

Examiners' Report
June 2012

GCE History 6HI02 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2012

Publications Code US032416

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 100 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that many candidates this series had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst weaker candidates were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were very skilled in using the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. In part B, whilst some candidates were very knowledgeable, it was disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. Some candidates over-used words such as 'inference' and did not have a secure understanding of its meaning. However, overall, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and slang language this year than in previous examinations.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates found the sources accessible and this question was well answered by many candidates. The best answers engaged in sustained cross referencing in relation to the question. In such answers, candidates appreciated that Source 1 could be used to point in both directions, that Source 2 could not be taken to represent Irish reactions and were likely to contrast the optimistic note struck by Source 2 with the views expressed in the other two sources. There is still a significant minority of candidates, however, who work through the sources sequentially and therefore limited their opportunities for cross referencing. Weaker candidates did not always fully appreciate the relative positions of Collins and De Valera. On the other hand, there were some candidates who used their own knowledge of the two men to write quite extensively about them; candidates should be reminded that this question is not assessing the deployment of extensive own knowledge.

(a) The three sources offer a mixture of conflicting opinions as to whether the Anglo-Irish Treaty was received positively by the Irish. Although in S1 Collins seems to challenge this notion, supported in S3 by De Valera, Lloyd-George in S2 provides a strong counter-argument. Therefore the overall impression given by the sources is that the Anglo-Irish Treaty divided opinion.

The evidence presented by Collins in S1 suggests that although his actions as a delegate in signing the treaty have provided Ireland "something which she has wanted these past seven hundred years", the acceptance of the Treaty has effectively "signed my death warrant". This would suggest the fickle nature of Irish nationalism, and expresses the opinion that his signing of the Treaty will not be universally supported. Such evidence is also backed up in S3, where de Valera states: "I am against this Treaty because it will not end the centuries of conflict between the two nations of Great Britain and Ireland." Thus on the surface it would seem that, at least in part, there is consensus that in fact the reaction to the Treaty was a negative one.

And yet, we must consider the provenance of the sources. Although a private letter, Collins ^{helps vent frustrations at the ever-growing goals of nationalists,} does not highlight widespread opposition to the Bill. In fact ^{he is} he betrays clearly is attempting to cover his tracks and ^{give} good cause to sign the Bill, as a leading nationalist surely he was aware of the Treaty's implications. ^(showing that perhaps among average Irishmen it could be popular) Moreover, the public speech element of De Valera's speech, may mean ~~to~~ that, although he may not have

((a) continued) agreed with all Bill elements, as a staunch FULL Republican, he is trying to attract support for opposition to the Bill, suggesting opposition is as of yet not widespread.

S2, a speech by Lloyd George provides interesting counter evidence to the ~~peace~~ fearful view of Collins in S1 as he questions whether "anyone" (in an exasperated manner) will support the "bargain". Although "bargain" suggests an unsavoury compromise, Lloyd George says Ireland "is radiant because her long quarrel with Britain has been settled" and that Ireland's negotiations have occurred "not only without loss of self-respect," ~~but~~ but with an increase of honor to herself and glory to her own nation." We certainly must take into account that as chief engineer of the settlement Lloyd-George undoubtedly is aiming to convince the House of Commons of the Treaty's viability and sustainability, but on a personal level will also view the Treaty through rose-tinted spectacles. Therefore although Lloyd-George suggests the reaction to the Treaty is wholly positive (as he speaks of "Ireland" as a whole), S3 ~~also~~ provides once more strong counter-evidence, suggesting that the signing of the Treaty is unsatisfactory as "Irish peoples ~~do~~ would not want to ~~be~~ me to save them materially at the expense of their national honor". Thus in many ways, although Lloyd-George hopes "this agreement can ~~we~~ win a deep, abiding and passionate loyalty", this is the opposite from what de Valera feels Irishmen want (not to "get into the British Empire after seven centuries of fighting")

Therefore, through cross-referencing of sources it is clear that there is no clear ~~side~~ ^{definite} answer as to how the 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty was received. Although Collins must have had reason to sign it he

((a) continued) questions whether "anyone" will be satisfied, whilst although Lloyd-George provides counter-evidence, he clearly speaks with an agenda. Therefore, although speaking with a clear goal towards winning anti-treaty support, De Valera's speech shows indeed many met the Treaty with a negative view, although it must be recognised he speaks for a dissident minority. Thus perhaps Lloyd-George does hold water, yet I would argue that based on the sources, the Irish response was in fact negative.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate briefly references the key theme of each source in the introduction, demonstrating a firm grasp on the core arguments. There is sustained cross referencing in relation to the question throughout the answer, comments on provenance are integrated into the argument and the candidate interrogates the sources thoroughly. This is a sound level 4 response.

Question 1 (b) (i)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions. The sources were accessible for most candidates, although weaker candidates did not tend to make full use of Source 6. Some impressive answers were seen where candidates used extensive contextual knowledge which they integrated with the key arguments that were raised in the sources to arrive at a measured judgement. Weaker answers tended to fall into one of two categories. There were some answers where the candidates relied heavily on the material in the sources, demonstrating very little specific own knowledge and making rather generalised comments. The other approach taken was to describe, sometimes in very general terms, the content of the various Land Laws; for some candidates such description went back in time to the Famine. It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) i) During the early 19th century, Irish tenant farmers were in a pretty poor position in Ireland. However, towards the late 19th century, the position of Irish tenant farmers improved in some extent for a variety of different reasons.

Firstly many pieces of legislation were put into place to try and improve the situation of tenant farmers, for example the 1881 Land act is one of many Land acts which were drawn up to try and improve situations in Ireland. These Land acts resulted in many beneficial effects for the tenants such as they could purchase their property and legally own the land for which they could not do beforehand. Source 4 backs this up, which is an extract from a textbook published in 2008. Due to being published in 2008, this source should not be biased and contain both sides. Some can argue many of the early Land acts, didn't actually benefit tenants. This may be the case, however the government was persistent and towards the late 19th century, these acts proved beneficial for Irish tenants. Therefore, this shows that the position of Irish tenant farmers improved in the last quarter of the 19th century.

((b) continued) Secondly, there were many petitions and protests held to try and improve the tenants situation in Ireland. One example of this is when many Irish farmers decided to protest by gathering in large crowds and forming outside ~~private~~ landlords private estates. This would put major pressure on the land lords as it would not only stop the farmers production but get in the way of the land lords business. Other forms of protest include of tenants refusing to pay their rents due to 'exorbitant' rates. This protest gained much support and resulted in forcing the government to come up with another land act to make sure tenants rates are no longer huge. Source 5 is a prime example of the situations of tenants improving. It shows that many more tenants were in Ireland and the conditions of most of them were improving. This improvement was largely ~~in thanks~~ due to the sheer size of some of the tenant protests. Therefore this also shows that the position of Irish tenant farmers improved.

However there is some evidence which states that the position of Irish tenant farmers did not improve. Firstly ~~the~~ during the late 19th century, the land war broke out in the years 1880-82 and 1887-90. This land war caused many struggles for the Irish

((b) continued) tenants and actually caused there to be many more evictions instead of proposed improvements. Many Irish believed that the Land war ~~was~~ could not have been started by landlord exploitation and the fact that ~~the~~ ~~then~~ it cannot be proved that the tenants even won the battles. If this was the case then the situation for the Irish tenants would have not improved but got worse. The Land war also resulted in the failure to reduce rents which was set out by the Land acts. More proof which shows that the situation did not improve is the Land war actually put an end to landlord investment and distracted farmers from actually farming. Therefore ~~the~~ source 6 and the Land war shows us that the position of ~~the~~ Irish tenant farmers did not improve in the last quarter of the 19th century.

To Conclude, I believe that the position of Irish tenant farmers did improve in the last quarter of the 19th century. The main causes for this, I believe were the many Land acts which were passed by the government which gave tenants many benefits such as much less rent to pay, loans made available to tenants with low interests and being able to purchase their property and legally own the land. ~~the~~ However I also believe that the Land war ~~was~~ ~~the~~ restricted how much the tenants position improved but overall

((b) continued) did still improve despite the consequences of the land war. Finally I agree with the view that the position of Irish tenant farmers improved in the last quarter of the 19th century mainly due to the Land acts and the protests.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer is aware of the issues and the debate. It broadly takes each source in turn, integrates with some, but not extensive or specific own knowledge. It discusses the provenance of the secondary sources for which there is no credit in AO2b, which means that time that might have been used to develop the argument and the supporting detail has been lost. This is doing sufficient for level 3 in both assessment objectives, but would be improved if the sources were used as a set, rather than separately.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions. There were again some impressive answers seen in response to this question. Such answers were able to use the sources to establish the basis of the debate and to develop their arguments using supporting own knowledge. Source 9 was generally well understood and well used within high scoring answers; weaker answers tended to quote directly from this source, but rarely moved beyond this. Weaker answers often had some own knowledge, especially about the gun running incidents, but dealt less confidently with their discussion of Asquith's role. However, some candidates demonstrated very limited own knowledge and relied heavily on the content of the sources, which they tended to paraphrase, sometimes with limited understanding. Most candidates focused well on the time frame of this question. It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

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

* (b) The sources clearly provide conflicting accounts as to whether sole blame can be given to Asquith for failing to resolve the Home Rule crisis. Although Smith in S7 highlights the problems with Asquith's "wait and see" policy and also his "original blunder of not providing some type of separate treatment for Ulster", other Read in S8 in fact looks upon "wait and see" as a skilled political manoeuvre as he attempted to "force both sides to choose between acceptance or resorting to violence." Thus it is necessary to take into consideration the belief in S8 that it was the fact that Nationalist and Unionist "differences appeared irreconcilable", whilst also looking at S9's evidence promoting Unionists and Conservatives a key barrier to resolving the issue.

It is clear in S7 that Smith places a large onus upon the actions of Asquith. It is true that to some extent his "original blunder of not providing some type of separate treatment for Ulster in the original Bill" inflamed Unionist passions. The resulting 1912 Bill saw a reaction in which Ulster ~~organised~~ formed the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) to prepare for war, also making obstructionist intentions clear as Carson led the signing of the "Solemn League and Covenant". This ~~blame original blunder~~ initial mistake by Asquith seems further attenuated by his ~~inability~~ refusal to step in, in Ulster. He pursued "wait and see", and ~~could~~ "nothing

to prevent both sides arming themselves". Indeed he did allow the Lorne gun running, and UVF drill to go unpunished, whilst turning a blind eye to the Curragh mutiny in which ~~Ulster~~ British soldiers in Ulster refused to fight their ~~early~~ Ulster compatriots. Thus the views of Smith in S7, certainly agree with the belief that the divisions and issues surrounding ((b) continued) Home Rule, were in large part created and attenuated by Asquith.

However ~~both~~ the fact that to sources 7, 8 and 9 all point towards the intransigent position of Ulster somewhat checks this argument. Read in S8 highlights how both "Nationalists and Unionists had modified their positions since 1912; but because their remaining differences appeared inescapable" a solution seemed difficult. Indeed evidence of "both sides arming themselves" pre-dated 1912 (nb. Ulster Defence Association 1986) whilst nationalists had long since lost faith in Redmond's Home Rule Party, and the influence of radical groups like the IRB (underpinning) and Sinn Féin (Ginneth) had rapidly expanded. Therefore we can point to evidence suggesting that the intransigence of both sides is to blame and that in fact, as S8 shows, Asquith took measures to ~~actual~~ ease tensions. For example, contrary to S7's belief, Read says Asquith was ~~arming~~ moving towards a proposal for the permanent exclusion of Ulster. Although it ~~would~~ would have enraged nationalists, it would also "have forced both sides to choose between acceptance or resorting to violence, and Asquith did not believe that the leaders of either side would want to risk war when each had gained so much." Thus to a certain extent ~~a~~ by pursuing "wait and see", Asquith was trying to let violent thoughts die down, and force each side to accept a treaty that would solve the disagreement in a political, not violent way.

However, we must criticise Asquith's naivety in this respect.

If evidence presented in S9 is to be valued, then Asquith had certainly underestimated both the fierce and "over my dead body" attitude to Home Rule in Ulster, and the similarly committed nature of nationalism.

((b) continued) In fact we could add to Smith's argument by correcting his statement that Asquith did "nothing to prevent both sides arming themselves." In fact his prosecution of Nationalist arms shipped to Houth only exaggerated tensions, making him appear partial to the Unionists, something only confirmed by his "proposal for the permanent exclusion of Ulster" (S8). S9 also provides evidence that in some respect Asquith underestimated the deep Conservative support for Unionism. Bonar Law, the Tory leader stated "I can imagine no length of resistance to which Ulster will go, in which I should not be ready to support them, and in which they will not be supported by the overwhelming majority of the British people." This element of popular support for Ulster in Britain displays the political misjudgements of Asquith over Home Rule, supporting again the notion that in "depriving these men of their birthright" he had made a grave mistake (if that is to say Home Rule was carried through).

However, we must also assess the ~~fact~~ nature of S9. ~~The~~ Its pro-Conservative and pro-Unionist nature also highlights the latter factor in causing difficulty for Home Rule in that the out of power Conservatives used it as an issue to hinder and undermine the Liberal Government. Although ~~the~~ Bonar Law highlights ~~a~~ just motives for Conservative opposition to Home Rule, such as ~~a~~ its nature to "deprive men of their birthright" and its ~~a~~ unpopularity with the "overwhelming majority of the British public" ~~we~~ (in other words this Bill is no "ordinary constitutional struggle"), elements of jockeying for party advantage are clear. Indeed in 1912 the Conservatives played Randolph Churchill's 'Orange Card' of BRC, and in giving "support" and advocating Unionists would be "justified in resisting by all means in their power", they acted as a hugely divisive force, only furthering

((b) continued) difficulties of Home Rule, that otherwise Asquith may have fixed.

There is clear evidence presented in the sources that indeed it was partly to a large extent that fault of Asquith, the Liberal PM, that the crisis of Home Rule was not resolved. His "wait and see" policy and failure to "prevent both sides from arming" can certainly be recognised as only allowing tensions to grow. However, it must be noted that to a large extent, Conservative obstruction was a key barrier to resolution of the crisis, whilst at the same time the intransigent mindsets of the both Nationalists (who lost faith in Redmond's Home Rule solution) and Unionists, played a vital role. Thus, although S8 suggests Asquith made clear efforts to resolve the crisis, S7 and S9 show that he only furthered problems in an already improbable peace furious issue, unlikely to be resolved via peaceful means. Thus he created and furthered key divisions over Home Rule.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The sources are used to drive the answer and their conflicting interpretations in relation to the focus of the question are weighed and evaluated. This candidate has quite an extensive own knowledge and this is integrated with the arguments that have been derived from the sources to reach sound judgements in relation to the focus of the question. This is level 4 in both assessment objectives.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates were able to access these sources, with stronger candidates being able to perceive some of the nuances that it was possible to discern. Stronger candidates were able to use Sources 10 and 11 to both support and challenge the premise of the question. Many of them were able to discuss what constitutes effective leadership and use this as the basis of their cross referencing. Such answers were likely to use their own knowledge to contextualise the sources. Weaker answers often worked through the sources sequentially with a separate paragraph on provenance. A significant minority of candidates engaged in description of a range of issues from their own knowledge. These included actions taken by Gandhi, including some from outside the period of the sources, and the development of Hindu-Muslim conflict. There were a number of candidates who did not spell Gandhi correctly.

(a)

Dis Do not suggest - or stuff
NOP Gandhi effective
Ag Sources do suggest to a certain extent

These sources do suggest that to a certain extent, Gandhi was an effective leader. Source 10, which is a letter from Chelmsford to King George V which suggests that it would have been confidential and therefore honest. However Chelmsford would have been quite bias against Gandhi due to his personal views. The purpose of it was to inform the King so it should be quite accurate. He says, "Gandhi is a man of great saintliness of character", these words are speaking very positively of Gandhi, and having a good character is crucial to being an effective leader. Similarly in source 12, which is written by Gandhi so this would be bias towards himself. It is from an article so he would be wanting to gain supporters. He says, "that he prays God will give ~~them~~ India; "strength to remain non-violent to the end." This here clearly shows his passion and determination for the

((a) continued) independence of India which ~~which~~ would show effectiveness. He is effective in that he is speaking to the public.

However, the sources do also suggest that to a certain extent Gandhi was in fact an ineffective leader. Source 11 is from Jinnah to Gandhi addressing his cooperation with Gandhi. Jinnah was opposed to what he is referring to so this shows not much weight could be put on the source for evidence. He says, "that Gandhi's methods have," caused split and division in almost every institution that you have approached." "A split among the country's people is very negative impact among the people and shows how here Gandhi has been quite ineffective. Similarly in source 10 Chelmsford calls Gandhi, "hopelessly impractical", which is obviously critical in being an effective leader of India.

These sources do suggest to some extent that Gandhi was an effective leader, as in source 10 he is shown to have a great character, and source 12 shows he was consistent and passionate which is also very important. However, in source 11 he is said to be

((a) continued) causing "disorganisation and chaos".
In source 10 ~~to~~ it is said that dealing with him is "difficult". These sources suggest that actually he was very difficult and ~~isn't~~ not effective as a leader.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer clearly appreciates that the focus of the question is on Gandhi as an effective leader and keeps coming back to the issue. There is some attempt at cross referencing, but this is not well developed and sometimes amounts to little more than matching quotes. There is also an attempt to consider provenance, but this is not well developed. This response is a low level 3.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions.

This question elicited a variety of responses across the mark range. There were some answers in which highly sophisticated reasoning was demonstrated by some candidates who had clearly considered the sources with great care and were able to integrate arguments derived from the sources with sound own knowledge of the period. For example, one candidate argued from Source 14 that 'the reasoning Montagu gave was disingenuous given the subsequent brutal methods used to maintain control after this, both at Amritsar and in response to the non-cooperation campaign.'

Whilst many candidates argued effectively in favour of the question proposal that the British concessions were to increase control and picked up the prompt in Source 14 as to altruistic motives, fewer recognised the possibility of exploring 'nationalist demand' as a counter argument. Not all candidates were able to give accurate detail about the Morley-Minto reforms or the Government of India Act, but many displayed better knowledge of the Rowlatt Acts, Amritsar massacre and the partition of Bengal. Weaker responses generally tended to rely heavily on the sources and only possessed rather generalised knowledge.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

* (b) ~~Source~~ Source 13 suggests that the British introduced many reform acts that would give India hope for independence, however only cause a divide between them in reality. This was done purposefully by the British and the Indians could see this happening; for example it took only a few weeks to pass the Rowlatt act, however the Montagu-Chelmsford Report took 3 years to come into action. This source links well with source 15 as it explains that the liberal government did what they could to ease the tension of the partition of Bengal, which would in fact help India, however it then suggests that "they were no more than a tentative beginning to finding a solution to the problem of British rule", implying that the British were using the Indians to strengthen their hold. The fact that this was

written * by McDonough from The British Empire highlights the fairness and admittance of this source.

Source 14 is very ironic as it is part of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report which was ultimately a failure & led to the Simon

((b) continued) Commission which ultimately was Birkenhead's way of escaping the Labour government. Source 14 states that "we have a richer gift for her people than any that we have given them". Source 13 links well with this as it claims "these concessions can be seen as a way of strengthening the Raj". These two points juxtapose each other and ~~push~~ ~~the~~ ~~side~~ push more toward the side of Britain trying to strengthen their hold.

The Rowatt act also played a big part, as it was passed in a short amount of time and deliberately ~~wasn't~~ wasn't publicised in places where Indians would gather, consequently leading to the Amritsar Massacre which was a clear event of Dyer trying to broadcast his power, and strengthen Britain's hold by creating a mass division in all of India.

Source 13 also links with source 14 as they both explain that Indian were or would be satisfied by their actions, however source 14 being biased as due to it being written in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and source 13 being published in 2008 making

((b) continued) It inaccurate to how Indians were feeling highlight the fact that the British were in fact using their concessions to strengthen their hold.

~~As~~ In conclusion, the sources and my own knowledge suggest that the British used their concessions to strengthen themselves and give Indians false hope toward independence.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 2 answer in both assessment objectives. There is no real sense of a debate, basic information is extracted from the sources and although there is some own knowledge, it is not very developed and not well integrated into the sources. There is no need for the candidate to discuss the provenance of secondary sources.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions.

This question elicited a variety of responses across the mark range.

Some candidates tackled this question with confidence, using the sources as the basis for a debate, supporting these arguments with well-founded factual knowledge. Understanding of the events that unfolded between 1945 and 1947 was frequently good, with candidates discussing Jinnah's call for Direct Action in context and in detail.

Some candidates read the question as one dealing only with the reasons for independence and such answers did not consider the question of the speed of the process. Although much of what was written in such an answer could be credited, such misreading of the question often held potentially level 4 answers out of the higher level.

Weaker responses generally tended to rely heavily on the sources and only possessed rather generalised knowledge.

It was disappointing to note that many candidates made generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

(b) (ii)

Labour Gov. MOUNTAIN WEDDING

Disagree

Economy £70 mil India no longer asset People didn't like Empires

Main reason for speed in indep. was to prevent civil war

Agree

- Getting restless
- Br would look poor.

Reward for WWII

(B) (ii) Some historians may argue that it was the fear of civil war as to why the reason for the speed in which Independence was granted. ~~The~~ The Indians were becoming restless and the British could no longer ignore the signs of civil war. However, there are also many other reasons as to why they were granted independence. Britain were in a very poor state after the war economically, and India was proving to be a hindrance rather than an asset. Also the new Labour Government had just come into power in Britain and they would want to give India some kind of recognition for their efforts.

To a certain extent some historians may argue that the main reason for the speed of independence was because
(b) continued of the threat of civil war. In source 16 it says, "Indians were beginning to turn against and kill each other," the British were becoming more powerless to stop it, and if this violence continued then there could potentially be civil war. There were few remaining British forces in India ^{due to WWII} and if civil war were to break out it would be a ~~disaster~~ disaster to the British reputation. They had been shown in cases such as Chauri Chaura and Direct Action Day, what could be done.

However there are also many other reasons as to the speed in which independence was granted. As shown in source 18 the British economy was in a terrible state by the end of WWII and would have to, "reduce its global activities". The British were spending £70 million a day by the end of the war, on war efforts. By this point ~~Britain~~ India was no longer an economic asset to the British, if anything a hindrance. They couldn't afford to keep India and so this may have contributed to the great speed in which they granted independence in the end.

((b) continued) As well as this, Empires were becoming something more of the past. ~~The~~ The US's disapproval of the British Empire was becoming more blatant, as they too fought ~~against~~ for their independence from Britain. Source 17 makes it clear the Indians didn't want the British there, "If you are in a place where you are not wanted... the only thing to do is to come out." Also the British were fighting the spread of the German Empire in WWII, it seemed rather hypocritical of them at this point to cling ~~on~~ on to India.

After World War Two ~~the~~ ^{the} Labour government came into power in the UK. Atlee, the new PM was much more in favour of Indian independence than the previous PM Churchill was. Also, at this point the British were ~~just~~ just setting up the welfare state, India was becoming less of a priority.

Also on a more ~~per~~ perhaps trivial factor, Lord Mountbatten wanted ~~to~~ to return back to England by a certain

((b) continued) date; This was to attend a Royal wedding of his niece's. For this reason he may have increased the speed in which independence was given.

It could be argued that the main reason for the speed of independence granted was ~~for~~ ^{to} prevent the onset of Civil War. They knew of the growing tensions between the Hindus and Muslims, Direct Action Day was absolute proof of this. However there were also many other factors such as the British economy being in such a poor state, as mentioned in source 17, it would not have been economically sensible. Also the Labour Government was becoming concerned by the building of the welfare state in Britain, ~~and~~ the new government were more liberal and more compliant with the idea of granting independence. The threat of civil war was an important factor but many ~~histor~~ historians would argue not the only one.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is level 3 in both assessment objectives. The candidate clearly understands the debate and uses the sources to construct an argument, although sometimes the material in the sources could have been used more effectively. The arguments are supported by some relevant own knowledge, although sometimes the information is described rather than used fully.

Paper Summary

A general summary of the areas for improvement in the approach to this paper which may prove of benefit to centres.

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.

Part B

1. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources. Indeed, some candidates often engaged in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

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 publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US032416 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

