analysing the attitudes at that time we know that there was a growing resentment towards the British Raj and "tensions mounted."

Source 16 is further dictating how hostility was a result of the British "Syed Ahmed Khan felt that democratic reforms would put Muslims in danger." To understand this point fully we must understand the context of it and the in depth meaning of the source, firstly who was imposing the reforms, and we know that it was the British so it must be the British putting the Muslims in danger. This in turn led to the Simla delegation, Simla was in the Himalayas where British officials would stay in the heat of summer, Muslims sent 70 delegates to attain separate electorates for Muslims which was "embodied in the Indian Council Act of 1909" or Morley-Minto reforms. A main reason for this was to appease Indian attitudes, however Hindus felt that it created hostility as it introduced communalism in India and how a separate religion would be

((b) continued) treated as a separate political party.

However Source 17 outlines how it wasn't only the British who were creating and maintaining hostility. The Lucknow pact put the Muslims and Hindus in an alliance however by the late 1920's it was beginning to deteriorate. "Attempts were made by Jinnah for new arrangements in 1927 and 1929 but rejected" this shows how the refusal of Indians willing to work with their counterparts was creating hostility. Nehru, future head of the Hindus, argued that there was no need for a "precarious alliance" as ~~for~~ the first general election in India proved that they were representative of the community as a whole as Muslims themselves voted for the Indian members. At this period membership of the Muslim League now led by Jinnah was low. Jinnah later offered a 14 point plan which was ~~rejected~~ rejected by his counterpart. This outlines how Hindus and Muslims themselves created hostility and it was not down to the British themselves.

Source 18 strongly outlines how it was the British who were maintaining the hostility and

((b) continued) "Hindu Muslim Settlement can only come after independence" meaning after the British

withdrew from India. Still arguing the point that the British created and maintained the hostility ~~between~~ the British often "watched" and never intervened. Many would argue that the Hindus created a lot of hostility. Jinnah stated how Gandhi "dashed our hopes whenever there was a chance of agreement" Although this could be seen as a counter argument that it was not only the British creating hostility but the Indian people themselves, we can ~~and~~ acknowledge that the British organised the round table conference and insisted on Gandhi attending. They were so insistent that they released approximately 19000 political prisoners (Gandhi-Irwin pact) this conference Gandhi claimed to speak for the public but it created tensions as "For Gandhi, Congress is India" (Source 18) Gandhi portrayed ~~how~~ to the public persona how arrogant he was to think one man could represent the views of 300 million individuals which created hostility, not forgetting it was the British who created the ~~the~~ Round Table conference some could say they maintained hostility.

((b) continued) The Government of India act 1919 also led to the Rowlatt acts which was a direct action of British thinkers this led to great mass-disobedience and protests. "As tensions mounted

in years ... British officials watched' which could be interpreted as maintained hostility. Sources 16 and 17 were written by historians and are both secondary sources which ~~can~~ show a more balanced view. Source 18 ~~states~~ is a contemporary source and would be biased based on the fact it was a statement from the leader of the ~~more~~ Muslim League Jinnah to the press which could be a form of propaganda.

The Montague-Chelmsford led to hostility by the British also the Government of India Act 1935, not forgetting the Simon Commission and how it symbolised that decision making was still to be left to the British which enraged the Indian public. ~~Ⓢ~~

In conclusion I agree ~~with~~ to a great extent that in 1900-45 the political hostility between Hindu-Muslims was created & maintained by the British Influence we have heard how the British often made uninformed

((b) continued) decisions, partition of Bengal and induced separate electorates seen as a divide and rule policy. Further the British played a significant role in maintaining the hostility by watching with a bemused excitement" it was not

however the down to the British alone as Hindus played a role in creating hostility but it is safe to say that the British created the majority of the hostility and maintained it by creating uninformed council acts and government of India act without consulting Indians. In the end we know how the British officials maintained hostility by

① Further I know that WWI was a main factor in creating hostility as Congress was engaged as it was not informed

not intervening  
and stopping the violence  
or disruptions and

"rather watched with a  
sense of satisfaction"

and it is safe to say the British did <sup>create</sup> ~~create~~ and maintain hostility upon analysing and examining the sources and own knowledge.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This candidate clearly knows quite a lot, as is evidenced by the attempt at the end of the response to shoe horn in as much as possible. The candidate argues convincingly from the sources. This is at the level 3/ level 4 margin in both assessment objectives.

## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026453 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://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

