

# Script E

Centre mark 37/40



# Coursework authentication sheet

## Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History

### Assignment title:

Historians have disagreed about how far Gandhi was responsible for India gaining its independence in 1947. What is your view on how far Gandhi can be considered responsible for Indian independence?

Have you received advice on the title from the Assignment guidance service?

Y/N

Centre name:

Centre number:

Candidate name:

Candidate number:

State the examined options that are being taken:

Paper 1: Route A The Crusades, 1095-1204

Paper 2: Route A 2.1 Anglo-Saxon England and the Anglo-Norman kingdom, c1053-1106

Paper 3: Civil Rights and race relations in the USA, 1850-2009

Mark awarded	Comments [Comment box expands as you start entering text]
37/40	<p>This meets criteria in LS in all bullet points. It is most convincing in BP1 and BP5 and has super <del>weakness</del> in BP2 (occasionally does not integrate context), BP3 (occasionally does not explain reasoning) BP4 (criteria not all fully justified)</p> <p>Overall - LS mid band - qualities displayed but less convincing in places.</p>

**Teacher declaration**

I declare that the work submitted for assessment has been carried out without assistance other than that which is acceptable according to the rules of the specification.

Assessor name			
Assessor signature		Date	

**Candidate declaration**

I certify that the work submitted for this assignment is my own. I have clearly referenced any materials used in the work. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice.

Candidate signature		Date	
---------------------	--	------	--

**Additional Candidate declaration**

By signing this additional declaration, you agree to your work being used to support Professional Development, Online Support and Training of Centre-Assessors and Pearson Moderators.

Candidate signature		Date
---------------------	--	------

Historians have disagreed about how far Gandhi was responsible for India gaining its independence in 1947. What is your view on how far Gandhi can be considered responsible for Indian independence?

With reference to three chosen works:

- Analyse the ways in which interpretations of the question, problem or issue differ
- Explain the differences you have identified
- Evaluate the arguments, indicating which you have found the most persuasive and explain your judgements

Historians have long disagreed about the extent to which Gandhi can be found responsible for India gaining its independence on the 15th August 1947. One such historian, Bipan Chandra, highlights the importance of Gandhi's Non-Cooperation movement and believes that Gandhi served as a crucial catalyst in the fight for Indian independence, as his methods of peaceful resistance were what ultimately loosened Britain's grip upon India. However, this rise of Indian nationalism can also be correlated with a rise in violence, something that Gandhi failed to foresee. Other historians see Gandhi as less of an activist and more of a figurehead for independence, suggesting his actions had less impact when compared to those of figures like Muhammad Jinnah. Larry Collins and Dominic Lapierre explore this in their text 'Freedom at Midnight' as they explore Jinnah's role within the Muslim League and the events leading up to the partition of India. Lastly, some have even begun to look outside of India to find reasons for the gaining of independence in 1947. These historians include Patrick French, who presents the argument that British mistakes ultimately handed India its independence. In my opinion this argument is the most persuasive, as it demonstrates that the British empire was no longer fit for purpose and that mistakes made by the British government allowed for the inevitability of Indian independence. *3 different interpretations + judgement with some reasoning*

Mahatma Gandhi was considered to be the 'Father of India' and had thousands of devoted followers. However, it has been long debated by as to whether Gandhi truly deserves the credit he receives for India gaining its independence, or whether his reverence as a saint simply exaggerates his actual contribution to the independence movement. This line of thought is explored in Lawrence James' interpretation, as he considers that Gandhi's assassination in 1948 may have transformed him into a 'martyr.' James suggests that historical interpretations are likely biased, as it is hard to pass historical judgement on a man who is 'still regarded in India as a saint'<sup>1</sup>. As a result, we may find that Gandhi's contribution to the movement is sensationalized in that the judgements were passed after his assassination and therefore look more favourably on him. This conflicts somewhat with the view put forward by Bipan Chandra, which is that Gandhi's input was momentous, as he transformed Congress from an elite group to a party of mass appeal. Chandra tells us that

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 1997

*Notes  
- inter  
- peace  
- war  
- out.*

'The goal of the Congress was changed from the attainment of self-government by constitutional and legal means to Swaraj by peaceful means.<sup>2</sup>' Gandhi was able to change the entire mission of Congress, and introduced his own brand of nationalism in the form of peaceful resistance. This popular branch of nationalism can be seen within his 'Non Cooperation Movement' which is considered to be Gandhi's greatest achievement by Chandra. Successes of the Non Cooperation Movement include giving Congress a 'New energy'<sup>3</sup> and 90,000 students transferring to national schools and colleges in an 'educational boycott'.<sup>4</sup> James' interpretation tells us that the impact of this should not be understated, as it triggered province-wide strikes in places such as Bengal. Such attempts to disaffiliate themselves from the government meant that the 'Non-Cooperation Movement' was beginning to make life difficult for the British, as the Indian people wanted their own government, on their own terms. James shares this view as he surmises; 'India could not be ruled without the cooperation of a substantial portion of its population'<sup>5</sup>. Thus, the successes of the Non-Cooperation movement meant that India was well on its way to being ungovernable. It can conclusively be said that Chandra and James are both in agreement that the Non-Cooperation Movement should be viewed as Gandhi's greatest achievement as it established nationalism and activism amongst the Indian people.

Supporting  
Chandra's  
interpretation  
with  
evidence.

was not  
necessarily

Moreover, Gandhi's use of non-violent resistance showed him to be a great tactician as it built the foundations of long term resistance against the British. This can be summed up by James, who refers to the Satyagraha as 'Gandhi's weapon.'<sup>6</sup> This being said, the events of Chauri Chaura in February 1922 did effectively put an end to the Non-Cooperation movement and this stunted Gandhi's progress somewhat. The events of Chauri Chaura, wherein a group of protesters clashed violently with the police, undermined the whole concept behind Non-Cooperation, which aimed to expose the British as an oppressive force as they would be 'using force against civil resisters.'<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the movement had to be stopped immediately. In this respect Gandhi has been criticized - for failing to foresee the potential for violence that a mass movement such as the Non-Cooperation movement had. The short span of the movement has to be considered when evaluating the argument of James and Chandra, as the movement was launched on August 1<sup>st</sup> 1920 and then withdrawn in February of 1922. So it is entirely possible that the above interpretations overstate Gandhi's contribution. The Indian independence movement spanned a total of 90 years and so James and Chandra lend too much credit to Gandhi, as the Non-Cooperation movement was only a short phase in the entire independence movement. This ultimately makes both James and Chandra's arguments less convincing, as they are focusing on a snapshot of time within the movement rather than looking at the whole picture.

Judgement with criteria

assess (view)

It is important to note that Gandhi was widely criticised for his decision to withdraw the movement, as many believe he withdrew only to 'protect the interests of landlords and

<sup>2</sup> Chandra, *Indias Struggle For Independence*, 1989 p.184

<sup>3</sup> Chandra, *ibid* p.187

<sup>4</sup> Chandra, *ibid* p.187

<sup>5</sup> James, *op cit*, p.490

<sup>6</sup> James, *ibid* p.464

<sup>7</sup> Chandra, *op cit*, p.193

capitalists who would inevitably be at the receiving end of this violence.<sup>8</sup> Chandra's interpretation includes opinions of Gandhi that paint him as far from saintly and instead as a man preoccupied with concern for the upper classes of Indian society. However, Chandra does admit that 'Gandhi's critics have been less than fair to him' and goes on to present the counter argument that withdrawing the Non-Cooperation movement did ensure long-term results for the Independence movement. This is because, in light of the surge of violence, the movement would have been crushed by the British forces and 'the government would have had excuse to remove him and other activists from the scene.'<sup>9</sup> Chandra believes it is better that Gandhi withdrew the movement when he did, as this allowed them to regroup and refocus on complete detachment from the Raj without violent protest. She is also very aware of Gandhi's shortcomings but maintains the view of his central commitment, as he orchestrated the first attempt at an all-India mass struggle against the British. This makes for a reliable source as it weighs up the positive and negative aspects of Gandhi's campaign. Nonetheless, his contribution to the independence movement is still over-emphasised by both James and Chandra, which makes the argument much less convincing. They focus much more on his personality and personal decisions between 1919 and 1922 instead of focusing on the entire timeline of events. For example, James focuses on 1919 as the year 'Gandhi stamped his personality and principles on Congress.' This is a revisionist view as it reduces the gains towards independence during this time period to Gandhi's personality alone, when in truth his policies must have had mass appeal in order to win the support of the older, more conservative Congress members. Whilst James and Chandra both present Gandhi as the primary leader of the Independence movement, I do not consider their interpretations to be entirely convincing as they do not show Gandhi as a consistent leader for the duration of the movement. In fact, their interpretations reveal that although Gandhi's attitudes may have kick started non-violent activism in the name of independence, he largely failed to adapt and improve on his methods in order to be able to lead India to independence in 1947.

Whilst Gandhi may have been responsible for the initial momentum of the independence movement, it can be argued that Muhammad Jinnah is the individual who oversaw the eventual partition between India and Britain. This is highlighted in the interpretation of Larry Collins and Dominic Lapierre, who make this point by stating; 'When the clocks had chimed that magic midnight and India awakened to life and freedom, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi had been sound asleep'<sup>10</sup>. Here, Collins and Lapierre insist that Gandhi had little to do with the actual gaining of independence as by this time he had all but washed his hands of the movement. This is true; Gandhi made it clear that he could not tolerate the idea of complete separation between the Hindus and the Muslims. This observation is shared by James, who said that Gandhi wanted 'Indian freedom on his own terms and through his own methods. When both failed, he stepped down and turned his attention to spinning and Hindu education.' This, much like the British mistakes

<sup>8</sup> Chandra, *ibid* p.192

<sup>9</sup> Chandra, *ibid* p.193

<sup>10</sup> Collins, Larry & Lapierre, Dominic *Freedom at Midnight*, 1975, p.327

relevant  
view  
opinion

use x1  
to  
+ place  
view

locks citation

draws in  
support  
to  
analyse  
view

interpretation, suggests that Gandhi was unwilling to adapt his vision according to the will of the Indian people and as a result, had nothing to do with the eventual detachment from the British Raj. This then supports the interpretation that Jinnah was more successful in his leadership, as he remained an ambassador for Indian Independence up until its achievement. As this argument is shared by both historians, despite their interpretations putting forward different arguments overall, this makes the idea more convincing. Ultimately, the Indian people did not want Gandhi to lead them to freedom, and Collins and Lapierre believe this was finally realised when a 'mob of his countrymen turned on him'<sup>11</sup>. India looked to Jinnah to finish out what Gandhi had started.

Whilst Gandhi's tactics can be seen as divisive, Jinnah tried a different approach whereby he built a strong political relationship with the British government. He opposed Gandhi's methods of Non-Cooperation and expressed his disapproval by resigning from Congress, because the intertwining of religion and politics and the mass based aspects of Gandhi's movement alienated Indian politicians such as Jinnah. The idea of this alienation is also present in James' interpretation as he admits that a programme employed by Gandhi 'was not a programme to attract the conventional, liberal, progressive Congress member.'<sup>12</sup> From then on, Jinnah focused his attention on working with the British towards his own vision of independence. This can be seen in his close relationship with 'the last Viceroy' Mountbatten, evidenced by a mention of the 'close personal contact and mutual trust'<sup>13</sup> between the two. This tells us how Jinnah was able to work towards freedom as he allied himself with key figures within the British government in order to achieve independence. For this reason 'Mohammed Ali Jinnah had succeeded where the sorrowing leader had failed'<sup>14</sup> and this supports the interpretation that Jinnah played a more significant role, as he took the reins from Gandhi and aimed for independence by constitutional means. This goal was not reached, however, and he reluctantly gravitated towards the new aim of partition. A fact which, in turn, makes the overall interpretation less convincing as it shows that both Gandhi and Jinnah were unable to achieve their original aims. Jinnah's original aim was the enhancement of Muslim representation within Indian government, not the independence of India.

Focus shifted to a complete partition of India only after Congress repeatedly rejected offers from the Muslim League, such as Jinnah's 14-point plan which had been presented to Congress in 1929. This premise of the plan was to offer full religious liberty to all granted communities, separate electorates for minorities, and Muslim representation of a third in the central legislature among other things. This compromise was rejected outright by Congress and thus, Jinnah became resolved to the idea of separateness. This turn of events can again be attributed to the uncompromising attitudes of Gandhi and Congress, who were unwilling to allow the Muslims proportionate representation within government. Consequently, this resulted in India's partition from the Raj ending in 'chaos'<sup>15</sup> rather than

<sup>11</sup> Collins, Larry and Lapierre, Dominic *ibid* p.295

<sup>12</sup> James, *op cit*, p.467

<sup>13</sup> Collins and Lapierre, *op cit*, p.297

<sup>14</sup> Collins and Lapierre, *ibid* p.296

<sup>15</sup> Collins and Lapierre, *ibid* p.326

References from historians  
but not making this explicit

ending to  
admission  
arguing

text  
ending to  
admission  
arguing

probably questionable - ideas of  
Pakistan had been floated since 1920s.

parting ways with dignity. Regardless, this interpretation does show that Jinnah had an undeniably large involvement in the events preceding the partition of India. This interpretation differs from the previous one as it argues that Jinnah contributed more to the Indian independence movement than Gandhi, due to his collaboration with the British and his plans for the partition. That being said, this interpretation is not entirely persuasive as it only documents the events happening right before independence was declared; the majority of the chapter is based solely on events happening in New Delhi, at midnight on the 14th August 1947. In the same way that James and Chandra focus too heavily on Gandhi's contribution at the start of the independence movement, Collins and Lapierre only reference Jinnah's contribution towards the end and it therefore does not offer a cohesive picture of Jinnah as a major contribution to the movement. Nevertheless, we can use both interpretations together to piece together a timeline of whose involvement increased and decreased as the movement progressed.

Highlighting  
concern  
for  
reference

Patrick French's interpretation of the events of the Indian independence movement indicates that the biggest factor in India gaining independence had less to do with the Indian people themselves, but with mistakes made by the British government. This differs from Chandra's interpretation - which considers Gandhi's contribution to be the biggest factor - and Collins and Lapierre's extract, which considers Jinnah's input to be more significant. Particularly to blame in French's opinion was Winston Churchill, who was described as 'a public danger to the empire by no less a figure than Admiral Jellicoe'.<sup>16</sup> In this way, French's interpretation is similar to that of James as both focus on an individual's impact rather than looking at specific events. This judgement can be considered valid in that Churchill was considered a danger to the empire because of his refusal to compromise on matters such as giving India dominion status, therefore risking losing India altogether. French references Churchill's 'defiant line over Baldwin's India policy'<sup>17</sup> and the controversy this caused among other British politicians. The Government of India Act of 1935 only offered limited powers of self government (primarily by ending the dyarchy established in the 1919 Government of India Act and introducing direct elections) and Churchill did not want to grant even this to the Indian people. Churchill's imperialist attitudes and his unwillingness to relent any power meant that 'he was to prove a disaster for India'.<sup>18</sup> The information given in this extract appears to be true, as we know from our own knowledge that opposition to Indian autonomy led to individuals such as Gandhi pushing for purna swaraj. Therefore, French's interpretation differs from the previous two as it looks outside of India in order to explain who was most responsible for India gaining its independence. This makes French's interpretation more useful in terms of assessing the importance of Gandhi as it considers both internal and external factors for the cause of independence.

Drawing  
in  
support  
to  
develop  
analysis

clearer  
context  
used  
support

provides reason although  
explanation of this is limited

French's interpretation indicates that he places blame on policies set in motion by the British which then caused the final push for independence and in this, he sees the failure of the Cripps mission (led by the British in 1942) as the final straw. It offered India 'full

<sup>16</sup> French, Patrick. *Liberty Or Death: India's Journey to Independence and Division*, 1997, p.129

<sup>17</sup> French, *ibid*, p.129

<sup>18</sup> French, *ibid*, p.130

dominion status at some point after the end of the hostilities,<sup>19</sup> but this was regarded as being too little, too late and was immediately rejected by Gandhi, who suggested Cripps should take the first plane home. However, where French places the blame firmly on Churchill's shoulders for such failed initiatives, he also fails to take into account the stance of Congress which could be just as uncompromising. This makes his argument less convincing as it presents a reductionist view of the situation, disregarding the actions of the INC. For example, their immediate rejection of the August offer made in 1940, which would have granted them dominion status at some point after the war, shows that they were unwilling to accept anything less than complete self rule at this point. French called the post war settlement 'vague',<sup>20</sup> meaning it did not offer much in the way of self-rule, which may have been the sole reason for its rejection. This interpretation absolutely shows that mistakes made by the British deepened the rift between British government and Congress. However, French does tend to focus more on the responses of key individuals - such as Churchill and his inability to 'make concessions'<sup>21</sup> - rather than focusing on the key events which also shaped the path to independence, such as the the Second World War. This weakens his argument as he is too focused on the personality of figures within the British government and less so with the bigger picture.

evaluates  
view

Whilst French does admit that 'the outbreak of the war in September 1939 changed everything',<sup>22</sup> this stance relates more to Churchill's war-time leadership than the direct impact that the Second World War had on India. As Churchill declared war in England, Linlithgow - the 'Churchill of the East'<sup>23</sup> - followed suit by declaring war in India. This essentially means that Viceroy Linlithgow committed 300 million Indians to war without the consultation of Congress (or any other party for that matter). A move like this was just within Linlithgow's legal powers and this action demonstrated that, above all, Britain still considered themselves to be the rulers of India despite any talk of granting dominion status. It also completely undermined the Government of India Act of 1935, which promised a degree of power sharing between Britain and India. This was a considerable step back considering the Act gave large measures of autonomy to the provinces of British India and introduced direct elections, thus increasing the franchise from 7 million to 35 million. This knowledge gives merit to the argument posed by French, as the actions of the British following the war served to further anger and alienate many Indian people. The reaction of Congress also demonstrated this, as leaders ordered all Congress members to resign from provincial ministries throughout India, a move which gave opportunity for the Muslim League to strengthen their position within the British government. This in turn increased the divide between the Muslim League and the INC. Again, French focuses on the role of individuals such as Churchill and Linlithgow rather than considering the fact that the British empire was simply not equipped to withstand two World Wars.

context  
integrated  
into  
argument

<sup>19</sup> French *ibid* p. 140

<sup>20</sup> French, *ibid* p. 133

<sup>21</sup> French *ibid* p. 140

<sup>22</sup> French, *ibid* p. 129

<sup>23</sup> French, *ibid* p. 133

The British had been able to maintain control during the First World War using the Montagu Chelmsford reforms to the constitution, but it was clear that using the promise of dominion status would not be enough to maintain control throughout the Second World War this time around. Especially when considering that the reception of the Montagu Chelmsford was less than positive, even at the time of its introduction, as the 'ill-considered scheme of dyarchy satisfied few.' Chandra's interpretation here tells us that it would have received an even colder reception after the events of the Second World War and that serious compromises would need to have been reached in order to prevent the decolonisation of India. When considering the impact of the Second World War on the Indian people, we must also consider the financial repercussions on the British empire. During World War Two, the British had mobilised India's resources for their imperial war effort. They were able to crush the attempt of the Indian National Congress to force them to 'quit India' in 1942. This was not the case after the war, as they had exhausted too many resources to cope with another mass campaign. Not only did the events of the Second World War strain the relationship between the Indians and the British, it also weakened the British system of imperial defence. French fails to recognise this in his interpretation, making his argument less valid as he does not take into consideration the weakened state of the empire after the Second World War. It could be argued that the financial cost of maintaining control over India was what led the British to withdraw from India, not simply British error. This would mean that they did not necessarily 'lose' India as a result of their own mistakes, but chose to retreat on their own terms. Conclusively, French offers a damning condemnation of the actions of the British leading up to India gaining independence in 1947 and in particular, believes that the imperialist attitudes towards India and his reluctance to relinquish any real power to the Indian government (even after the Second World War) is ultimately what lost the crown jewel of the empire. This is undoubtedly a much more convincing argument than those put forward in previous interpretations, as it shows how the mistakes made by the British led to a breakdown in relations between the British and Indian government. It also shows that it was within the power of the British to retain their foothold in India, if only they were willing to compromise. On the other hand, the aforementioned interpretations look at key individuals and their individual outlooks and their impacts on the independence movement across a short period of time. This is less of a significant factor when compared with the attitude of the British government as a whole, across a much longer period of time. With this being said, it could still be argued that French presents a revisionist view of the achievements of Gandhi and Jinnah, as he attributes the gaining of independence to the failures of the British rather than the successes of the Indian people. For this reason, there were even calls to ban the book in India, which absolutely adds weight to French's argument as his avoids glorifying or romanticising the actions of Gandhi as many other interpretations do.

tending to address anything

reaching a judgement with certain

Shash Tharoor further strengthens the argument posed by French that the British are the reason India was able to gain its independence in 1947. Tharoor offers a strong condemnation of the British and such a condemnation is likely influenced by the fact that Tharoor serves as a Congress MP in India and is a man of Indian heritage. This means he may be more likely to support the actions of Congress and condemn decisions made by the British government, but would also lessen the amount of support that his interpretation

Politician but also acclaimed writer of non-fiction with several titles focused on Indian history and culture.

gives to French's view as there is an element of bias to his own standpoint. Nevertheless, Tharoor believes that the failure of the British in recognising the contribution of the Indian people (and their failure to reward them accordingly) is what resulted in the final push for purna swaraj. This also lends support to the interpretation by James, who is of the opinion that a combination of 'satyagraha, populism and Non-cooperation was the only way the Raj could be made to yield<sup>24</sup>' as Tharoor puts great emphasis on the 'heroism<sup>25</sup>' displayed by the Indian people during World War Two - in which thousands of Indian soldiers were killed or injured. In Tharoor's opinion, such heroism deserved recognition in the form of self-governance but the British instead mistakenly believed that they could placate the Indian people with 'fraudulent Montagu-Chelmsford reforms.<sup>26</sup>' These reforms took place in 1918 and acted as a poor substitute for self governance. Tharoor brands the reforms as 'cosmetic alterations,<sup>27</sup>' meaning that they simply changed the distribution of power enough to prevent the Indian people seeking independence. Thus, Britain's insistence that its own government could represent India paired with its reluctance to give the Indian people any actual power is what really led to the need for revolution. Tharoor's argument can be used to give credit to French's own, as they are both in agreement that British mistakes alone caused the Indian people to seek self government.

Conclusively, it can be said that French's interpretation best explains who is responsible for India gaining independence in 1947. This interpretation argues that it was the British reluctance to grant India dominion status within the empire which eventually led to the Independence Movement and the eventual partition of India. To come to this conclusion, French has explored a range of internal and external factors by considering the actions of the British and Indian government, as well as key events such as the Second World War. This interpretation also covers the stance of the British government at different points of the Indian Independence Movement, from the 1919 Government of India Act to the Cripps mission in 1942. This is something that James and Collins & Lapierre fail to do, meaning that they both present revisionist interpretations. Overall, French presents a well rounded argument; that Gandhi was not the biggest contributing factor to the Indian independence movement. Instead, mistakes made by the British are what ultimately caused India to gain Independence in 1947.

BPI L5 The key issues have been debated using a good range of material. The argument is sustained and developed through a discussion of the different interpretations.

P2 L5- There is good use made of supporting historians to discuss the validity of the different interpretations, Tharoor legitimate as an historian given the range of books he has published. Context is integrated although in places it seems to drive the argument rather than the other way round eg p4. Hence L5- not entirely convincing. The overall judgement

<sup>24</sup> James, op cit, p.490

<sup>25</sup> Tharoor, Shashi. *Inglorious Empire*, 2018, p.74

<sup>26</sup> Tharoor *ibid*, p.76

<sup>27</sup> Tharoor, *ibid* p.68

## Bibliography

Chandra, Bipan. *Indias Struggle For Independence*, 1989 p.184

Collins, Larry & and Lapierre, Dominic. *Freedom at Midnight*, 1975, p.327

French, Patrick. *Liberty Or Death: India's Journey to Independence and Division*, 1997, p.129

James, Lawrence. *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 1997

Tharoor, Shash. *Inglorious Empire*, 2018, p.74

Word count: 4101

BP3 The views of the 3 historians are analysed and the differences explained. It is clear that the nature of historical debate is understood. L5- The analysis + reasoning is not always clearly explained eg. p5 - internal / external factors - not made clear why this is valuable.

BP4 Criteria are established in reaching the judgment eg. p3 - Chandra + James - and L5- explained. In places they are not fully justified eg p.4 re. Jinnah but this is better than L4.

BP5 Knowledge is used effectively to demonstrate L5 the candidates understanding of the enquiry. In places it is used effectively to interrogate the argument is logical and the response is organised effectively

L5 37/40

## Coursework resource record

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History				
Centre name:				
Candidate name:				
Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date resource record checked
* James, Lawrence. Ray: The Making and Unmaking of British India 1997	Chapter 3	This interpretation <del>supports the</del> argument that Gandhi was responsible for independence	Friday 18th May 2018	
* Chandra, Bipan. Indian Struggle for Independence 1989	Chapter 15	This interpretation <del>supports the</del> <sup>argues that</sup> <del>argument that</del> Gandhi was responsible for independence	Wednesday 23rd May 2018	
* Collins, Lorraine and Lorraine Domine, Freedom at Midnight 1975	Chapter 11	This interpretation argues that Jinnah contributed more than Gandhi in the Matter of independence	Wednesday 6th June	

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History					
Centre name:					
Candidate name:					
Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date resource record checked	
* French Patrick, Liberty or Death: India's journey to independence and Division 1947	Chapter 8	This interpretation argues that British mistakes were more significant than Gandhi's role in gaining independence	Friday 15 <sup>th</sup> June 2018		
* Tharoor: Stash: Inglorious Empire 2018	Chapter 2	This interpretation supports the argument that British mistakes played the most significant role	Monday 18 <sup>th</sup> June 2018		

\*