

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2010

### GCE History 6HI02/D

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

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

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

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

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

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

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



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022890

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## GCE History 6HI02 Option D

There were some very good responses to this examination, with a sizeable number of candidates able to combine effective source handling skills with focused deployment of accurate and relevant own knowledge to achieve marks at level 3 and above. It was encouraging to see that many of the issues which had been identified in the summer report as posing problems for students were no longer causes for concern. However, there were still some common errors which undermined the quality of students' work and the purpose of the following comments is to offer some guidance for raising attainment.

1. Some candidates continue to lose marks because they seem unaware of the skills that specific elements of the exam are addressing. Overall 3 assessment objectives are being addressed in the Unit 2 exam; part (a) addresses AO2a (analysis, cross-referencing and evaluation of source material) and part (b) addresses AO1 and AO2b (analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context). It is vital, therefore, that students appreciate the differences between these assessment objectives and understand which of the 3 AO's is being tested in the two questions they are required to attempt.

2. The most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively. Occasionally, this was the result of limited vocabulary. However, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. It is important that candidates take time to read the sources, both content and attributions, carefully and precisely. One of the key characteristics of high performing responses to part (a) questions is detailed cross-referencing and this, first and foremost, demands clarity and accuracy in source comprehension.

3. One other area of confusion in the part (a) question surrounds the application of wider knowledge. Candidates cannot be rewarded for wider knowledge included in responses to part (a), since the questions target AO2 only. However, candidates should not ignore the historical context, or 'pretend they know nothing' outside the sources. At best, the placing of sources in a contextual vacuum may lead to a tendency to take them at face value and restrict responses to L1 or L2, or to speculation that is not focused on the defined enquiry. Therefore contextual awareness, especially an understanding of issues and attitudes, should be applied in order to help candidates:

- See the implications of statements within a source and make inferences relating to the enquiry –
- See the significance of the information given in the provenance of a source as a means of interpreting and evaluating the evidence offered by the source content. However, it should be emphasised that any references should be brief, and directly applied to developing arguments from the sources.

Contextual knowledge therefore plays a role in enabling candidates to interpret and evaluate evidence in order to reach higher levels, but it cannot be rewarded by separate marks. A brief reference may be useful in explaining the implications of a particular piece of evidence or the significance of its provenance and therefore support higher level arguments within AO2. Longer passages of contextual knowledge are a waste of time and may actually lead the candidate away from the task – which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources, in order to reach a judgement. However, candidates should not be discouraged from applying contextual awareness in handling the sources.

4. For part (b) questions it is important that candidates appreciate what they are being asked to do. A Part (b) task focuses on combining and integrating evidence from sources with wider knowledge in order to evaluate a given statement or view, and develop a substantiated judgement on this basis. It, therefore, draws on a conceptual understanding that all historical judgements are, in fact, based upon interpretations. Thus, candidates should analyse the evidence of the source material to support and challenge the representation in the question. The sources should be approached as a set and there will be some cross-referencing of evidence between sources and/or between sources and contextual knowledge to develop relevant arguments. At higher levels, conflicting arguments will be evaluated by reference to context and provenance to attempt to establish an overall judgement. However, it is important here that candidates do not engage in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation. Thus, in the best responses discussion will proceed on the basis of reasoning from the sources and discriminating use of evidence that has been weighed and contextualised to examine conflicting arguments and reach a reasoned conclusion.

5. Both part (a) and part (b) tasks are challenging, requiring candidates to engage in complex cross-referencing and analysis. To meet the assessment objectives effectively requires careful preparation and it is noticeable that more and more of the higher performing scripts include substantial plans. It cannot, therefore, be stressed enough that thorough and detailed planning centred around the source material is a prerequisite for success in this unit.

### Question 1a

This was an accessible question and candidates were able to understand the basic message of all the sources and link them to the focus of the question. Many candidates were able to identify valid points relating to the provenance, with stronger answers demonstrating more awareness of the possibility of alternative approaches e.g. source 2 is apparently a private letter, but was also sent to a constituent, possibly negating any expectation of privacy. A number of candidates worked through the sources sequentially, paraphrasing the content and making some links to the question. Some of these merely restated the provenance, but others were able to comment on it within this approach. Stronger responses engaged in direct cross referencing, contrasting the message of sources 1 and 3 with that of source 2. The best candidates addressed the sources as a set, demonstrating the nuances of the arguments and considering the provenance as part of the process in order to demonstrate the weight that can be assigned to each source in reaching a judgement.

(a) How far do 1 and 3 support 2 ~~that~~ in defense of the Black and Tans? 14AbAO2

2 → Some Fin. at fault  
→ Black B + Ts only reacted

Lt Col George

→ NOP → shows the attitude of the BTs

1 → idea of revenge

→ supports LG, but LG said SF had done more → one to fire

LG presents them as more moderate, as victims

3 → presents B and Ts as cruel, many unprofessional (drinking)  
- women and children → Irish are the victims

→ sources agree that the B and Ts took action, but present it in different ways

((a) continued)

In Lloyd George's letter he speaks in defense of the actions of the Black and Tans, presenting them as ~~the~~ victims who ~~were~~ acted in <sup>just</sup> defense, and ~~the~~ Sinn Féin as murderers. He says that the IRA 'cruelly assassinated' <sup>over a hundred</sup> members of the police, and therefore that the Black and Tans was justified in 'striking a blow in their own defence'. Source 1 is a notice posted by the Black and Tans themselves, and ~~is different~~ although it presents a similar view that they were exacting just revenge - 'an eye for an eye' - their own propaganda in fact proves them to seem more cruel than Lloyd George suggests.

They describe how they would take the lives of 'five leading Sinn Féiners' in return for that of one policeman, and would 'lay low every house that smells of Sinn Féin'. This suggests that they were acting more harshly than Lloyd George suggests,

((a) continued) as they took more lives in return for those that were taken from them, which goes further even than 'an eye for an eye' and venetian

They seem much more vindictive <sup>and vengeful</sup> than Lloyd George suggests. I am inclined to give this view more weight than that presented by Lloyd George, as he was a unionist who should be expected to be biased against the IRA, and favour the Black and Tans who were working for the government. It would not look good for him to condemn the actions of ~~a~~ government forces, especially to a constituent whose vote he would like to count on. ~~The~~ Source ~~or~~ 1 on the other hand is from the Black and Tans themselves, and therefore shows their vindictive attitude (they even say they are acting out of revenge), and this <sup>presentation of their</sup> attitude can be ~~not~~ trusted, as it is from them themselves. ~~The Black and Tans~~

~~The~~ Source 1 is not entirely opposed to Source 2, as it still presents the Black and Tans as being in the right, but it gives a slightly different impression of the way in which they acted.

Source 3 ~~is~~ does not present the Black and Tans as victims, as source 2 does, or as rightful avengers, as source

1 does, but presents the Irish as victims. He describes the Black and Tans as acting outside of the law they claimed to uphold, 'looting' ~~the~~, 'week long', and 'bussing shop after shop'. He describes the Irish as 'terrified women and children', rather than 'louts and ragamuffins' as source 1 does, or 'assassin[s]' as source 2 does. This source is written by an English journalist who ~~was probably~~ <sup>could have been</sup> ~~there~~ at the time, or who had heard eye-witness accounts, as he wrote this at the time, in 1920. However, we cannot use this to give more weight to the source's claim, as it does not say. Despite this, he is an English journalist, and perhaps this gives his argument credibility; he is arguing on the side of the Irish, despite the fact that he is English.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response engages in sustained cross referencing across all three sources. Despite one factual error, the provenance is considered in a way that demonstrates that the candidate is using it to judge the weight that can be given to each source. This is a secure level 4.



### Question 1(b)(i)

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options with slightly more attempting this question. The sources were accessible and candidates understood the basic line of argument that they presented. Better candidates were able to distinguish between the approaches taken in the different sources e.g. the different emphasis implied by the use of "arrogance" in sources 4 and 6. Many weaker responses worked through the sources sequentially, paraphrasing the content and making some links to the question. Some of these responses did display some evidence of contextual knowledge but a substantial number relied almost exclusively on what was contained in the sources. A number of candidates were able to distinguish between the public and private aspects of Parnell's career, with many candidates addressing the Kitty O'Shea affair and concluding that despite the moral outrage at Parnell's behaviour, he did not fundamentally damage the cause of Home Rule. Stronger answers were able to range across Parnell's career, integrating the strands that were identified in the sources with developed arguments from their own knowledge and arriving at a reasoned conclusion.

(b) Do you agree that Parnell's leadership damaged the cause of the Irish Home Rule?

Charles Stuart Parnell was a constitutional nationalist who reached 'a new peak' in the 1890s, whilst more radical than his predecessor Brian Isaac Butt, Parnell still remained within the legal refinements of the law. He was a Protestant landowner who was working for the Irish Home Rule cause. Parnell's leadership can be seen as a great influence on the cause of the Irish Home Rule but when his 'private life' emerged, it 'brought down his career and his cause together'. Source 4

Source 4 is an extract from a book published in 1980 and is very positive about Parnell's leadership it does not seem to think that Parnell damaged the cause of the Irish Home Rule unlike source 6 which is an extract of a book published in 1963. Source 6 thinks that Parnell's private life and 'arrogant refusal to resign' damaged the 'Home Rule movement'. Source 5 on the other hand is from B. Gladstone himself 'introducing the Home Rule Bill

to the House of Commons in April 1886. It is very supportive of Parnell's constitutional means, but perhaps <sup>because</sup> this is before the Kitty O'Shea affair became publicly known. At the time that source 5 was written, Parnell was still rapidly rising in popularity.

((b) continued) Source 6 ~~states~~ <sup>states</sup> that Parnell had 'reached a new peak' in 1890. At this stage Parnell's leadership seems to be helping to influence decisions with his 'forceful style' winning 'attention at Westminster and in Ireland'. However, 'the disclosure of Parnell's private life' meant the end to Parnell's career within the Home Rule Movement. The accusation that he had been having an affair with a married woman (Kitty O'Shea, wife of Captain O'Shea) was considered to be scandalous. R. Emmet talks of 'his arrogant refusal to resign' meant that the Home Rule Movement was torn apart. His oratorical skills were no use when his affair came to light.

Whilst it is true that once the affair became known Parnell's Home Rule career was over, sources 4 and 5 show what a dramatic impact he had upon the Irish Home Rule cause before the 1890s. A.C. Hepburn shows that he managed to influence 'ex-ferriars in Irish-America who had nothing but contempt for constitutional nationalism'. Parnell's arrogance, is seen in source 4, as a positive thing (unlike source 6) because it helped to win over Westminster and Ireland. Parnell's radical

language helped him weave together the Fenian strand along with the revolutionary nationalists and Home Rule constitutional nationalists such as Isaac Butt <sup>+ more importantly Gladstone</sup>. Whilst some methods, such as obstructionism, were not

(b) continued) ~~Always supported by the movement~~ always completely necessary. It did show the determination of these people to get what they wanted. Parnell was always 'clearly and constitutionally spoken' with an ability to take an opportunity. He was able to 'stimulate (in) grass-roots organisation and capture the imagination of revolutionary elements at home and abroad'. Therefore, it can be argued that he did not damage the movement at the beginning, only in the 1890s.

Even though his affair and 'arrogant refusal to resign' did damage the party in the late 1800s, in 1912, a third and final Home Rule Bill was passed. This gave Irish people more autonomy under British Rule and it eventually culminated in the Anglo-Irish treaty. Whilst it can be argued that Ireland (even <sup>to this</sup> present day) ~~is~~ never fully received Home Rule as the North was partitioned, it could be said that the North never really wanted total devolution of ~~the~~ British Power.

It could be stated therefore that during Parnell's time as 'president of the National Land League' and as a leading constitutional nationalist for Home

Rule, 'he was able to create a united movement' that was able to peacefully persuade British parliament to pass Home Rule legislation. During ((b) continued) his time as leader, he was able to unite all Home Rule movement groups - something that was never achieved again - and consequently was very influential on the Home Rule movement - not least because he was one of a few MPs allowed to actually sit at Westminster, whilst his private life ultimately damaged the Home Rule movement, it could be argued that it only slightly damaged it as it passed the Third Home Rule Bill in 1912.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response approaches the question analytically, integrating the sources and own knowledge very well, especially in the first part of the response. It deals with a number of different elements of the argument. The sources are cross referenced in places and the points derived from the sources are well developed. Despite the fact that there is some repetition in the later stages of the response, this answer has done sufficient to be awarded level 4 for both assessment objectives.

**Question 1(b)(ii)**

Answers were fairly evenly divided between the two options with slightly fewer attempting this question. The sources were accessible and candidates were able to understand their basic line of argument although some had difficulties with source 8. On the other hand, the high-minded nature of Redmond's source was grasped by almost all candidates. Weaker responses tended to work through the sources sequentially, selecting points taken at face value from the sources and lacking the detailed knowledge required to develop them. Contextual knowledge tended to be generalised and because the sources were treated discretely, responses frequently did not develop contrasts between the conflicting groups. Stronger responses cross referenced sources 7 and 8 to demonstrate the existence of conflict and went on to compare this to the counter argument represented by Redmond in source 9. This would be integrated with contextual knowledge to develop the argument. Most candidates concentrated on the period immediately before the First World War, but some answers went back further in time. Either approach was a valid response to this question.

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

(b)(ii) By 1914 it was possible to achieve a political settlement without civil war this is shown in source 9 it says 'armed nationalist Catholics in the south will gladly join forces with armed Protestant Ulstermen in the north.' This shows that the ~~Irish~~ Irish Volunteers were willing to join forces with the Ulster Volunteers to defend Ireland against Germany, this shows that the two sides were willing to unite and co-operate which is the complete opposite to civil war.

In 1914 the Home Rule Bill was actually made law this shows that political settlement without civil war was possible as ~~the~~ the bill had been passed and had it not been for the war then the bill may have stayed, but due to the act passed 3 days ~~earlier~~ earlier Home Rule was postponed till after the war. The fact that the settlement was done peacefully

Shows there was no need for civil unrest.

By 1914 it had become impossible to reach political settlement without civil war due to the unrest between the two sides, this is shown in source 7. 'The Ulstermen to proceed to any degree of revolt if necessary';

((b) continued) this showed the Conservative ~~Government~~ Party was looking for civil unrest to defeat the government and it shows the problem was getting worse. 'They turned to the more extreme Sinn Fein movement, which was busy recruiting a force to counter the Ulstermen.' This shows that both sides were being played to set off against each other and that the fact that the two groups were set up and were willing to revolt meant that a clash between the two was inevitable and this would lead to civil war.

Source 8 also backs up the claim as it is from Padraig Pearse who was in fact an extremist and part of the Irish Volunteers. He says 'I am glad that the Orangemen have armed.' He goes on to say 'bloodshed is a cleansing and sanctifying thing.' His views show what he and many others were thinking at the time and that they were willing to spill blood to get 'Irish Revolution'. Fighting between the two which is what the extremists were willing to do would again lead to civil war.

In 1913 in January the Ulster Volunteer force was set-up and armed and in November 1913 the Irish Volunteer force ~~was~~ was set up and by 1914 ~~both~~ both sides were armed. This shows that both sides now had weapons and

((b) continued) a stand off was a very real possibility and was seen as the only way to settle the Irish question.

Overall I believe that ~~the~~ by 1914 civil war was impossible to achieve political settlement as shown by sources 7 and 8. As both sides were armed and neither willing to give up on its views and surrender civil war was inevitable and eventually did take place in 1922 between pro-treaty and anti-treaty which showed that regardless of political settlement ~~the~~ civil war still went ahead.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response sets off by looking at source 9 and then develops counter arguments that are derived from sources 7 and 8. It therefore tries to build an argument based around the sources and for that reason moves into low level 3 for AO2. However, there is only limited development of the arguments and contextual knowledge is very generalised so there is insufficient depth for this to be awarded level 3 for AO1.

## Question 2D

### Question 2a

Most candidates were able to understand the sources at face value although a small number believed that source 10 was written by an Indian. A number of candidates worked through the sources, paraphrasing the content and treating the sources as information rather than evidence. However, most candidates did make some links to the question and few failed to reach level 2. Some weaker responses did attempt to cross reference the sources, pointing to similarities between sources 10 and 11 and contrasting these to source 12. In many cases however, this amounted to matching phrases rather than developing arguments. Stronger responses were able to go beyond surface detail to, for example, appreciate the significance of the need for the army, as referred to in source 11 or the fact that Indians were complicit in their own oppression, as referred to in source 12.

(a) All of these sources suggest to differing extents that British rule was based on respect and support of the Indian people. However both Sources 10 and 11 suggest that they were just as reliant on the police to keep control which suggests there was not always support <sup>from the Indians</sup>. Source 12 agrees with the question up to 1907 but it can be inferred from this source that support may have begun to crumble after 1907.

Sources 10, 11 and 12 all agree that the Raj relied on the support of the people. As Source 10 explicitly says "You couldn't do it without Indian co-operation" and Source 11 corroborates this by saying "We had to rely on respect". Both of these comments show that the British were even prepared to admit the extent to which they relied on Indian support. Source 12 is evidence of the comments made in Sources 10 and 11 saying "We are clerks and willing instruments of our own oppression". This shows that the Indians are aware that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> British are reliant on their support and it is the Indians themselves who are in fact helping the British to continue to rule over them.

Whilst both Sources 10 and 11 say they are reliant



on Indian support, this could just be viewed as appeasement to make the Indians feel important as they both go on to mention the importance of the police. Source 10 describes

((a) continued) how being "assistant chief of police" was a "very great" responsibility and how he dealt with "every possible case" including "riot cases". This suggests that the Indians did not <sup>always</sup> comply with and support the Raj ~~as they~~ as they were rioting. This suggests that British rule in India was in fact based on the support of the police ~~that~~ Source 11 agrees with Source 10 that the British "relied on the police". However whilst Source 10 suggests that "truth, fair play and decency" were <sup>the</sup> "most important factors for governing India, Source 11 suggests that it was in fact illusion which kept the British in control. It comments that "we had to rule by prestige" and "it was widely recognized that the ICS was utterly incorruptible". It can be inferred from this that the British relied on deceiving the Indian people to keep control. Source 12 is again evidence of what Source 11 is trying to achieve and say, that the British "rule by keeping us in ignorance". However Source 12 does not agree that the British will always be in control in India using illusion. Source 12 is "calling for resistance to British rule" and is telling the Indian masses what the tricks of the British are. This again suggests that the British rule in India was not maintained by the support of the Indian people up to 1914. However in this case, it is because of the uprising of the Indian

nationalist movement and not because of a different British tactic, such as illusion or the police.

((a) continued) Whilst all the sources agree that the British relied on the Indian people's support, they all suggest different more important factors which were what actually kept the British in power. Whilst the police were an important factor, the illusion mentioned in Source 11 and 12 is in fact the best tactic and with the growing nationalist movement, the ~~power~~ British began to rely less and less on Indian support.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response is a secure level 4. The candidate reaches a judgment by careful cross referencing of a range of issues that are considered across the sources. It does not use a formulaic approach to its examination of provenance; rather this is embedded in the argument in order to establish the weight that the sources can bear.

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

This was marginally the more popular of the two questions in this section. The sources provided candidates with a range of issues that they were able to explore. Weaker responses tended to take the sources at face value and paraphrase their content making some links to the question focus. Such responses often struggled to make source 14 relevant to their line of argument. Contextual knowledge in such responses was often generalised, in spite of some of the prompts that were provided by the sources, such as the reference to the partition of Bengal in source 13 or the reference to the Lucknow Pact in source 15. These were referred to, but the failure to develop these points beyond what was stated in the sources indicated a weak grasp on the context. Stronger responses were able to integrate the arguments from the sources with specific knowledge e.g. source 13 was used to develop a number of the counter arguments and was integrated with secure own knowledge to successfully demonstrate the shortcomings of British policy in the pre-war period and the impact of this on Indian desires for independence. This frequently led to well-judged conclusions about the relative weight of this factor as opposed to the stated factor of the impact of the First World War.

The first world war obviously had an enormous impact on the world as it marked a significant change in the political and military temperance of the world. Source 15 acknowledges the impact it had in India and suggests that the 'impact' of the war certainly 'brought forward demands for political independence'. As the source shows, the huge support given by Indians - 'serving with exemplary courage' suggests that they entered the war with an understanding that it would alter their relationship with Britain and gain their respect as they fought alongside to serve the King-Emperor! This

((b) continued) views also seen in S14 where Gandhi himself suggests Indians do their 'best to support the British' - seeing it as their 'duty'. Nonetheless, as S15 carries on to establish, the Indians were faced with 'appalling hardship' which seems motivation enough for a 'desire of independence'. It was certainly true that Indian soldiers were ill-equipped and poorly prepared, so much so that it led to the war in Mesopotamia to be titled 'the messop'.

Furthermore, as S15 also mentions, the treatment of Muslim Soldiers who were unhappy about fighting against the great, Muslim Ottoman Empire (and subsequently mutinied on several occasions) led to them feeling far more prepared to work with Hindus towards independence. This change in 'desire', mainly caused by the war was marked in December 1916 with the Lucknow Pact. This laid out not only the desire of the Indian people to govern themselves but also set out practical guidelines for electorate representation. The aim being it would show the British the 'severity' of their desires!

This was a direct result of the war and once peace was reached in 1918 there certainly was a consensus amongst the Indian population that they deserved repayment - being with more political independence. At the start of the war Prime Minister Lord Asquith fuelled this by stating that the Indian support for the war meant that governing in India would be viewed with

((b) continued) 'a new angle of vision'. This kind of statement was always going to 'stoke up' Indian 'desires' and so the evidence as S15 go for to suggest the war had a significant impact on Indian views of independence.

On the other hand there is a large amount of evidence to suggest that this 'desire' was there in the Indian consens long before the war which means it wasn't 'mainly' caused by it. It perhaps acted as a catalyst and spurred people to believe that something

was one, but as Source 13 shows independence had been discussed for a while.

The Source (13) points to other factors as 'fuel' for the desire for Independence. The 'rejection by the British community' certainly played a large part in polarising educated Indians, particularly in the Bengal region. As the source suggests, even 'By 1900 the Indian National Congress was already well established'. In 1907, Congress was split by Tilak's call for Swaraj or 'self-rule' so there was already a latent 'desire'.

Political manoeuvres in the early 1900's also could be seen as a cause for Indians wanting Independence. The Partition of Bengal in 1905 outraged the Hindu community particularly and so much so that it was named a national day of mourning. This also sparked off some of the 'terrorism' S13 discusses as in 1908 two European women were killed by a bomb meant

((b) continued) for a judge. This action coupled by the reunification of Bengal in 1911 (which upset the Muslim community who lost their powerbase) increased the action of Indian Nationalism and the campaigns for Independence.

Another act made by the British could also be seen as a cause for stirring up 'desire' before the start of WWI. The Morley-Minto reforms - or Indian Councils Act in 1909 although, as mentioned in S13 was an attempt 'to increase the role of native Indians in local government' failed

to have much of an impact as by 1917 only 26/178 of the initiatives presented to the councils were passed. This, as S13 describes, 'proved a profound reaction' that being a 'desire for independence'.

The Home Rule Leagues, run in 1916 by Gokhale and Annie Besant are a further example that even before the war was over 'desire' for independence was well established, so much so that they forced the country going speeches and handing out propaganda.

Furthermore, to a certain extent, S14 could be interpreted as disagreeing with the view that the 'impact of the first world war' was the main cause for a call for independence. Although, the war situation by 1915 had yet to reach its worse <sup>resource</sup> possibility suggests that the war showed how

((b) continued) The British and Indians could work together.

Overall, the evidence would suggest that an Indian desire for independence was not 'mainly caused by the impact of the first world war' which although significant, seemed to have just brought about a greater sense of justification to this desire - as Source 15 strongly argues. The war perhaps marks a time when the British were more aware that they needed to offer something but by this time, what the British were willing to concede 'was not enough'. Instead, the evidence in S13 suggests that a belief had been long coming, if only amongst the 'Bengali Baboos'. As this advocated

elite were the voice of Indian desire this arguably suggests that independence had been the goal for a while - it certainly had been for Tilak. Other factors which drove the desire were the political misjudgements of the British which although as ~~the~~ S14 shows, did not completely destroy respect for them by the first World War, did not mean that they were willing to continue to be dominated. Underneath it all, was perhaps an innate desire for self-control, sovereignty and the removal of an alien nation for whom, with their war ~~and~~ effort and the luckless pact, they had shown they were worthy to.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates a strong question focus that is sustained throughout the response. It integrates the sources and a secure contextual knowledge to reach clearly argued conclusions. These attributes make this response a secure level 4 in AO1. The sources are constantly referenced with an understanding of the judgments that are contained in them, so the response also achieves level 4 for AO2.

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

This was marginally the less popular of the two questions in this section. The sources were generally well understood by candidates and were used to develop a range of factors that might be used to explain the reasons for the Partition of India. Weaker responses were heavily reliant on the content of the sources which they frequently paraphrased sequentially with little contextual knowledge to support the line of argument. This meant that they were unable to activate all of the prompts that the sources provided; this was particularly noticeable in the use that was made of source 18. Stronger responses were able to explore the range of alternative explanations that were provided by the sources and to develop these arguments with their own knowledge. They were often able to focus on the longer term disagreements between Hindus and Muslims which were clearly identified in both sources 16 and 17 and hinted at in 18 and to cross reference the sources with their own knowledge to strengthen the argument. They were also likely to consider the role of Mountbatten and Nehru's attitude, as briefly referenced in source 18. By examining such a range, they were able to reach a clear judgment about the impact of the Second World War in causing the Partition of India.

(b) The Partition of India in August 1947 into India and Pakistan had many causes. The long-standing tension between the Muslims and the Hindus was made worse by the British use of communalism, the Second World War, the inability of Congress and the Muslim League to cooperate and Lord Mountbatten's actions.

During the second world war, the Hindu dominated Congress and the Muslim League had taken two opposing viewpoints on the war. Congress, angered by Churchill's lack of consultation with Indians before entering the war and the slow progress towards independence, began their Quit India campaign in August 1942. This campaign of civil disobedience throughout India led to over 30,000 troops being used to put down the disturbances and the death of 1000 people.



Congress was declared illegal and <sup>1700</sup> many of the leading members were arrested. Meanwhile, the ~~the~~ Muslim League gave their full support to the war effort and continued to cooperate with the British. This left the Muslim League in a better position as

((b) continued) they could enter into negotiations with the British to ensure that their desires would be protected. This difference in tactics meant that although 'in 1939 there was still the possibility that they could work out some sort of agreement. After the war that possibility had ~~to~~ gone' <sup>(S17)</sup> as the Muslim League had become as powerful and popular as Congress (in 1945 the Muslim League won 90% of the Muslim vote in the elections). However, 'intercommunal strife between Muslims and Hindus was widespread even before the war', as the ICS officers on whom's comments source 16 is based remembered. Their position in the ICS gave them the ability to observe these building tensions which could often 'set off a full-scale riot' as it was their responsibility to control and end these results. Turinah also agrees in source 17 that 'Hindus and Muslims belong to two different civilisations... based on conflicting ideas'. Some of the differences between

ideas'. Some of the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims were intrinsic in the way they practiced their religion. For example, the Hindu religion involves many festivals involving

((b) continued) loud music and street processions which could last for several days, disturbing the worship of Muslims, who worship in silence. There were also communal tensions because in most places Hindus were in the majority.

There were also many growing tensions between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. The INC insisted that they represented all Indians and were reluctant to admit that the Muslim League represented the Muslims. They were opposed to any form of communalism because they thought that the government of India should be directly in their hands. Additionally, the form of government each group wanted differed greatly. Congress wanted a government with a strong central government and weak provinces whereas the Muslim League wanted a weak central government and strong provinces in order to protect the interests of the Muslims in the provinces.

where they were in the majority. Although Jinnah often tried to reach a compromise with Congress, such as after

(b) continued) ~~the~~ 1937 election and with his 14 point plan in 1922, no compromise could be reached. Gandhi and Nehru were also very rude to Jinnah on occasion, with Gandhi acting very patronisingly towards him and Nehru's active dislike. Nehru also announced ~~that~~ during the Cabinet Mission that any government of India after ~~the~~ independence would be Hindu dominated and would not involve the Muslim League, leading to Jinnah's final demand for full partition.

Source 18 also cites the actions of Lord Mountbatten as a reason for partition. Mountbatten had a 'partiality towards Nehru' and his wife <sup>(Lady Mountbatten)</sup> was even rumoured to be having an affair with Nehru. In contrast, his relationship with Jinnah was very frosty because Jinnah refused to be charmed by him. Jinnah's knowledge of this made him very suspicious of Mountbatten's plans for India. Mountbatten's 'fear that the British would be swamped' also led

him to accelerate the negotiations, bringing (b) continued ~~parties~~ partition forward to the 15th August 1947 when Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister had originally suggested that India would gain its independence by June 30th 1948. Mountbatten's worry that Britain would look bad also led to his 'interference in the work of the Boundary Commission' and 'willingness to browbeat the princes' according to source 18. As source 18 is a secondary source the information it gives is mostly accurate, although Rosmary Rees does have a slight anti-British take on India's history. However, her ~~interpretation~~ interpretation of Mountbatten is ~~well~~ backed up by evidence and could have led to partition as not enough time was given for a negotiation to take place over a united India and Mountbatten often sided with Congress because he thought that Pakistan would quickly collapse back into India.

The Partition of India does not seem to have been caused mainly by the impact of the secondary World War, despite this being Rosmary Rees's analysis

((b) continued) of 'it' in source 18, but was instead caused by the 'growing discontent' that Jinnah described in source 17. Although it may not have led to 'the final destruction of such a state' as Jinnah predicted due to his own wish for partition and attempt to gain support for it from in the speech this source is taken from, 'the conflict between Hindus and Muslims was a long-standing one', ~~and~~ <sup>The</sup> ~~due to the lack of cooperation~~ between Congress and the Muslim League enhanced these tensions, making Partition almost inevitable after the war, particularly after Jinnah's call for Direct Action in August 1946 causing riot across India, including in Calcutta where 6000 people were involved. Even had partition not been ruled by Lord Mountbatten, it is difficult to see how the Muslims and Hindus could have created a united India together.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response starts well; the introduction makes it clear that the candidate is aware of the need to consider different interpretations. In the course of the answer the candidate develops some of these interpretations demonstrating a secure contextual knowledge and making some use of the sources which are integrated into the line of argument. It is clear that the ideas expressed in the sources are used to help the candidate shape the argument. There is some attempt to cross reference the sources, although this is only done briefly. This response achieves level 4 for AO1 and is borderline level 3/4 for AO2.

**6HI02 D Statistics**

## Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	38.8	8.8

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		20.6	37.9	62.1	79.4	88.5



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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US022890 January 2010

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

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

