

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

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 2014

Publications Code US039084

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated for their performance this examination series, as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. There was a wide range of responses seen across the mark range.

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

However, it is again disappointing to note that there was a significant 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 understand the language of cross referencing, but did not actually engage fully in the processes of cross referencing, merely asserting agreement or disagreement between sources without explaining its basis. There seemed to be an increase this series in this kind of approach, making it very hard for candidates to move beyond level 2 even where they clearly understand the issues raised by the sources. Also in this series, there appeared to be a 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 these 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 significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always fully understood. In some cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge being used at all. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part (b) questions. Some candidates appeared to view both parts of the examination as relating solely to the use of sources. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. Despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, this issue continues to pose a challenge for many candidates. A significant number of candidates commented to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part (b) in this exam series. Such comments are frequently 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 and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work. There were a number of candidates who used the word 'infer' extensively, without actually understanding its meaning. There also appeared to be an increase in scripts where the handwriting of candidates proved difficult to read this examination series.

## Question 1 (a)

This question worked well and the sources presented few difficulties for candidates, although there were some phrases that were not fully understood or were taken out of context by some candidates such as 'the Government has been foolish' in Source 2. Some excellent answers were seen where candidates were able to cross reference with confidence, consider the implications of the provenance and reach measured judgements in relation to the question. Whilst most candidates attempted to engage in some cross referencing, there was a minority that took a source by source approach with no consideration of the provenance of the sources. There was a tendency in a number of responses to deal with provenance in a rather generic way rather than focusing it clearly on the sources that were represented. Very few candidates appreciated that Source 1 was a letter to a newspaper referencing an article that had appeared in the newspaper.

(a) How far do the sources suggest that the British authorities responded to the <sup>1916</sup> Easter Rising with extreme force?

Source 1 is a letter sent by Bernard Shaw to the Daily News, which in the Shaw voices his opinions over the reaction to the Easter Rising from the British: 'men were shot in cold blood...', here this shows that the reaction from the British was in fact very brutal and left no room for negotiation. After the Easter Rising the British had little time to give to those involved. This is supported from Source two which is from the 'Times newspaper: rebels have been shot and sentence is to be executed'. This again backs up the idea of source 1 that British forces at this point were more than willing to respond with extreme force as the Easter Rising had taken it too far.

Source 1 however is written by Shaw who was Irish himself and sent to an British Newspaper he voices the opinion that 'it was entirely incorrect to slaughter them', it is not surprising that a

((a) continued) Irish man would hold this view point as it was his people that the British would be targeting. Source 2 contradicts this idea by saying 'executions were absolutely necessary to teach the traitors', again it is not surprising that source 2 displays this viewpoint as 'the Times' was a British newspaper.

Source 3 instantly states that 'action in Ireland of the military has aroused bitterness'. Healy and Irish Nationalist has automatically stated the known view that the Easter Rising was absolutely going to create a storm within Britain. Source 3 supports the idea of both 2 and 1 that there was to be mass 'executions of Sinn Féin prisoners' therefore showing that the reaction of the British was in fact the use of extreme force. Source 3 contradicts Source 2. Source explains that the government was not 'stating plainly the reasons why these men were shot', whereas Source 3 says that they had 'been shot under decrees of courts-martial' which supports source 4 which said 'As the Government shot the prisoners first and told the public about it'. This idea of letting the general public know the

(a) continued) force and brutality that the British government were willing to use against those involved in the 1916 Easter Rising was a tactic to show that they were to hold no mercy and that a uprising to that extent was highly unacceptable.

Sources 1, 2, and 3 all agree on the idea that those involved in the Easter Rising were undoubtedly met with extreme force by the British. Source 1 explains that 'there was no room opportunity for effective protest' after the first executions, showing that the British were not giving any way in for extreme violence to outbreak once again. Source 2 contradicts both 1 and 3 by saying 'it is wrong to represent this punishment as excessive', however as the source is written by a British newspaper so it is unlikely that it would agree with the fact their tactics were too forceful, which is in fact the truth. The executions of many Sinn Féiners showed the degree of force which was used by the British forces was entirely excessive, with all the sources agreeing.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 3 response. It engages in some developed cross referencing, although not all opportunities for this are taken. There is some consideration of the provenance and this is integrated into the argument although it is not extensive.

### **Question 1 (b) (i)**

This question was answered by the majority of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use these together with varying amounts of own knowledge to produce a range of responses. Many candidates were more effective on either pre-1882 or post-1882. The most impressive responses clearly understood the dividing line provided by the date in the question and were able to develop a range of valid arguments that focused on the significance of events before and after this date. Weaker responses generally relied very heavily on the sources and provided very limited evidence of knowledge beyond what was there. Some candidates were unsure as to the date of Parnell's death which led them to credit him with the Second Home Rule Bill and, in a few cases, also with the Third. It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

(b) Do you agree with the view that Parnell made his most significant contribution to the cause of Irish nationalism in the period after 1882?

The cause of Irish nationalism during the time period after 1882 was subject to a extensive amount of change. Not only was this change a necessity but a long time in coming especially with to those who rented land. It could be said that the extent <sup>to which</sup> the changes that were brought to Irish Nationalism were in fact due to the leadership of Parnell who made it his issue to fight for the rights of tenants. With the issuing of land league and development of the three Fs Irish Nationalism was moved along and Parnell could have been the catalyst in this development.

Source 4 plainly states suggests that Parnell was 'a practical politician' during the period after 1882. Parnell was successful in making speeches and gaining electoral support for his party. Creating a strong backing for his party was the first step in creating a significant contribution to the cause of Irish nationalism. He was the first one of the first to turn 'Home Rule from a vague ideal into a practical politics'. This was crucially important.

(b) continued) towards Irish Nationalists as it was the first stepping stone towards the fight for an independent Ireland. It could be said that Parnell was the leading man in creating the fight for Home Rule in which key political leaders such as Gladstone, Collins and De Valera could all build upon. In the General Election of 1882, it was shown the extent of Parnell's backing as they were a clear majority showing that the changes less that could be made were near enough inevitable.

On the other hand it could be said that Parnell made little contribution after these years.

Source 5 shows that 'agrarian distress worsened', and 'evictions multiplied', this shows the extent to which Parnell had to right the wrongs of those tenants facing unfair landlords. It was of 'vital importance' ~~the~~ 'importance' that 'Parnell exploited the vital issue of land', the main issue in Ireland at this point was the issue of land. Ireland had already faced poor harvests and it was apparent that tenants were the victims of unfair landlords. Due to Parnell's extensive protesting and the support drew off leading Fenians it was a success in the idea that Gladstone passed 'a Land Bill' - which gave tenants 'the famous 'three Fs'. This was a huge stepping stone in the development of Irish Nationalism which was led by Parnell.

On the other hand it could be seen that the

((b) continued) Land Bill which was passed and the 3Fs which were a result of the Bill were in fact useless to many tenant farmers. The terms of the 3Fs were not entirely clear; those tenants who had rented land for more than 30 years were exempt from the 3Fs and were still victims to their landlords. Those who wanted to buy their land could not afford to repay their loans so were moved no further forward, and many landlords failed to change their ways as punishment was not seen through as many landlords knew those in parliament, therefore could manage to negotiate and keep rent high. ~~Therefore~~ It was also the work of many Fenians such as Davitt and the overruling leadership of Gladstone who managed to pass the bill. As a result it is unclear as to the extent of Parnell's contribution and the changes made to the use of land.

Source 6 from Michael Davitt explains the way in which Ireland at this point under Parnell's ruling was very much 'ungovernable', and that suggesting that Parnell had a long way to go to settle a country under so much unrest. Davitt describes 'the Kilmainham Treaty was a political defeat for the forces led by Parnell', ~~at least~~ The Kilmainham Treaty failed in its way to change much of the conditions for Irish Nationalists and instead caused more political unrest. This was a massive failure

((b) continued) in the eyes of the Fenians. Davitt describes Parnell's aim to defect and destroy landlordism as a failure. It wasn't until the early 1900s that the issue of landlordism had changed to an extent to make any more improvement. The Land Act of 1912 made a considerable difference to the lives of tenants. Source 6 undeniably questions the extent to which how significant Parnell's contribution to Irish Nationalism was.

It is not a surprise however that Davitt as a Fenian leader would disagree to the significance of Parnell's contribution to the change of Irish Nationalism. So this could indeed be a bias report.

Overall the source agree with the idea that Parnell made a significant contribution towards the change of Irish Nationalism. Source 4 agrees with source 5 in the idea that Parnell was a 'practical politician', and managed to 'exploit the ~~the~~ vital issue of land' resulting in the Land Bill and 3Fs and even though the 3Fs may not have made considerable change at the time they were undoubtedly significant in showing that the lives of tenants and the deconstruction of landlordism was at the forefront of Irish politics during Parnell's leadership. Source 6 provides evidence that Parnell was a popular figure 'abundant

((b) continued) 'Friends and ample power', which appears to contradict the overall source as it shows that Parnell's popularity would go a long way in achieving his contribution to the significant change he made to Irish Nationalism. Therefore it is no question that the contribution to Irish Nationalism was in fact highly significant and Parnell paved the way for many more Irish Home Rule leaders to succeed in making greater change.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response takes a source by source approach paraphrasing the content of each source in turn and using some relevant own knowledge to develop what is in the source. This makes it very difficult to pick up on the key date of 1882 and the answer is not well focused on this. This response achieved a low level 3 for AO1 and level 2/3 margins for AO2.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

It is a good idea to plan answers so that the organisation of the essay avoids a source by source approach which makes developed argument more tricky.

## Question 1 (b) (ii)

This question was answered by only a small number of candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. In view of the limited own knowledge that most responses displayed on this topic, the sources were the basis for the answers produced by many of the candidates attempting this question. There were very few impressive answers seen to this question.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

\* (b) (ii) Do you agree with the view that the Cultural Revival of the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century had a 'significant political impact'?

Cultural revival in Ireland was a good campaign to keep Irish traditions alive and not become history. Its effects on politics however was considerable but not entirely significant.

Source Seven, a Secondary Source from a historian, argues strongly that the revival of Irish culture was a significant impact on politics. "Transmitted new ideas" is a good piece of evidence that shows new ideas were being adopted by people and even enough to attract the Fenian movement into political affairs. The Fenians strong numbers helped provide support for politicians who adopted Irish cultural revival ideas. With the strength of the Fenians military force alongside politics makes them a formidable force. The GAA also allowed everyday people to become involved in a non violent battle against the English. These sports would often get people not normally interested in politics more involved due to the nature of games. Source one seven provides evidence which does show that cultural revival did in fact have an impact on politics but not a significant impact.

Source eight discredits Source seven by stating "non-political organisation". This in theory would suggest it would have no involvement & therefore no effect on politics. The Gaelic League was an attempt to rise above politics and therefore attract both members of former Unionists & Nationalists. The Gaelic League did have success which must indicate that it had some impact on politics if it managed to join both sides together.

Source nine agrees with Source eight in stating that importance that the Cultural Revival is "no political matter". Source nine repeats the significant fact that is not a political affair with "whatever our politics", "whatever his politics", & "for this is no political matter". The success of Cultural Revival shows that it must have had impact on politics whether or not it was meant to be a political situation. "encouraging Irish nationalism" corroborates Source seven's argument about one feature. An encouragement in nationalism is likely to lead some Irish people to join one faction group & ultimately put more pressure on politics and its motives. Source nine basically discredits itself by supporting Source seven and showing that Cultural Revival would lead to nationalism which would then result in some nationalists becoming more violent towards politics.

((b) continued) Meaning Source mixes original argument of disagreeing  
with the question at hand ~~actually lead to do~~  
is actually ~~cast~~ a side when looking further into it's  
~~Comments~~ Statements.

Based on the evidence from the sources I do  
not agree that there was significant impact on  
politics from cultural revival. However ~~there~~ it would  
be wrong to suggest it had no impact at all.

Each source indicates in some way that revival  
of Irish culture would have impact on politics &  
even two different sources corroborated each other,  
that being sources Seven & Nine. Although source  
eight does not <sup>corroborate</sup> ~~corroborate~~ <sup>non</sup> contradict one other  
<sup>two</sup> sources, it does still suggest that the Gaelic  
League had an impact on Nationalists & Unionists  
& even bring the two together. Therefore I agree  
cultural revival did have an impact on politics in  
the late nineteenth century however not a significant  
one.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is clearly using the sources for information only and whilst there is some implicit analysis it is derived from the sources. This is level 2 in both assessment objectives.

## Question 2 (a)

Candidates clearly found all of the sources accessible and many recognised that they could be seen to both support the view expressed in the question and to offer alternative explanations. Most candidates attempted to cross reference in their responses; at the lower levels this generally involved taking the sources at face value and matching quotes, whilst at the higher levels, candidates were able to make nuanced points based on the sources. There were relatively few candidates approaching this question on a source by source basis. Most candidates attempted to consider the provenance, but at the lower levels this tended to amount to assertions and generalised comments such as 'Source 10 is biased because it is by Gandhi'. Some candidates also experienced some difficulty in locating the Round Table Conference. A significant minority of candidates misspelled Gandhi; it is important that well known names, especially when actually the author of one of the sources, should be correctly spelled.

(a) The second Round Table Conference hoped to provide more concessions and discuss either independence or Dominion status. However, the conference soon collapsed, with Gandhi blamed for his poor political skills, although one could also blame Congress and the lack of Muslim representation.  
agreement with Hindus.

As source 12 mentions, Gandhi was 'out of his depth' at Congress. This was due to him being a 'poor political negotiator' and 'claiming to speak for Muslims.' The reason for Gandhi being out of his depth is referenced in Source 10, a statement by himself. He ~~conceded~~ he 'tried to act as a mediator; without success.' This shows both mentioned sources comprise the view that Gandhi's 'poor

((a) continued)

Political Skills were responsible for the break up of the Second Round Table Conference

However, not all sources go for the view that it was Gandhi's 'poor political skills. In contrast to Source 12, Barns (Source 11) indirectly blames Congress for the collapse.

It states that Gandhi have 'taken courage into his own hands' and 'in defiance of Hindu leaders', reach a 'settlement with the Muslims'.

~~This would be~~ whilst one could say this is poor political skills, it is more to the contrary, with many ~~not~~ politicians not wanting to risk angering their party. As such, by not having a 'settlement' with Muslims, Source 12 correctly points that Gandhi could not claim to represent '95 ninety-five per cent of India. As such, it can also be argued that Congress's failure to negotiate with Muslims, ~~as the reason~~

(a) continued) for the failure of the Second Round Table Conference.

★ therefore a lack of a Muslim-Hindu agreement, as the reason

In conclusion, I feel the sources do agree that it was Gandhi's poor political skills as the reason for the collapse of the Second Round Table Conference. However, I feel source 11 does represent a fuller view, highlighting the lack of a Muslim-Hindu agreement as having also contributed.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is clearly a level 2 response. There is some understanding of the issues, but the answer makes a series of statements that do not amount to cross referencing of the sources. Provenance is not considered. This response lacks both the depth and the range that is required for level 3.

## **Question 2 (b) (i)**

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. The source that posed the biggest problem to candidates was Source 15, which was not always used as effectively as the other two sources. Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge of this period, although this varied greatly in range and depth, writing about the partition of Bengal, the First World War, Rowlatt Acts and Amritsar. Where candidates linked this knowledge securely to the focus of the question and argued in both directions, they were able to produce highly effective responses. A number of candidates tended to focus on the post-war period, and a significant number of descriptions of events at Amritsar were seen.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

\* (b) The turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century saw the death of Queen Victoria, and began the slow march to eventual independence for India. Indian nationalism sky-rocketed, and the cause of this is of much debate. Some point to British repression as the cause of this, although one can also mention World War I, Montagu-Chelmsford reforms and cooperation between Congress and the Muslim League for the cause of Indian nationalism growth.

Britain was regarded as a morally upholding ruler, especially when compared to other Imperialistic countries. However, as mentioned by leader of the Labour Party, representing <sup>the</sup> majority working class, repression will only intensify the determination to secure self-government. He used the controversial partition of Bengal

((b) continued) as an example. Whilst the cause was to make administration of the province easier, it did create a Muslim majority in the Northern section. This meant that if elections were held, Muslims would win seats. This greatly antagonised Congress, and Hindu-Muslim relations. Many felt it represented the policy of divide and rule. Refusal to acknowledge any issues until 1911 showed British Repression as helping to kick-start Indian Nationalism.

When Source 13 mentioned Repression increasing a desire for self-governance, as the cause little did it realise ten years later that the Amritsar Massacre would occur. Following a gathering of 1600 Indians, which was deemed illegal, General Dyer felt force had to be used. Soldiers began firing on the crowd, not stopping until all 600 bullets were fired. 328 were immediately killed, with

((b) continued) 1200 wounded. As one historian mentioned, it was a 'small mercy' that the German tank would not fit. British ~~at~~ morality was on its ~~in~~ knees, and as Source 14 mentions, 'Indian nationalist opinion was devastated'. The light reprimand in the Hunter Inquiry and British reaction to General Dyer's actions only made matters worse, and as both Source 13 and 14 state, only increased the growth of Indian Nationalism and self-governance.

However, it was not merely British Repression which was the cause of the growth of Indian Nationalism but also World War I. As Source 15 states, the army increased from 120,000 to 400,000 ~~strengthening~~ 'strengthening Indian Society'. Furthermore, many Muslims struggled to fight the Ottoman Empire as the sultan was considered head of the Muslims. Finally,

((b) continued) The prolonged war embarrassed the Government, making them appear incompetent and as such, World War I shows that it was not just British repression, but also the use of Indian soldiers as the cause for the growth for Indian Nationalism.

It was not just the war that caused growth, but cooperation between Muslims and Hindus. As Source 15 highlights, Congress and the Muslim League were united behind 'common nationalist cause; break the famed policy of divide and rule'. The co-operation forced a new Government of India Act, known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms. The hope was power would be conceded, and a date for self-governance. However, the power released was minimal, and with a mere promise of discussions for a date ten

((b) continued) years later, Indian Nationalism  
saw. As such, the failure  
to make sufficient concessions  
caused Indian Nationalism to  
grow to unmatched levels.

In conclusion, I feel that  
British repression did cause  
Indian Nationalism to grow.  
The Amritsar Massacre ensured  
Britain forever lost its war  
ground. However, the opportunity  
to fix matters through the  
war and concessions was  
missed, causing India to  
finally gain independence in 1947.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is level 2 in both assessment objectives. It makes a series of statements that are not always clearly linked to each other. Most points made are raised from the sources which have been paraphrased. Whilst it understands the broad approach that is required in this question, it lacks development and explanation and most of the own knowledge is very generalised.

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

This question was answered by about half of the candidates, most of whom found the sources accessible and were able to use them to create a debate about the issues. Some very impressive answers were seen to this question where candidates took the issues raised by the sources and developed them with excellent own knowledge to produce measured judgements in response to the question. Most candidates were able to discuss the roles played by both Jinnah and Congress, although many did not go beyond these two elements to consider any other factors. However, responses were also seen where the candidates had very limited own knowledge and relied heavily on paraphrasing the content of the sources, not always with a secure understanding of their message.

It was disappointing to note that once again this year many candidates were still making generic points, some at great length, regarding provenance which cannot be rewarded under AO2b. This issue has been highlighted in previous reports, but the continuing practice disadvantages candidates who spend time that would be more usefully spent on focusing on the question.

\* (b) Jinnah can be considered responsible for partition due to the fact that it was he who incessantly demanded it and brought it up in the first place. However, to some extent it was the role of the British government, Viceroy Mountbatten and Congress that led to partition by making the Muslims feel as though they were not represented enough in the 70% Hindu dominated India.

Source 16 agrees with the statement by suggesting that it was the Muslim League, led by Jinnah, who suggested the notion of separateness in the first place. Indeed, source 16 says 'the areas in which Muslims are numerically in majority', giving the examples of the North-West and the East of India, 'should be grouped to constitute independent states in which the units within them should be autonomous.' This suggests in a meeting ~~over~~ of over 100,000 Muslims in Lahore, Jinnah first alluded to his idea of Muslim separation from the Hindu majority. He also says that 'no constitutional plan could be workable or acceptable to the Muslims unless such territorial readjustments as may be necessary are made'. ~~This was the first of~~ This was the first of Jinnah's <sup>incessant</sup> demands for separateness. Indeed, he ~~rejected the proposals of~~ <sup>but rather</sup> first disliked <sup>but reluctantly agreed to</sup> the proposals of the

((b) continued) Cabinet Mission because it didn't offer separate states straight away, but thought that they could democratically come about through plebiscites asking if the regional groupings wished to secede and become independent. However, Jinnah was responsible for the partition as he tirelessly pressed ahead with it due to the fact that his health was failing, but he wanted to be Pakistan's first leader. Source 17 agrees with <sup>source 16</sup> the statement by saying that 'he was... arguing tactically for more than he really thought possible or desirable in order to achieve more than a realistic demand could'. This suggests that although the Lahore Resolution may have ~~was~~ been a tactical demand, it led to the partition of India due to the fact that he ~~achieved~~ set it in to the minds of the 100,000 Muslims ~~to~~ listening, and just made the idea of separatism a concept. This was more than separate electorates he had argued for, ~~but~~ including ~~at~~ at the Lucknow Pact in 1916, ~~but this~~ as it was ~~more than~~ separation.\* Indeed, Jinnah also led to the partition of India with his call for direct action days in August 1946. He thought that he had exhausted constitutional methods and called for the fate of Pakistan to be decided in the streets ~~at~~ by the mob. However, there escalated horrific violence from this.

((b) continued) ~~At its height,~~ the hartal in Calcutta <sup>led</sup> to a march of 100,000 people at its height. The Calcutta Riots followed, in which 6,000 people died, as the crowd had armed themselves with lathis and sticks. Three days and nights of killing, lynching and arson followed until the troops could finally suppress it. This Jinnah's call for Direct Action Day led to partition ~~because~~ because it suggested that partition was necessary in order to avoid such communal violence. Direct Action Day was the slippery slope for the communal partition, <sup>it made</sup> the British ~~also~~ want to leave India as soon as possible, because it seemed like a civil war was approaching and they didn't want to be a part of it. This was because they didn't have ~~the~~ <sup>enough</sup> enough troops or enough money to sustain the Indian army, which was already costing them £1.5 million a year. It took 57 infantry battalions to suppress Quit India, and ~~this~~ <sup>was</sup> a civil war is much bigger, so ~~this~~ Jinnah's Direct Action Day led to partition because the British were scared of an approaching civil war.

\* However, source 16 cannot have much weight put on it because it was seven years before partition, and as source 17 says 'it was powerfully unclear'. The Muslim League could arguably ~~not~~ be more

the Lahore Resolution  
(b) continued) radical in addressing a large ~~crowd~~ crowd,  
because they wanted to use it to bargain.

However, source 18 <sup>of</sup> disagrees with <sup>sources 16 and 17 and</sup> the statement,  
suggesting that it was Congress who ~~helped~~ caused  
~~assist~~ partition because they were too stubborn. It  
says that partition was 'greatly assisted by the  
continued blunders of the Congress leaders', particularly  
when they rejected the Cabinet Mission's proposals  
for a federal solution to India's communal problem.  
It said that 'once the Cabinet Mission had failed,  
the partition of India ~~was~~ had become virtually  
inevitable'. This suggests that ~~partition was inevitable~~  
Congress led to partition because they didn't  
accept proposals which could have prevented  
partition. The League hadn't rejected the Cabinet  
Mission's proposals, as source 18 says, 'Jinnah...  
had reluctantly accepted it'. This suggests that  
it was only Congress who stood in the way of a  
peaceful 'federal solution to India's communal  
problems'. Indeed, they continued to ~~ignore~~ ~~+~~  
reject the fact that Muslims ~~wanted~~ wanted separate  
representation. ~~Ext~~ This is apparent at the 1931  
second round table conference, when Gandhi  
claimed to speak on behalf of them, and <sup>at</sup> in the  
Simla Conference in 1946 when they refused that

((b) continued) Muslims needed electoral safeguards to protect their interests. However, Congress was massively Hindu dominated and had shown that from as early as 1905 when they were outraged at the deliberate creation of a Muslim majority province in the 1905 partition of Bengal. They also showed it in the 1946 Indian elections when they refused to include any Muslim representatives. ~~It~~ when they were successful in the 1937 elections, they led to partition by showing Muslims what it would be like to live under a Hindu Raj. They were very disrespectful to Muslim interests and in Bihar cow slaughter was even banned. Congress flags were also ~~hoisted~~ put on buildings. <sup>gandhi's flag</sup> Muslims felt threatened by the special relationship between Congress and labour, which fuelled Jinnah's desire for separatism because they had no such special relationship with the Raj and felt underrepresented. Indeed, Mountbatten was very close to Nehru, which antagonised Jinnah, and politically favoured him by giving him a preview of Plan Balkan on holiday together in Simla. \* (continued next page)

Overall, the sources agree with the statement as they suggest that Pakistan came from Jinnah's conception in the first place. They suggest that if Jinnah hadn't have brought it up it

((b) continued) wouldn't have been considered. <sup>16</sup> Source 16 is his first mention of separateness and source 17 suggests that it was ~~to~~ his fault, even though ~~to~~ it ~~was~~ perhaps was more than he bargained for. Although source 18 suggests Congress could also be held responsible, it says that they 'assisted' Jinnah, who had already called for a separate Pakistan.

~~\*(continued from previous page)~~ This shows that Lady Mountbatten was also said to be having an affair with Nehru, which was another link between Congress and ~~to~~ the British. Mountbatten also was anxious of independence being quick due to the interruption in his naval career and the imminent royal marriage of his cousin, ~~so~~ so he was perhaps hasty in ~~giving~~ doing the 'easiest' option, ~~and~~ which seemed like giving Jinnah what he wanted. Source ~~18~~ 18 also says 'Jinnah seemed to prepared to agree to ~~a~~ less than a fully sovereign Pakistan provided Muslim interests were safeguarded. However, Congress made it obvious that they did not want separate electorates and were an umbrella organisation for all. Therefore, ~~other~~ ~~pe~~ source 18 suggests that Congress played a role in partition by fuelling Jinnah's opinion that Muslims were better off out of a unified India, because their interests could not be

((b) continued) fully listened to or respected, because they were only a minority at 20% of the population.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response clearly understands the focus of the question and uses the sources to drive an argument which is supported by some detailed own knowledge. There is clear evidence of the issue being debated and a judgement being reached. AO1 is level 4 and the sources, which are not quite fully activated, is at the level 3/4 margins.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

It can be helpful practice to reference the core arguments in the sources in the introduction, in order to shape the direction of the essay.

## Paper Summary

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

### All Questions

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. Too many candidates are using phrases such as 'using the sources as a set', without actually engaging in that task.

### 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 work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. 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 and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable without coming to any judgement on its worth.
4. 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.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part (a). Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

### Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. 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. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
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 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.
4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified. They should maintain the focus throughout their answer and 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