

Examiners' Report  
June 2013

GCE History 6HI02 D

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2013

Publications Code US036148

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## Introduction

Examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination. Many were able to structure their work effectively, addressing the specific focus of both the Part A and Part B questions and writing with understanding and insight about the key themes.

At the highest levels of attainment, there was impressive work.

However, it is disappointing to note that there were a minority of candidates seen in this exam series who performed poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In Part A, many candidates were able to use the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agreement or disagreement and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. There seemed to be an increase this series in the number of candidates who worked through the sources sequentially; this makes it very hard for candidates to cross reference effectively and move beyond Level 2. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in Part A and as a result, such candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements.

In Part B, it was again disappointing to note that a minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. In a small number of cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge at all being used. Candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the Part B questions. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of responses seen this year where candidates used their own knowledge to create the line of argument and made only passing reference to the sources. The best answers made use of both elements, using the sources to shape the argument and own knowledge to develop the points raised. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, even more candidates appeared to comment on provenance in their responses to Part B in this exam series. Such comments are often very generic – the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in Part B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. The usage of 'bias' seems to have increased again this year and brings with it all the variant misspellings – biast and biasicity to name but two. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work – there seemed to be an increase in misnumbering of sources and misquoting of dates (e.g. 1956 instead of 1856) which might well be identified if the script was proof read at the end.

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

## Question 1

### Question 1 (a)

This question worked well and presented few difficulties for candidates. They found the sources accessible and it is pleasing to note that there were relatively few examples of a source by source approach seen. Most candidates attempted to engage in comparison and cross referencing, even where it was not fully developed. Some answers tended to take the sources at face value or to only pick out what a general reading revealed. This limited the development of cross referencing and so limited the level that could be awarded. The best responses not only cross referenced effectively, but also examined the provenance of each source with confidence and insight. The very best picked up on the dates, especially of Sources 1 and 3 and were able to use this to good effect in developing their argument.

It was noted that some candidates did not develop their comments on provenance beyond a very basic level e.g. Source 2 was dismissed because it was a speech.

(a) ...  
The Land Act of 1881 in Ireland was largely due to the agitation from the Land League, as shown by sources 1 and 3. Source 2 is undoubtedly denying this, claiming that it was the British government's moral obligation to help the poor. Sources 1 and 3 on the other hand, prove that it was certainly to do with the Land League. Source 1 explicitly mentions the plans to organise strikes against landowners, and source 3, whilst beginning by saying it was a result of the situation in Ireland, goes on to explain that the situation was caused by the Land League, setting the fact that the League caused the Land Act.

The fact that Gladstone's Land Act was brought on by Land League agitation, is certainly proved in Source 1. The source, a speech by Charles Stewart Parnell, the founder of the Land League, to his Land League followers, opens by stating that "the measure of the Land Bill of next session will be the measure of your activity and energy this winter", immediately stating that the Land Act is a result of the League. As Parnell is the founder of the League, and he is speaking

((a) continued)

to the League, this could of course simply be to rally the League and raise morale by putting them under pressure, but it is largely true. The source goes on to mention that, if the landlords continue to be "stubborn", then they "shall... tell the people of Ireland to strike against rent", deliberately inciting striking and reaction, similar to the "guerilla social warfare" in source 3. Overall this source certainly owes the Land Act to the Land League.

In terms of a disagreeing point of view, Source 2 does not claim it is the result of the Land League, but in fact the British government's moral obligation. The source states "It is the aim of the Government to improve the condition of the very poor", claiming a sort of moral high ground, as if they are simply doing it to help the poor. It goes on to say "No doubt, great evils arise from the excessive poverty of the tenants", further claiming to help Ireland, to do it for the good of the population. However, this source was taken from a speech to the house of commons, therefore logically placing emphasis on the land Act being the government's choice, and not due to the forceful nature of the Land League, as that would make the government look weak. Source 2 certainly disagrees with the proposition.



((a) continued)

Source 3 begins by stating that "Mr Gladstone's Land Bill of 1881 was a condition of things in Ireland which bordered on near-rebellion". This does not directly give any credit to the Land League, and accounts it to the overall Irish situation. However, the source goes on to state that "this was largely, if not entirely, the deliberately planned work of the Land League", which undeniably accredits the Land Act to the work of the Land League. The source even mentions that the League used "guerrilla social warfare", which directly relates to the striking ~~was~~ mentioned in source 1. Even though this could be seen as propaganda, as the Author, Michael Davitt, was a leading member of the League, it was published many years after the Land Act, and therefore is merely a reflection, agreeing with the fact that the Land League achieved the Land Act.

The Land Act of 1881 was certainly the result of the agitation and war of attrition waged by the Land League. The British government may have claimed that it was issued due to the moral highpoint on which the government stood, and that the government whole-heartedly backed it, as shown in source 2. However, both sources 1 and 3 prove that the Land League had created a rebellious situation in Ireland, through strikes and guerrilla warfare, that the Government had no choice ~~but~~ but to grant the

((a) continued)

*land Act.*



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

The opening paragraph very clearly shows that this candidate is aware that there is a debate to be considered. The response then moves to a paragraph with the focus on each source in turn, although within each paragraph there is an attempt to cross reference some aspect of the main source being discussed with at least one other source. The conclusion also starts to try to make some sort of judgement. This is not a typical Level 3 response, but there is sufficient evidence of the skills required to be in that level.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

It is not recommended that answers should be organised on a source by source basis. Generally this approach encourages paraphrasing and is unlikely to move out of Level 2.

Question 1 (b) (i)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly more attempting this question. Many candidates successfully used the sources to extract a range of issues, and explored these issues in their answers with varying degrees of support from their own knowledge. The vast majority of candidates did understand the significance of the Hawarden Kite and were able to discuss this appropriately, although somewhat surprisingly, a minority of candidates did not make reference to it.

There was generally a good understanding of the sources, especially Source 4, but many candidates still relied too heavily on the sources. Whilst some candidates tended to structure their responses on a source by source basis, more developed answers looked for the themes and the alternative views that could be presented.

Stronger answers considered the interaction of the different factors and offered an overall judgement.

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

\* (b) Do you agree with the view that Gladstone's decision to introduce Home Rule was motivated by a desire for political advantage.

It should be seen that Gladstone's decision to introduce Home Rule was motivated ~~to a~~ <sup>to a</sup> ~~degree~~ <sup>certain</sup> degree by the desire for political advantage. However it should be seen that issues of the empire were a factor and most importantly ~~was~~ the deterioration of Ireland through increased radicalisation. Source 4 strongly implies that political tactics were a key aspect to his decision on Home Rule given the support it brought from Parnell's MP's and the bill's power to sideline Chamberlain. Source 5 goes on to suggest Gladstone aimed to steer the party back to more traditional liberal policies. Source 5 ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> in the way that it suggests Gladstone can be seen that Source 6 agrees with the state of disintegration as Gladstone references the failures of coercion and the ~~side~~ <sup>side</sup> resistance. Gladstone suggests that it is highly important to ensure



((b) continued) the rule of law implying a lack of this within Ireland. ~~As~~ The seeking of a political advantage must be acknowledged as a factor in bringing about Home Rule but more importantly there was a ~~whole~~ wish to export liberal values Policies' ~~and~~ which influenced Gladstone's decision. The most ~~important~~ <sup>significant</sup> factor which led to the attempt to pass Home Rule was the growing violence and lawlessness in Ireland.

¶ Gladstone's motivation to gain a political advantage should be seen as a leading factor behind his decision. As is suggested by source 4 ~~was~~ an important gain for Gladstone would have been the increased importance of Parnell's 86 MPs. ~~In~~ This can be seen to provide a political advantage as it provided Gladstone and the Liberals with the majority within the Commons. The source also references the advantage of Home Rule as it ~~would have~~ was 'a way to sideline Chamberlain' this was an advantage given the growing support that he had developed by 1885 it can be seen that Chamberlain challenged Gladstone's supremacy. ¶ It can be seen that political advantage was ~~the~~ important in Gladstone's decision to propose Home Rule.

However it ~~should~~ ~~be~~ must be acknowledged

((b) continued) That this was highly limited. As was seen when the first Bill was presented to the House of Commons. It is the case that Gladstone's first bill did not include Irish MPs remaining in the House of Commons. It must therefore be seen that the continued gains from Parnell's 86 were not a priority for Gladstone. In a similar way that passing ~~of~~<sup>attacks at</sup> the Bill did not strengthen Gladstone's position in relation to Chamberlain arguably it increased Chamberlain's power as he and around 70 liberals voted against the bill. It must therefore be seen that political advantage was not the leading factor for Gladstone when preparing the Home Rule bill given the fact that the bill arguably hurt Gladstone politically.

Through the sources it can be seen that there was an increased drive to push liberal values which acted as an inspiration for Gladstone's proposal of the Home Rule Bill. As is suggested by Source 5 Gladstone 'had supported emerging nationalism and claimed 'that British rule should encourage self-government'. This therefore implies that Gladstone wished to liberalise the empire to some degree and so encourage self-government whilst maintaining overall British control. This is supported by Source 4 which explains that Gladstone wished to 'steer the party back

((b) continued) to more traditional Liberal policies'. The ideal behind Home Rule ~~providing~~ was to provide Ireland with their own parliament whilst maintaining rule ~~of~~ over Ireland at Westminster although this would focus on issues regarding the empire such as war. In this way the proposals of Home Rule match the more liberal and idealistic views that Gladstone had towards the British Empire. ~~In~~ The push of liberal values was an important factor in pushing for Home Rule as Gladstone aimed to spread his ideals throughout the empire.

Most importantly Gladstone was forced to suggest the Home Rule bill due to the deterioration of Ireland and the lawlessness that prevailed. As Source 5 correctly suggests ~~in~~ the fact that Ireland 'was on the brink of social disintegration' was the final push in Gladstone's journey to self-government.

~~The~~ The growing discontent led to an increase in radical action ~~within~~ within Ireland which is seen through the Clerkenwell bombings and the 1881 Phoenix Park murders where the Chief Secretary and Under Secretary for Ireland were murdered by Fenians. This radicalisation showed the ineffectual nature of coercion and the need for real change to be implemented. The failure of coercion is acknowledged

((b) continued) by Gladstone through his speech in which he claims that 'coercion is morally worn out' and that the 'coercion Bills as ours are stiffly resisted'. ~~This suggests a~~ This lack of support can be seen in the failure of the Ashbourne purchasing act where tenants failed to make use of the money made available to them. Source E suggests a failure to uphold law in Ireland and the fact that this is required for a 'civil life' to prevail. ultimately it is the case that the main cause for Gladstone's introduction of Home Rule was the growing violence and lawlessness in Ireland.

Although political advantage and liberal values were important elements of Gladstone's thinking behind Home Rule, it must be seen that the deterioration of Ireland in regard to the loss of real law was the most important factor.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is Level 3/4 for both assessment objectives. It uses the sources to set up an argument. There is also clearly a strong contextual knowledge which is integrated with the arguments derived from the sources. On occasions, the response lacks specific supporting detail.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Aim to incorporate specific detail to support the line of argument.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

Candidates were split fairly evenly across the two questions, with slightly fewer attempting this question.

Responses to this question were often less well supported in terms of own knowledge than those to question 1(b)(i). There was generally a good understanding of the sources, although a minority of the responses relied too heavily on the information that was provided in the sources. However, the relationship between Collins and De Valera was well understood as was the implication of Collins signing the treaty. There were some very assured answers which were able to consider both sides of the argument using wider own knowledge and using this as the basis on which to reach a considered judgement. Such answers often were able to make appropriate use of Source 8, which was rather over-looked in many responses, except for quoting the last sentence.

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

\*(b)

In 1922 an Irish civil war broke out between De Valera's anti-treaty forces and Collins' pro-treaty forces as a consequence of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in the year before. I do agree with the view that the main reason for the outbreak of the Irish civil war in 1922 was De Valera's attitude to the Anglo-Irish Treaty. I have made this decision by the use of sources 7, 8 and 9.

All the sources hint at this view in the question but source 7 fully and entirely agrees with the ~~the~~ question of De Valera's view of the Anglo-Irish Treaty. In this source it says "a ~~quote~~ speech from De Valera says "I am against the Treaty because it will not end the centuries of conflict between Great Britain and Ireland." This shows that his attitude towards the Treaty was extremely negative feeling that nothing had been solved in the Treaty for Ireland. This is also supported as he also says "That Treaty makes British authority our masters in Ireland." This shows his negativity towards the Treaty as they benefited as he thing they were fighting for; freedom of Ireland now British authority, has still not come but it cements British authority. He also hinted at a civil war in Ireland as at the end of the speech he says "It leaves us a country going through a period of internal strife" This shows that he believes



that the Treaty will only cause tension and conflict within Ireland itself, ~~furthermore~~ ~~ago~~ again showing the negative attitude towards ~~furthermore~~, the Treaty.

((b) continued)

<sup>9</sup>  
Furthermore source ~~8~~ also supports my view that De Valera's attitude towards the Anglo-Irish Treaty was the main reason for the outbreak of civil war in Ireland. ~~This is shown as it says "Sir Henry Wilson was killed by the members of the IRA on the doorstep of the London house"~~ ~~That~~ This is shown when Eamon De Valera became president ~~of~~ and it says "This marriage involved the relegation of ~~the~~ Griffith's constitutional views." This quote shows that constitutional means of dealing with things in ~~the~~ Sinn Féin has gone as De Valera was more revolutionary as he was a leading figure in the 1916 Easter Rising. This means that De Valera's negative attitude ~~to~~ towards the Treaty and also being a revolutionary nationalist added up to an outbreak against the Treaty causing him to rally anti-Treaty forces in Ireland.

However, on the other hand source 8 suggest other reasons and therefore disagrees with my view that De Valera's attitude to the Treaty caused the civil ~~to~~ war. Source 8 suggests that the civil war was created by the British. This is shown as it says "The ~~British~~ Irish Civil War was thus begun on British orders." This came about as British government threatened to bring in troops to Ireland if the free-state didn't act against the IRA as they murdered Sir Henry Henry Wilson. This clearly emphasises that British orders instead of De Valera's attitude started the civil war as the free-state (the product of the Treaty - basically southern Ireland) acted upon the IRA causing the civil war in

((b) continued)

Ireland. This ~~is~~ could also be seen as more reliable source than source 7; De Valera's speech as it is a history textbook with the purpose to inform the reader not get ~~an~~ a biased view across. Furthermore ~~see~~ the quote "instead the republicans objected. The IRA split and a section of it rose ~~up~~ in arms against the Free State." This quote suggests that as well as De Valera opposing the Treaty, many others also did including parts of the informally revolutionary IRA who immediately showed their anger to honour the Treaty by two members killing Sir Henry Wilson - ~~who~~ a member who signed the Treaty.

~~is~~ In conclusion, De Valera's attitude towards the Anglo-Irish Treaty was the main reason towards the Irish Civil War in 1922. My viewpoint is supported by sources 7 and 9 as they both show that the negative view and attitude of De Valera caused Irish Civil War as he was ~~at~~ a revolutionary nationalist and he wanted of "internal strife" in source 7. Even though source 8 suggests that the British orders caused the Irish Civil War due to their threats to the Free State, I still believe it was De Valera's attitude because he continuously campaigned for nationalisation of Ireland ~~by~~ but the Treaty caused Ireland to swear to the crown (showing signs of unionism).



This response uses the sources as the basis of the argument and achieves Level 3 for AO2. However, there is very little supporting own knowledge, even of a contextual kind, so despite the argument presented, this response is firmly rooted in Level 2 for AO1.

## Question 2

### Question 2 (a)

The sources in this question gave candidates ample opportunity for developed cross referencing and there were relatively few instances of a source by source approach being taken. However, many candidates did not read the sources with sufficient care. As a result, in Source 12, some candidates ignored the first part of the first sentence 'They sacrificed a fine old soldier...' and simply picked out the next part of the sentence 'and killed British prestige in India forever' to argue that Dyer's actions had 'killed British prestige'. Such a line of argument was likely to run into difficulties of interpretation. Some candidates also missed the nuances in Source 10, viewing the comments made as representing Chelmsford's personal views. In spite of these issues, there were many excellent answers to this question as the sources worked very well in combination. Most candidates were able to offer a range of sensible comments on Source 11 although a small number of them described Churchill as the Prime Minister, despite the provenance of the source being clearly stated. The fact that some candidates did not recognise Source 3 as a woman had no impact on their ability to evaluate the provenance of the source.

(a) **PLAN**

General Dyer's actions at Amritsar - appropriate response to situation?

1. appropriate to the lines of British (10)
2. inappropriate - excessive use of force (11)
3. Yes, but British interests achieved (12)

**RESPONSE**

There are three clear viewpoints on whether Dyer's actions were a justified response to the situation. The first argues that they certainly were, but were just inconsistent with the other <sup>weak</sup> government policy - this view is put forward by source 12, but challenged by source 11. The second view is that the viewpoint that there was an excessive use of force making the response unreasonable - this is shown by sources 11 and 10. Finally, the last viewpoint contradicts that of the first in arguing that - as a one-off - Dyer's response was justified to save the life of the British.

residents - this is put forward by source 10 and challenged by source 11.

((a) continued)

Finally, source 12 clearly argues that Dye's response was justified; Dye is described as a "five old soldier". It further argues that the government's other policies were weak in not using violence and that the massacre at Amritsar all the more necessary; the situation is described as the "indies may imagine the General does not see force to repress outbreaks". However, source 11 challenges the assumption that the government's approach is wrong, arguing that "close and effective cooperation" is the best means of policy making - hence saying that Dye's actions had to take place. We might also challenge the reliability of source 12's provence - the author is a British resident, and therefore is not likely to bring into the imperial argument about the British having a right to control India by force. Furthermore, the fact he may be brought up in India might have created fear of the Indians, which was common in the separate lives of the Raj.

Secondly, there is a strong argument that Dye's response was inappropriate - he



((a) continued) ~~and~~ used an excessive amount of force. This is not proved by source 11. That agrees it is "excessive" and "unlawful" - ~~both~~ in clear reference to the facile use of violence. This viewpoint is also indicated clearly in source 10 where Chelmsford ~~admitted~~ acknowledges he agrees <sup>that</sup> Dyer "exceeded what was needed" and was "guilty of feeling humanity". Indeed, this is also said to be the view that Chelmsford ~~expressed~~ they take; ~~admitted~~ acknowledges its actions.

~~However, as in~~ In addition, we might ~~with the point~~ praise. The prominence of source 10 as Churchill was a staunch imperialist and thus to be arguing that ~~it~~ a showy violent, military ~~action~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~necessary~~ to win British control is out of character. Furthermore, the fact he rode the speech the year following the massacre also debilitates the fact that he would have been pithy to the information immediately after the massacre ~~and~~ as many of the details were immediately in the public eye.

Finally, we can agree that Dyer's actions



((a) continued)

were justified as a pre-off in order to save the laws of the Bible. This is done most clearly by source 10, which agrees "his actions were illegal" and this is clearly in reference to the "Bible canon", denoting its high importance. However, Chelwell says that "I do not believe it" to this extent, and says that there were "strong fortifications" but "were based on the basis of violence done". In analyzing the provisions of source 10, we can say that this view is most readily portrayed as it is in clear opposition to Chelwell's view - he says the opposite view has been "idle" in being got across. It is also in a private letter, and therefore more frank and honest.

In conclusion, we can say that source 10 is linked by the fact that it contains its own predominant viewpoint of the actions being necessary defence, and this is linked with thought supporting source 11's view that timber was unnecessarily violent. Source 11 is strong as it is written in a report and Chelwell is agreeing against expectations, implying honesty. Source 12 is linked through the

((a) continued)

validity of ad upriser of the into  
and give less few details about the  
to problems of a passive approach. This source  
12 provides the biggest insight.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

There is sustained cross referencing in relation to the question throughout this answer. It considers the provenance of the sources effectively. Whilst there is some judgement, this is not sustained throughout the answer. Thus the response achieves Level 4, but is not at the very top.



"calm the discontent in the country", depicting that there was significant opposition that needed to be quelled. This is also clearly from

((b), continued)

towards the beginning of the period in question as the speech was made in 1907. Furthermore, the fact that he agrees that it was "not a reform at all" shows that reform was absolutely necessary demonstrating the fact that there was serious opposition that continued. However, we can challenge the reliability of this evidence - the source was from the year that Congress split into the radicals, and the hard-line approach there might be in an effort to gain support from some of the more extreme New Party. However, we could argue the reverse, which is occurring, that Gokhale was a moderate who would be opposed to the Party, and thus for him to be agreeing in this manner demonstrates a serious degree of opposition.\* There is also additional evidence to show that from 1900-14 there was serious opposition. The Bengal independence movement was the cause of the 1905 Partition, which created the problems. Furthermore, the Congress had been established since 1885, and this showed strong



((b) continued)

oppositional to many government policies throughout the period.

\* Some also support this argument, saying that Curzon's role as viceroy that started before 1900, made the nationalist movement "non-violent ideal" - hence serious opposition.

We can also agree that there was increasing opposition throughout this period and that the initial state of affairs in 1900 did not represent serious opposition to British control of India. This is shown most clearly by source 13, which argues that by 1900 "the Indian middle class and the government were gradually moving apart". It is quite clear here that this process was "gradual" and therefore not extreme at all. This is further supported by the argument that "Indian nationalism was still a movement rather than a force" - the fact it was a "movement" shows that it didn't show serious opposition. Opposition only seems to be implied by the fact that people after 1905 were "deeply stirred". A limitation of the scope of this source is the fact that it does not outline



((b) continued)

what the situation was after 1905. We have here to look at source 15, which argues that disappointment over the failure of the Hindu's scheme shows an intensified the prevailing feeling of discontent - this shows that the feeling was widespread then before. My own knowledge can back this up by saying that serious political challenges to British rule were being established - following the partition of Bengal, politicians such as Lala called for swadeshi and the boycott of British goods and British imports by 25<sup>th</sup> by 1914. Furthermore, <sup>after</sup> the 1906 Simla Deputation, Muslims pressed the All-India Muslim League to challenge the government, and forced them to make concessions in 1909's Indian Council Act to reserve special provisions for Muslims.

Finally, one could also argue that there was no serious opposition at all, a view supported by source 14. Here, it is argued that all attempts to form serious opposition were "ended" by the use of governmental policy: either the <sup>reversal</sup> of

((b) continued)

The Path of Bengal in 1911 or the 1909  
Moley-Minto Reforms. Clearly, this process  
is described as inducing imperial aims.

Also, ~~was also~~ however, is directly argued  
against in source 15, where both the sources  
that general policy could even make  
things worse - in the case of the Minto  
where it was "unnecessarily offensive". However,  
as already explained the political value of  
this speech brings into doubt its reliability.  
However, the fact Congress' membership was  
increasing greatly throughout this period and  
that British were to depart feeling figures  
such as White only served to increase the  
tensions and would lead to Gandhi and  
was relevant to after the war with one exception.

In conclusion, the opposition got greater as  
time went on. This view is supported by  
all the sources - primarily through source  
13 and also through explicitly by source 15  
saying that activities got better and  
people were increased. Source 14 is dubious  
factually and does even acknowledge the  
value of there being greater problems - it  
just does it was to say, for example that

((b) continued)

The result of the Partition of Bengal did not completely justify itself. Indeed, in many cases the development of the Indian League and the increase in Congress were due to a desire to meet a need which was essentially a significant opposition to British rule in India as it was then understood.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is Level 4 in both assessment objectives. There is a clear line of argument that is derived from the sources and used to drive the answer. This is integrated with some specific and detailed own knowledge that suggests the candidate has a secure grasp on the key issues of this period. The sources are thoroughly interrogated in the course of the response.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was very much the more popular of the two questions. The sources worked very well in giving the candidates ample scope to use them in combination and to draw from them a nuanced and cogent argument; the best responses did this in a very impressive way.

A common issue identified in some responses was a tendency to make broad generalisations and a lack of awareness that Gandhi's role altered as time passed.

However, such responses were still often able to find something relevant to say about Gandhi's significance, even where they relied far too heavily on the content of the sources. Source 18 was problematic for some candidates who struggled to locate it chronologically. Many candidates used the whole time period of the question offering relevant own knowledge from each decade. A small number of answers were seen that fell into the trap of providing a narrative of Gandhi's life without explicitly referencing the question. It was disappointing to note that many candidates were still making generic points regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b.

(b) ii)

Plan -

Paragraph 1 - Gandhi was major obstacle in early years  
e.g. constantly trying to perfect Satyagraha called off civil  
disobedience campaign in 1922 after violence

Paragraph 2 - Quit India led to Congress being arrested,  
British less unwilling to cooperate.

Paragraph 3 - Turned congress into mass movement appealed  
to all, rich and poor e.g. early Satyagraha (1917) at Ahmedabad.

Paragraph 4 - demands made by congress ultimately led to  
concessions. e.g. Salt March and Gandhi-Irwin Pact 1931

ii) On one hand, it can be argued that during  
the years 1915-42, Gandhi was a major  
obstacle to the progress of India towards  
independence, yet, alternatively it can be said  
that Gandhi's actions actually served to boost the  
progress towards Indian independence and he was not

India closer towards independence through his  
ability to transform 'the Congress into a mass  
movement' and so put pressure on the British. In



((b) continued) contrast, Source 17 argues that Gandhi was in fact a major obstacle to independence as his beliefs hindered the 'party's progress'. Source 18, largely reflects on the limitations and failures of Gandhi's Quit India Campaign in 1942 and so sees Gandhi to have been a major obstacle in this respect. On the basis of the sources and all evidence, it can be said that although some of Gandhi's actions contained limitations on the progress of Indian independence, ~~but he was~~ ~~been~~ he hardly represented a major obstacle as he was effective in bringing the idea of Indian independence closer.

The less convincing argument maintains the view that during the years 1915-42 Gandhi did represent a major obstacle to Indian independence. This is demonstrated by the tactics that Gandhi ~~put~~ undertook in order to try and achieve Swaraj (self-rule for India). Source 17 highlights that his 'Gandhi's need for spotless moral perfection hindered the party's progress'. This is largely in relation to the policy of Satyagraha that Gandhi insisted that all Indians who wanted self-rule or an independent India should

((b) continued) take in order to ~~the~~ convince the British. The fact that Satyagraha was solely based on the principle of non violence in order to convince your opponent what is morally right was arguably ineffective in pursuing the cause of advancing independence for India as it gave no trouble to the British to put it down as they could easily suppress it. Furthermore, it can be said that Gandhi's strong belief in non-violence ultimately stifled Congress' long term goals for independence. This is demonstrated in source 16 which ~~says~~ <sup>mentions</sup> 'Gandhi called off the non-cooperation campaign in 1922'. Gandhi ultimately called off this non-cooperation campaign involving mass 'hartals' (strikes) against British rule as in 1922 33 Indian policemen were killed by a protest which turned violent in Chauri Chaura. By having called off the campaign, Gandhi arguably restricted its purpose just at the time when it was proving to be ineffective in British rule and so this suggests he was a potential obstacle. However, in evaluation, it must be mentioned that Gandhi's policy of non-violence actually brought about respect from his opponents and so may have made the British more willing to cooperate

((b) continued) with Indian demands

In addition, it can be said that particularly in 1942 Gandhi represented a large obstacle to the progress of Indian independence as his 'Quit India' campaign proved to be ineffective and not actually succeed in its aim to remove the British. This is highlighted in source 18 as 'a ~~very~~ gravely embarrassing India's war effort at a critical time'. The fact that Gandhi called to do this in the middle of World War Two would have greatly angered the British government as they would have likely liked to focus on the war effort rather than this mass campaign. Furthermore, it can be said that the response that the 'Quit India' campaign of 1942 enabled the British to give restricted the progress of Indian independence. This is suggested in source 18, which states 'the punishment from which he suffers is of his own choice' in relation to Gandhi. The campaign proved to be ineffective as within 24 hours the majority of the INC leadership had been arrested and imprisoned with the Congress's funds being frozen.



((b) continued) and offices occupied by the British. From this position for the duration of the War, the INC could not actively press and campaign the British for independence as they were in prison. ~~In addition, the fact that~~ This would have therefore ~~highly~~ limited the progress for independence, however, as a result of the call for 'mass non violent action' despite Congress being jailed, many throughout India went on strikes and made India very difficult to govern thus encouraging the British to leave.

On the other hand, the more convincing argument maintains the view that Gandhi was not an obstacle to Indian independence but instead ~~actively~~ actively progressed the cause. This is highlighted by his ability from 1919 onwards to create a mass movement against the British Imperialist Conf. This is highlighted in source 16 which states that Gandhi transformed the Congress into a mass movement' and source 17 backs this up by saying his 'leadership was an inspiration to millions'. Such strong leadership through his ability to speak to and engage



((b) continued) the masses would have brought all throughout India ~~being~~ behind the call for independence and so progressed the cause. This can be demonstrated by his first Satyagrah's one of which was in Ahmedabad in 1919. By succeeding in this protest to increase the wages of the mill workers, Gandhi proved Congress' beliefs could become a mass movement as he could unite the poor with the rich is further demonstrated in Source 16 which highlights 'Congress' membership was drawn not merely from the elite, but also from the lower reaches of society'. By uniting all, Gandhi could create a mass movement that would effectively restrict the British.

Furthermore, it can be said Gandhi ~~did~~ actually did well to further the case for Indian independence due to his success in a variety of his campaigns. This is demonstrated in Source 16 which states 'Britain's response to the demands made by Congress leaders was to make concessions to Indian opinion. Thus, this suggests Gandhi was effective in achieving concessions from the

((b) continued) British and the best example of this is likely to be Gandhi's salt march of 1930. As part of his salt march to the sea at Dandi, Gandhi hoped to cause the British to change their ~~the~~ laws on salt which gave the British a monopoly in the industry at the expense of the <sup>people</sup> Indian people. This campaign can be seen as highly successful as it ultimately led to the Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931 which was the first time ~~in the~~ that the British had been openly willing to come to an agreement with Congress and thus offer concessions. The pact was therefore a huge success in furthering the Indian campaign for independence as it demonstrated that the British were willing to make concessions to individuals could lead to independence in the future.

In conclusion, although some ~~one~~ maintains that Gandhi remained a significant obstacle to Indian independence, particularly in early years, this view is undermined by the fact that even though ~~that~~ some campaigns such as the Non-Cooperation Campaign 1920-22 had some limitations Gandhi

((b) continued) was still able to unite Congress and further the argument and case for Indian Independence. In addition, although Source 18 states that Gandhi's Quit India campaign heavily restricted the progress for Indian independence, despite Congress being imprisoned it still created mass difficulty for the British. In my respect Source 16 has the most convincing view that during the years 1915-42 Gandhi was not a major obstacle to independence as he was a main factor in the fact that it eventually happened.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response is a strong Level 4 in both assessment objectives. It ranges with impressive confidence across the period of the question, integrating arguments raised by the sources with detailed and specific own knowledge.

# Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

## All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Candidates need to use the terms 'implies' and 'infers' correctly. Candidates should argue that a source implies something and that they, the reader, infer from it.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

## Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Candidates who work through sources sequentially cannot go beyond level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
- The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
- There are no marks available for knowledge in part A. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

## Part B

- Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Some responses relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
- 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.
- 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 and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.



## **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>











Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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