Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI02) Paper 1A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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 or 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.

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

June 2017
Publications Code

Examiner Report: WHIO2 1A India, 1857-1948: The Raj to Partition

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHI02 1A which covers the option India, 1857-1948: The Raj to Partition. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

It is pleasing to note that in Section A more candidates understood what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation this year. There was, however, less evidence of the detailed knowledge base required in this section to be able to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. Some candidates are still writing about limitations in question a and this did impact on the length of part b for some candidates.

In Section B, some candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis, but more responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was targeted.

It remains important to realise that Section A topics are drawn from highlighted topics on the specification whereas Section B questions may be set from any part of any Key Topic, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important. There was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

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

Question 1a)

There were some good responses that achieved high Level 2 or beyond. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained. Most candidates who failed to reach Level 3, did so because of questionable assumptions regarding the provenance and a mistaken tendency to discuss the limitations of those and using contextual knowledge incorrectly to evaluate the limitations. There were also a number of responses with very limited contextual knowledge which impacted on those candidate's understanding of the source. Some candidates did not understand the meaning of the phrase 'spare no efforts' assuming that this meant the British government did nothing or very little to deal with famine and this did tend to undermine their analysis. In a small number of cases candidates mixed up the famine with that in the 1940s which negated their arguments.

DOC ID: 0429001117196: This is an excellent level 3 response achieving level 3 on all the bullet points in the mark scheme. It has god inferences and makes valid points about the provenance of the source to establish its value. It makes a clear judgement in relation to the question.

Source 1 is moderately valuable to a historian enquiring into the reaction of the British Government to the Bengalese famine of 1876 - 78. The value of the source arises due to its credibility, reliability and the detail it provides of the constraints faced by the authorities in their response.

Firstly and foremost, the source is valuable as it is an official statement made by a member of the British Government, Lord Napier who held office in India as Governor of Madras and Viceroy of India. As a result of the nature of the statement and the official audience, the House of Lords, to which it is being made, however Lord Napier is likely to have been well informed and the audience would have expected an accurate account of the response to the event, thus elevating the credibility and reliability of the source.

In addition, another reason the source is valuable is because it explains the hesitancy that there were varied immediate reactions to the famine. The fact that there were 'mixed feelings' in the government depicts that there was were perhaps those

a conflict of interest. This is most true as at the time Britain was attempting to balance its budget and spend a minimum. Viceroy Lord Lytton even stated that the response to the famine must be "subordinated to the final consideration of disbursing the least amount of money. The source qualifies this claim as it tells us that "a resolution on the part of the Government of India to accomplish this [famine relief] with the least possible expense." The 'mixed' reactions arose when several members of the House of Commons and British officials in India considered that what was being done was not enough and that more could be done without the "imposition of heavy and permanent burdens on the industry of the country." For example officials regarded the 'Temple wage' of 450g of wheat and 1 anna for an adult male worker was almost ~~This conflict was particularly visible in response to~~ inhumane, depicting that there was "no lack of human endeavour to combat the effects of famine and to save the lives of people committed to their care."

Moreover, the source is valuable as it admits that that any response to a famine of such a "large scale" would be considered scarce as it would be "impossible for the Government to save every life." since it covered 210,000 square km The famine resulted in an approximate death toll of 5 million people, but the Government claims to have "spared no efforts." This is fairly true as 8 million rupees was

used to make 700 million tons of relief available to those in British ~~the~~ areas and 7 million rupees was spent by the government in relieving 72 million victims in the princely States. Rs Hence it could be Lord Temple, Commissioner of famine relief, reported in 1877 that he had the famine under control, however, many ~~historians~~ a British official regarded that a famine can hardly said to be under control if a lower 1/4 of the population dead, implying that 15 million rupees was nowhere near enough relief, particularly given that 1 unit meant 1 was relief for one person for one day.

Furthermore, the source is valuable as the statement is made ~~as~~ during the ongoing distress in India so it is almost like a live commentary of the response and hence more likely to be accurate and reliable.

Overall, the source is moderately valuable because it tells us the varying responses to the famine that there were due to a conflict of interest between the economy and the survival of the people. It informs us of British official opinion - ~~that~~ they claim to have done their best given the circumstances, and it also admits the large scale and overwhelming nature of the famine that may have also hindered an more effective response.

Question 1b)

The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Candidates often used accurate contextual knowledge was but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some perceptive answers looked at the author of the source and contrasted his views with the majority of Congress, views that could be teased from the source in its comments over the reluctance of Congress to take up armed resistance. Some candidates lost focus on the question and began to write extensively about campaigns after the First World War. Candidates do need to remember that stand alone knowledge is not rewarded in A02 and that knowledge is used with the source material to reach judgements about the weight that can be attached to the source.

DOC ID: 0429001288471 This is a level 4 response. It includes reasoned inferences and considers both the strengths and limitations of the source. The interrogation of the source is developed using sound contextual knowledge and has a sense of the values of the society from which it originates. It has a brief judgement that arises out of the main body of the answer.

Context: just after 1907 partition so esp. anti-British. before WWI, that showed many Cong. pro-UK.

1907, Congress split, Tilak revered, opposed by many, not weighty. Was in minority.

Author: radical, opposed UK, later became more moderate, trying get support, trying be anti-UK on purpose, so less reliable? Times

Content: exaggeration - oppression, being kept in ignorance, but self-gov. accepted as aim after 1907.

Source 2 is valuable to a historian in many ways, and does lend some weight to the view that attitudes in Congress were generally hostile to British rule. This is partly due to the authorship of the source, and partly to the fact that some of the content is backed up by the my own knowledge of the time.

The author, Tilak is was a member of Congress in 1907, so his views are weighty in that they represent authentically, some of the views of Congress. However, Congress was divided at this time. There was a significant bloc of moderates who opposed Tilak and his minority radical supporters so it must be questioned how reliable the source is in representing as a whole, the attitudes of Congress to British rule. It is quite likely that only a minority view is being given.

The source is clearly attempting to inspire members of Congress to more militant ways of ending British rule; as a result it makes use of exaggeration, when talking of the British, and is quite agressively hostile. However, given the purpose of whipping people up into a frenzy of hostility to the Raj, its

content is thus, less useful. For example, Tilak makes a sweeping statement that it was the purpose of every Englishman to fool the Indians into believing that the Indians were weak, and the British strong. This accusation is not supported by the Indian Councils Act of 1909 only two years later, where provincial councils were enlarged to create non-official, non-British majorities. This does not back up the accusation that the government was attempting to keep Indians in blind slavery. (line 20, and line 16).

Also, the source was done in 1907, just two years after the Bengal partition. Memories of the partition was fresh in the minds of Congressmen, so increasing their hostility to the Raj. However, this might not have been the case always, so the general attitude of hostility demonstrated in Source 2 is probably just the result of that, and waned with time, and the reunification of Bengal in 1911.

However, the content of the source can also be supported. Tilak claims that self-government is Congress' aim – this was in fact their self-declared aim at the general meeting in Surat in 1907. It is also true that most in Congress did not like taking part in 'active resistance' while almost all declined to use 'armed weapons'. This can be seen in the reaction to the partition of Bengal, where there was very little terrorism. Most people used newspapers to express discontent or took part in national boycotts, further supporting Source 2's references to boycotting. This then increases the weight of Source 2 as it accurately

~~The statement that the British knew they were a 'tiny minority'~~ describes the attitudes of many moderates to British rule.

Nevertheless, ~~it is untrue~~ Tilak himself became more moderate in later years, especially after his deportation, suggesting that his references to 'oppression' and 'alien government' and lack of freedom may either have been ill-founded or that he himself stopped believing that the British were as bad

as he suggests. Also, it is clear that his wishes to actively resist British rule by not paying taxes, and not keeping the peace were not accepted by Congress, who split in 1907, and effectively ensured that Tilak wasn't elected President.

Finally, the source is written in 1907, and so does not represent Congress' attitudes up to 1914. As the ~~a~~ response to the outbreak of war demonstrates, there was widespread loyalty to the Raj in 1914. Gokhale, notable moderate, recommended fighting for Britain, and so Tilak's ~~alleged rhetoric that~~ assertions that Congress would 'not give them assistance too... keep peace' and not 'pay taxes' are inaccurate. The contrary occurred, with Congress assisting the British in their war effort. It was only after 1920 that the first campaigns against paying taxes and boycotting law courts, occurred.

Altogether then, I do not give much weight to Source 2 in ~~you~~ exploring the attitudes of Congress to British rule as I do not think it is entirely accurate, and I do not think it represents the views of many.

Question 2

There were a number of responses to this question. Those candidates who did answer the question showed some awareness of the second order concept – change and continuity – and were able to draw changes in the government of India that suggested progress towards self-government as well as continuities in the system. These included the Indian Councils Act 1892, the Morely-Minto Reforms and the Ilbert Bill 1883. The most common problem which limited achievement in this answer was candidates who focused on the work of Congress and even Gandhi's campaigns after the First World War and thus did not focus on the 'government of India' as specified in the question.

DOC ID: 0429001288479: This is a secure level 4 response. Although there are some minor errors of detail, there is a good range of factors which are explored in sufficient detail to address the question. The judgement is based on valid criteria.

India's progress towards self governance was largely contributed by a mixture of both long term growing nationalism and short term efforts and reforms. After the Indian Mutiny of 1857, the formation of the Indian National congress (INC) sought to widely achieve self-governance and the withdrawal of British opposition and rule in India. The INC, divided into the moderates and extremists both had differences approaches towards achieving self-government. But, they had the same goal and were driven by underlying Nationalistic ideals and efforts. This essay will be discussing the extent to which these efforts created any progress towards self governance that was ultimately obtained in 15th of August 1947.

The formation of the ICS gave way to authoritative representation of the Indian people, ~~both the Hindus and the Muslims~~ giving them a chance to take part in decision making and proposals intended for India. After the Indian Mutiny of 1857 and the establishment of the East India company, the Indians were given more opportunities ~~but~~ to participate in ~~legislative~~ legislative and provincial governments. They no longer had to ~~become~~ understand the decisions made merely by the British but were given an opportunity in congress to be a part of the process alongside the British. This contributed largely to self governance as now the Indians were no longer ~~viewed~~ to be seen as subjects under the British but were now seen as capable subordinates and were given opportunities to

be in power a position ~~of~~ power.

The moderates in the INC were known to be cooperative with the more liberal, British Labour party. The Labour party were more open to the idea of giving the Indians representation and ~~on the~~ control over governance in India. They were unlike the British conservatives who believed in the racial superiority of the British over the Indians, working to keep ~~the Indians~~ India on a tight leash. The Labour party unlike the conservatives did not hear ground national ideals and efforts in India but instead supported the ~~ease~~ and enlightenment of the Indians. Therefore, the Government of India, in their existence and support of the Labour party made way for the future of impending self-government.

With the proposition of separate electorates came the more equal representation of political parties between the majority Hindus and muslim minorities. This proposition was made in 1906 in the simla delegation where they demanded the British would get Separate electorates. This made the political process more fair and more representative of all sections of the community with more opportunities and fair representation, more power and authority was given to the Indians in order to obtain self-governance. Therefore, this allowed for progress towards self-governance.

However, the partition of Bengal in 1905 ~~,~~ obstructed the road to self-government. Lord Curzon's reasoning behind the partition was to ease the administrative processes in Bengal due to its large size. However, it created anarchy and dissension between the Hindus and muslims in East and West Bengal. It can be argued that the partition was enacted so as to curb growing nationalistic movements in Bengal upon taking place and ~~strengthening~~ strengthening. Bengal was known to be the most nationalistic movements in the country and efforts of the time in the fight for self-government. This therefore, acted as a roadblock to self-government and retarded/hindered progress. Even though the partition was annulled soon after, its effects of creating a feud between the hindus and muslims lasted for much longer after that, ~~and~~ acting ~~as a~~ as a divisive factor amongst the Indians.

The Morley-Minto (Indian councils act of 1909) reforms brought about separate electorates for the muslims and more opportunities of representation in the administrative sectors within the government. This led to a gradual change towards the Indians by the British, now viewing them as capable and worthy of opportunities. Indians were given more opportunities to become higher education and higher levels of literacy which ~~made~~ made them in being educated enough to actually participate in the progress towards self-government. The Indians were given chances to equip themselves with the necessary tools to fight for their rights and to be able to express themselves on multi fronts. Moreover, the ~~Indian~~ Morley-Minto reforms were set to be

renewed every 10 years. This gave hope for more reforms leading to self-government for the Indians and their empowerment. Therefore, the government of India did make significant progress towards self government in 1880-1910.

In conclusion, the efforts made by the government between 1880-1910 did not directly lead to radical change to self-government. However, it gave Indians the opportunity to be represented, to fight against racial inferiority, to be educated and literate in order to further progress towards self-governance. Even though the partition of Bengal was a setback to the Indians that divided them and resulted in disharmony, it led to recognition of not only the majority but the minority and their representation. Therefore, the Government of India did make progress towards self government in 1880-1910 indirectly, paving the way to more significant changes to British rule over India in the future. Hence, it contributed as an indirectly way further and a catalyst to self-government to a large extent.

Question 3

There were few answers to this question and most candidates struggled to focus on the second order concept – change. Many answers considered the benefits of economic exploitation to Britain, looking back to a previous question set on this paper. It is important thus that candidates do not produced pre-prepared answers and take some time to plan their answer to address the question set before writing.

DOC ID: 0429001117196: This is a secure level 4 response. It explores the key issues and is developed with a range of secure knowledge. It has a clear focus on the concept of change.

British trade with India experienced significant change in the years 1857 to 1914. Trade became more extensive, frequent, large in magnitude and more efficient due to technological and infrastructural advances. However, one thing remained the same, the British persistently benefitted more.

First and foremost, British trade with India changed due to rising FDI. Foreign Direct Investment. In 1857 due to the mutiny and fears of a repeated rebellion, investors were initially nervous about India's political stability, which affects their economic stability. However, the British self-ascribed 'victory' after the mutiny and effective consolidation of power convinced hitherto nervous British investors that the India more was safe. As a result, the first half of the same century saw India was the largest destination of British overseas investment which in 1900 was £240 million. By 1910 this number grew to £356 million and 50% of this was for the development of railways and subsidising tea and coffee plantations. Hence, the surge of British investment caused significant change in trade between the two countries.

In addition there was an increased flow of exports and

means between the two countries which only grew after the opening of the Suez Canal. The British exported Indian raw cotton, jute and coffee and the Indians imported British manufactured goods such as cotton, steel and the growth of railways from 1853 onwards only boosted this trade as raw materials could be transported faster and more cost-effectively from the countryside to be exported, which also gave farmers a guaranteed income. Hence, the railways and the Suez Canal increased and already existing trade flow between the two countries.

However, a drastically unequal change in trade for India occurred in 1879 when viceroy Lord Lytton abolished taxes/tariffs from the Lancashire cotton mills in England. The government then proceeded to abolish tariffs on all goods coming from England into India in 1882. The impact was disastrous as British cotton was highly processed and therefore of a higher quality and a fraction of the price of Indian home-spun cotton. British cotton flooded the Indian market increasing Indian consumption of British cotton from 55% in 1875 to 92% by 1896. Consequently, cottonwoods were ruined and India's import expenditure sky-rocketed whilst export revenue plummeted resulting in worsening trade deficit. Thus, although trade improved for Britain, it was at the cost of India's economy.

In addition,

~~The~~ British trade with India experienced significant change due to the development of port cities such as Bombay and Kashmir. ~~The British need India~~ The improvement in India's infrastructural capacity allowed for the flow of trade to increase ~~between~~ and by the mid 19th century, India was the single largest export market for the Britain. The ease of trade also improved due to the infrastructural development such as the modernization of roads, for example the Great Trunk Road from Calcutta to the Punjab, via the towns of the Gangetic plain ~~and~~ as well as bridges, such as the one spanning the entire River Sutlej made transportation of resources ~~made Indian goods more so~~ cheaper, as a result English goods were more price competitive due to cheaper costs and British imports could be distributed efficiently. ~~The~~ These, the infrastructural improvements, including that of telegraph and postal networks that made communication and international trade easier, improved the trade between Britain and India, changing the extent to which it occurred drastically. These developments also attracted investment from other countries and laid the foundation for a growing modern economy that has resulted in increased trade ~~in~~ same with other countries

However, earlier British interference in India's agricultural sector also changed trade between the two countries. The government commodified grain which was previously for the self-sustenance, it encouraged the harvesting of

non-edible cash crops such as jute and exported immense quantities of the grain. It also improved irrigation so as that more agricultural goods could be traded between the two countries. The Ganges Irrigation Canal was stretched for 350 miles and similar canals were built in Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Orissa and other agricultural hubs. A significant development was the fact that Assam was essentially a jungle in the 1800s but by the early 20th century 300 million acres of land had been irrigated and in total, the area of land irrigated increased by a factor of 8. This increased the agricultural produce that was exported to Britain, particularly in 1876 when 720,000 tons of grain was exported to Britain, hence trade between the two countries increased.

However, this increase in trade was at the cost of Indian lives as the subsistence increase in agricultural exports coincided with the Bengalese famine of 1876. The British had commodified what the people depended on, reduced the harvest of edible goods and exported masses of grain to Britain, whilst the Indians starved and approximately 5 million people eventually died. The trade was extremely unbalanced and favoured Britain much more. This evidence of this lop-sided trade is also visible in the development of the railways as it was British companies that built them with large state subsidies, and raw materials and spare parts were imported from Britain whilst Indian companies such as TISCO were refused

contracts. The repair was also restricted to British workshops, despite the availability of Indian ▶ locations such as in Jamalapur. Furthermore, only Europeans were hired as engineers and drivers, and which ultimately depicts that the British used India as a market for their own goods and services, stripping India of an opportunity to experience industrial growth like the rest of the emerging economies such as Japan and Russia. Hence, although the trade between the two countries increased, it was mostly one-sided as India was importing more and more British goods and services without a reciprocal increase in their own export revenue.

Overall, British trade with India did change - it increased due to the improvement of infrastructure, removal of protectionist policies such as tariffs and increased confidence in the Indian economy. However, the change was a positive one for Britain but an extremely unsustainable one for India. Although they experienced development internally due to infrastructural developments, it was exploited by the British to meet their own needs and India ultimately suffered an extremely unfavourable trade balance. Thus, change occurred, but it was not radically positive and for only benefitted Britain.

Question 4

This was by far the most popular question. The best responses developed Jinnah's role across the time period and examined his changing attitudes and his conversion to the decision on the necessity of Partition, and additionally explored a range of alternative factors including the roles of Congress and Nehru and the Raj as well as considering the underlying differences between Hindus and Muslims. Lower scoring responses tended to deal with a limited time period focusing mainly on the impact of events during the Second World War, or to write very generally about conflict between Muslims and Hindus. Some candidates made not distinction between Independence and partition and this limited their analysis and achievement.

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

Section A

- Make sure you are aware of the topics highlighted for the source question and have prepared for them
- A careful reading of the sources is needed so that the issues raised are clearly identified
- You must ensure that you draw out inferences, but these should always be directly linked to the source and not driven by contextual knowledge
- You should consider the nature, origin and purpose of the source
- Do not merely restate what the provenance says – think about how it can be used to address the question. In a, this requires a consideration of how it adds value and in b, this requires considering value and limitations
- Contextual knowledge should be used to support the answer, not to drive it, and should be made relevant to the enquiry
- Question 1a does not require a consideration of the limitations of sources
- It is unlikely that weight can be assessed by listing all the things that a source does not deal with.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified

- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels

- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision

- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question

- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.