

# Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
in History (6HI02) Paper D

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

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43887

All the material in this publication is  
copyright © Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

## Option D

### Introduction

Centres and candidates are once again to be congratulated for their performance this series as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. In an examination in which the majority of candidates were re-taking the examination paper, there were many impressive answers to be seen and relatively fewer weaker answers than has been the norm in the past.

In part A, the majority of candidates did attempt to cross reference the sources in their answer, although this was developed with varying degrees of success and for some this amounted to merely asserting that the sources either agree or disagree without explaining how they have arrived at this conclusion. Answers of this type are unlikely to have moved beyond level 2. There were a number of candidates who did not consider the provenance of the sources and this meant that they could not advance very far in the mark scheme. There were also proportionately more candidates than in the past who spent considerable amounts of time elucidating their answer with own knowledge - this cannot be credited in this question. Indeed those candidates who did this were wasting time that would have been better spent in developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit - cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements. There were certain stock phrases that were used by some candidates e.g. taken as a set; this is only appropriate if that is what the candidate is doing. In too many cases, the phrase was not accompanied by the action.

In part B, there were a number of candidates who relied primarily on the material in the sources. There were also a number of candidates who demonstrated some range and depth of knowledge that could be applied to the part B questions. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. It continues to be the case that despite comments in previous examiners' reports for all recent exam series regarding the focus of AO2b, candidates continue to comment to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part B in this exam series. Such comments are frequently very generic e.g. the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in part B. Some candidates spend an excessive amount of time on this and they would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work.

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

## **Q1a**

There were many impressive answers on display with candidates who demonstrated an ability to engage in developed cross referencing and engage with the attribution to reach reasoned arguments about the weight that the sources could bear. The sources were generally well understood with many candidates able to use them effectively as a group. There were relatively few candidates who approached their answer on a simple source by source basis. There were, however, a minority of candidates who used extensive amounts of own knowledge to write a general essay. Such material could not be credited as it does not meet the requirements of the question.

### **Example script**

This response is clearly in level 4 because of the sustained cross referencing throughout the answer. It is accompanied by sound consideration of the provenance. It is slightly less strong on make explicit judgements and for this reason would not reach the top of the level.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

- (a) ~~How far do the sources suggest that the use of violence by the Royal Irish Constabulary and the Black and Tans in 1920 was 'justifiable self-defence'?~~

The beginning half of Source 2 argues that the Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC) and the Black and Tans in 1920 was 'justifiable self-defence'. It describes them as a 'disciplined force' in which the Chief Secretary for Ireland can 'confidently count upon'. This infers that the RIC were a respectable force who had to do their jobs properly. This viewpoint is contrasted in Source 1, where the RIC are called 'traitors', this suggests that these men in fact were not respectable and were a disgrace to the country. This leads to the idea that the RIC was in fact not justifiable as their actions were not ~~what~~ what the people wanted. Source 2 goes on to further cement his claim by saying that the RIC are 'hiding his country for the enemy' which infers that they are in fact not working in self-defence for Ireland but for the British in controlling and cementing the British authority.

A reason why the sources differ in their views may be due to their provenances. Source 1 is from



(a) continued) an Irish Republican Army soldier and therefore it is obvious that they would be against the RIC as the RIC was created by the British and it was the British that they were trying to get ~~the~~ separated from, therefore this source has ~~obvious~~ a good reason to be bias which reduces the reliability of it and thus the weight. ~~However~~ Nevertheless source 2 also has a certain level of bias to it as well because it is from Sir Horace Greenwood who is British. Therefore, for the same reason why source 1 could be unreliable, it ~~is~~ also could be highly bias. The British would want to make the RIC look ~~better~~ better than good as the RIC was highly significant for British control. Therefore relatively equal weighting can be put on both sources.

Source 2, however does go on to disagree with the statement slightly and says that there are cases in which 'unjustifiable action was undoubtedly been taken' which directly goes against the statement, however the use of 'some' implies that it is a small minority and as a whole their actions are 'justified'. Source 2 also goes on to discuss the 'brutally murdered' contracts that their Irish saw, which is also supported in source 3 which states that the people were in 'terror







(a) continued) neutrality

To conclude sources 1 and 3 disagree with source 2 near the RIC and Black and Tans were 'inhabitable self-defence' and even source 2 goes on to say that there were some cases in which the statement is incorrect. Most weight can be placed on source 3 because unlike sources 1 and 2, it was the least-likely to have hidden biases.



## **Q1bi**

Both questions tended to attract similar numbers of candidates. The sources were generally well understood, although it was disappointing that greater numbers did not exploit Source 6 fully. A minority of candidates had only limited knowledge of the material required for this question and relied heavily on the content of the sources. There were, however, some impressive answers which integrated the sources and very secure own knowledge to reach clearly reasoned conclusions. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

### **Example script**

This response has a number of strengths - it makes judgements relating to the focus of the question, it draws out inferences from the sources and it has mainly accurate and detailed supporting own knowledge. By taking a source by source approach and running out of time, the answer does not deal equally well with all sources. On balance, AO1 reaches the margins of level 3/4 and AO2b is doing sufficient to reach level 3

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

(b) ~~ii) of part (b) (ii)~~

i) The sources 4, 5 & 6 seem to suggest that the agitation by Irish nationalists in the years 1867-85 never posed any significant challenge to the British government, most notably in sources 4 & 6 ~~who~~ <sup>that</sup> suggest most notably source 4 suggests Fenian activities were 'relatively unimportant' & that it was a 'myth' that did not present any 'genuine threat'. Similarly source 6 suggests that Gladstone was able to resist the Land League and therefore it didn't pose a significant threat. However, source 5 alludes to the idea that the Irish nationalists did pose a significant threat by forcing parliament to grant Home Rule.

Source 4 supports the view that agitation by Irish nationalists never posed a significant challenge to the British government. It argues that Fenian activities were 'relatively unimportant'; that they were simplistic acts of 'street theatre' rather than serious revolutionary ventures'. Although it does point out that the 1867 Manchester ambush 'encouraged a wave of sympathy' and that this meant the Fenians'



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 9 2 0

9  
Turn over ▶

((b) continued) failure was turned into a 'serf of victory', it maintains that this simply strengthened their 'myth' and therefore implies that no real challenge to British government existed.

My own knowledge supports this interpretation to a certain extent. Indeed the Fenian activities can be viewed as street theatre rather than revolutionary ventures in the period because at the time, the Fenian movement was quite diverse. In the wake of the Famine in the 1840s Irish nationalists & indeed Fenians who wanted an end to British rule in Ireland were in a diaspora in America as the Fenian Brotherhood or Cum na Gael, or in small communities in Britain & Ireland. This meant that there was poor planning & organisation to the 1867 Fenian uprising in Ireland. Indeed, the British even had many Fenian informants that meant that the risings in February in County Cork & Kerry were easily thwarted, as were the other risings across Ireland in March, including the rising in Dublin. Nonetheless, the significant impact that the 1867 Manchester Ambush had, is arguably downplayed by the source. Although the source points to sympathy from the Catholic Church, and a change~~d~~ from their view of the



((b) continued) Fenians as 'freemasons' before ~~the~~ William O'Brien, William Allen & Michael Larkin were executed is alluded to. The source omits how these so-called 'Manchester Martyrs' blurred the line between the constitutional & ~~revolutionary~~ revolutionary nationalists like themselves. Indeed in 1869, the Fenian Jeremiah Rossa was elected as the MP in Tipperary and thus the Fenian movement became somewhat of an umbrella movement incorporating ideas such as Home Rule & Land Reform. Thus it can be argued that the Fenians posed a much more significant threat than suggested.

Source 5 challenges the view that agitation by Irish nationalists never posed any significant challenge to the British government. It suggests that with Parnell's support for land agitation would come the encouragement of 'constitutional nationalism in Ireland' and that would help 'force parliament to grant Home Rule'. It also argues that Parnell's agitation would 'force the British government to introduce land reform' & that this would ultimately encourage landlords to throw their weight behind Home Rule. Thus it suggests that Irish nationalists did challenge the British government.

My own knowledge supports this view to



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) some extent in that the creation of the Land League in 1879 & subsequent land agitation undertaken by Parnell & leaders like <sup>in County Mayo,</sup> Michael Davitt, did challenge the British government and made Gladstone introduce Land reforms. For example the campaigning of the Land League throughout the 1879-82 land war issued slogans, speeches & rallies which meant that many ~~stopped~~ paying rents & didn't take up land where tenants had been evicted. There was even violence for example in 1880 when land-lord ~~James~~ Meentemes was assassinated for evicting his tenants. The Boycott of Captain Boycott in <sup>September</sup> 1880 meant that Gladstone introduced the 1881 Ashbourne Purchase Act to add to the 1870 Land Act already in place, this provided for a committee to ensure that rents were fair and provided a further £5 million in loans for tenants to purchase their holdings. However) although the Home Rule movement did gain in popularity, for example Parnell created the Irish Party in 1882 and this was committed to Home Rule, it even had a pledge that its MPs had to vote the same way as the party, it did not become a reality, or even was proposed in a Bill until after the period. Thus this suggests that



((b) continued) In regard to Home Rule, there was less of a significant challenge to the British Government. Overall, it can be seen by source 3 that Gladstone did indeed resist the Land League, for example by imprisoning Parnell.



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 1 3 2 0

## **Q1bii**

Both questions tended to attract similar numbers of candidates. The sources were generally well understood and well used, with most candidates appreciating that the counter argument could be based around Source 9's arguments concerning Asquith's role. The better answers were able to develop the arguments presented in the sources by some impressive own knowledge which enabled them to draw well focused conclusions in response to the question posed. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

### **Example script**

This is a secure level 4 response for both assessment objectives. In AO1, it argues a clear case which is well supported by knowledge. In AO2b, it clearly examines the issues that have been raised by the sources , even if at times it might have made greater use of them.



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

(b) ii. Do you agree with the view that the Conservative Party, under the leadership of Andrew Bonar-Law, was responsible for the crisis over the 2<sup>nd</sup> Home Rule Bill in the years 1912-14?

All three sources give reasons as to why the third Home Rule bill had opposition, with source 7 and 8 focusing on the bond between Conservatives and Unionists and source 9 focusing more so on Asquith's lack of reaction to the growing anti-Home Rule force in Ulster. The third Home Rule bill went through the House of Commons in September 1912 and was later rejected by the House of Lords. However the Act of Parliament in 1911 had meant that all the House of Lords could do was veto it for 2 years and therefore the third Home Rule bill was set to be in place <sup>in</sup> 1914 which meant that the Unionist and Conservatives only had 2 years to do something about it. However overall it can be seen that the Conservative party was not responsible ~~for~~ for the crisis, but it was due to the growing rivalry and hostility between northern and southern Ireland which had meant that there was bond to the same sort of opinion.

Source 1 stated that the Conservative were opposed with the Unionist cause because it would



(b) continued) 'the popular aim doctrine', which is probably  
true as many in Britain felt sympathy for the  
Protestant brothers in Ulster ~~and~~, many thought that  
Ireland would not be able to lead themselves and  
many thought that Ireland leaving would ~~cause~~ lead  
to other tentacles in the empire wanting freedom too.  
There also after the first world war, many believed  
in Woodrow Wilson's self-determination and would  
respect the will of the people. Nevertheless it is true  
that most conservatives wanted union and that  
led to Andrew Bonar Law ~~speech~~ 'must  
meeting of Unionists at Stormont Palace' where he  
spoke in front of 13,000 people, encouraging them  
to go against Home-Rule and receive directly  
mail to stir things up in Ireland and cause  
a crisis. He shared a platform with Edward Carson,  
Carson was the leader of the Unionist and therefore  
them two being at the same ~~page~~ stage together  
shows great unity between the conservatives and  
Unionists. This was against the liberals who gave  
'their support to 'Irish Nationalists'. The significance  
of this is that it shows that the divisions  
in ~~between~~ Britain was carried forward in  
Ireland and opinion between the two, both  
politically and through force was ~~generally~~ generally.  
Some of these divisions have been



((b) continued) (and the liberals in power) had found it hard to control what was happening in ~~Ulster~~ Ulster. It started the 'Army would not obey orders' by Asquith. This is because many in the army had sympathised with the ~~Irish~~ Ulster and this is shown in the Carragh. Munnig in 1914 where ~~Asquith~~ Asquith ordered the British army to go to the north and seize the weapons houses there were rumors going around that they were to ~~capture~~ detain the Ulster leaders and that if they disobeyed that they would be hanged. This led to 56 British officers resigning, threatening to resign which was significant as it showed that the British government could not even rely on its own army. This lack of control ~~was~~ ~~strong~~ ~~solidarity~~ a reason to why there was a Home-Rule crisis which is that the government could not enforce more control.

Source 8 and 9 both agree that Asquith had failed to judge how strong the Ulster opposition was. Source 8 states that Asquith was expecting that the Conservatives 'pledged ourselves so definitely to support Ulster's resistance' which infers that they did not acknowledge the significance of the Ulster Union. Source 9 states Asquith failed



((b) continued) 'to arrest those who were openly advocating sedition in Belfast' which suggests that Asquith was a significant reason for the Irish Home Rule crisis. The ~~source~~ <sup>source</sup> ~~might be referring~~ <sup>might be referring</sup> to the Home-Rule running in April 1914 where the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF) had successfully and openly received foreign shipment which had 35,000 rifles and 3,000,000 rounds ammunition which significantly strengthened their force. This was further made important after the Irish Volunteer Force (IVF) had a tactical gun running that same year in July.

The clear reason for the crisis over the 3rd Home Rule Bill was because of the 'private armies' that were forming. After the third Home Rule passed in the Commons in 1914, there was an Ulster day. This was when 490,000 Ulster Irish people signed the Covenant of No Solemn League in which they promised to fight for unionism by any means necessary. This was signed first by Carson, which further solidified the importance of the covenant and then bond in source 7 as it shows that Carson has the support of hundreds and thousands. The covenant was also signed by some in blood which shows how strongly they



((b) continued) felt about it. The card out had led to the formation of the UVF in 1913 (as save 9 miles) and his was seen as a direct rivalry between the UVF which had been in Ireland since for many years before and who had openly drilled in eastern Ireland. These two sides would say different things and would have never come to ~~the~~ a conclusion to the 'with the sun that would make them both happy, especially as the ~~Irish~~ were Nationalists wanted the union of Ireland to be under Home Rule, especially as there was several causes in the north which were mainly unionist and they would not accept permanent partition which was offered to them by Asquith's government. Therefore the crisis was inevitable.

To conclude, I do not agree that the conservative party ~~was~~ under Bonar Law's leadership was responsible for the third Home Rule Bill crisis ~~and~~ as I believe that the crisis was inevitable due to neither sides in Ireland being <sup>able to</sup> ~~willing to~~ come to a conclusion that would satisfy both parties. Therefore even without the constructive support for the Ulster unionists, there would have been a crisis. I also slightly agree with source 9 and 9



((b) continued) that the crisis was exacerbated by Asquith's underestimation of the Ulster's unwavering strength. If Asquith was to be stronger in his support for the Home-Rulers and had ~~been~~ <sup>dearly</sup> ~~been~~ <sup>been</sup> with their opposition sooner then the crisis would not have been as bad as it was. Nevertheless, as previously stated, a crisis was inevitable because the ~~best~~ personal views of each side were so opposite and deeply ingrained that tension was inevitable and the crisis occurred in 1912-1914.



## Q 2a

There were many impressive answers on display with candidates who demonstrated an ability to engage in developed cross referencing and engage with the attribution to reach reasoned arguments about the weight that the sources could bear. A minority of candidates struggled with Source 12, taking the statement regarding 'delay and frustrate' out of context and suggesting that this was the actual purpose of the Mission. This then led to some inaccurate cross referencing. Whilst some candidates were able to reference and develop the provenance to very good effect, there were a significant minority of candidates who simply asserted it or made very generic comments.

### **Example script**

This is a level 1 answer as it only really deals with one source in a developed way and thus effectively does not cross reference the sources - they key elements in this question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 1**

**Question 2**

(a) There is overwhelming evidence ~~to~~ to support the notion that the main reason for the failure of the 1946 Cripps Mission was ~~the~~ <sup>due</sup> ~~to~~ ~~lack~~ of ~~the~~ ~~the~~ Gandhi's unwillingness to ~~compromise~~ ~~compromis~~ ~~compromis~~ ~~e~~. It is evident that sources 11 and 12 both agree that the lack of progress was due to Gandhi's lack of compromise however source 10, argues that that the mission was ~~some~~ ~~what~~ of a success.

Source 11, a personal diary extract from a British civil servant, claims that "Gandhi did not care whether two or three million people died, and that Gandhi ~~did~~ would rather they should ~~than~~ die than that he should compromise". This primary source strongly supports the statement ~~and~~ and claims that Gandhi was more than happy to go to extreme lengths in order to avoid cooperating with the British. Given the context, the author being a civil servant, this view ~~is~~ undoubtedly





((a) continued) would have been held out perhaps  
indiscriminated into the members of the  
government, ~~however~~ due to the author  
~~accompanied~~ <sup>therefore</sup> questioning the credibility,  
however due to the author being  
present at the Mission in ~~1946~~ 1946, his  
views can be argued as credible.

This supports the Stateman in the  
question that the failure of the Cripps  
Mission was due to Gandhi's lack  
of compromise.



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 5 2 0

## **Q2bi**

This was the more popular of the two questions in this section of the examination. There were some excellent answers to this question, which displayed keen analytical understanding and a sure grasp of contextual knowledge. The best answers often used source 14 as a pivot to find the range in their counter arguments. There were answers which strayed beyond the chronological parameters of the question, going back to the mutiny. There were also a number of answers which engaged in fairly long descriptions of events at Amritsar at the expense of analysis. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

### **Example script**

This answer is aware of a range of relevant factors that could be called upon to answer the question. These have been derived from the sources and are explored on the basis of own knowledge. This response is therefore level 4 for both assessment objectives.

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

(b) Part (i) "Military strength main reason why Britain kept central" 1900-1919.

The British Raj, had taken control of India with force and was prepared to keep control in the same manner. But was this actually how it planned out. Source 14 suggests that the policy of Britain towards India were "repression, concession, progression." This sums up the main argument for why the British was able to keep control. Some historians suggest that the loyalty of Indians kept them from overthrowing the Raj. Source 13 seems to suggest this, that the British were needed to "recover her [Indians] national freedom." There certainly was liberal reform between 1900-1919, but did these keep tensions down low or was the effect actually the opposite. Finally source 15 shows that Britain did intervene with military hardness but does not actually present much of an argument for this stopping the Raj being overthrown.

One reason why Britain kept control over the subcontinent could be down to the military strength of the British. Source 13 actually admits that the Indians were "not in a position to gain our freedom by fighting with the British." This is certainly shown through out the whole period of



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 9 2 0

((b) continued) British rule, never in India, civil disobedience was used possibly due to serious strength of British Military. Source 15 discusses the Amritsar massacre in April 1919. This occurred after protests broke out due to the Rowlatt Act in 1919. These laws were passed both Hindu and Muslim in India and led to trouble across the country. The British government sent Dyer to Amritsar, where he massacred 400 people wounded 1500 and broke up mass protests across the country. This was all done to work to "make an example of those who had defied his orders". This shows that not only does the military intervention make things a lot worse, as the Amritsar massacre led to the first civil disobedience campaign in 1920 and widespread hatred of the British, it was not actually that good at keeping control. Not to mention that the British government in India were severely outnumbered by Indians, and the British relied upon Indian police to keep control. Therefore I wouldn't suggest that it was the main reason why Britain kept control of the subcontinent.

Another reason why the British kept control was a political policy of "concessions" as some 14 points etc. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms 1909, Government of India Act 1919, Bengal state reorganisation 1911 all provided Indians with greater representation on both the legislative councils and vice versa executive council. However



(b) continued) we can actually see now that these liberal reforms did not actually do much, the Morley-Minto reforms provided the middle class Indians more power, the very people who supported the Raj. Although there was not much discussion about the reforms as both the Indian National Council and the Muslim League were so very moderate. As Tilak says in source 13 "we shall advance step by step, believing in a conciliatory manner with the British." This shows just how moderate the Congress was. Therefore I would suggest that the reforms implemented <sup>were</sup> important to the British keeping control of the Raj subcontinent, when combined with moderate Congress and Muslim League then it does become very important and one of the main reasons.

The loyalty of the Indians can also be said to be a important factor in keep the British keeping control of the subcontinent. As source 14 says the British "abused a magnificent disaster in ~~1914~~ 1911 which encouraged loyalty." This was festal with the outbreak of WWI in 1914 in which all indent workers in India were dropped. 875,000 Indian soldiers enlisted for action, 64,000 were killed in action. This shows the massive loyalty to the British Raj. This could explain why there were no mass uprisings against the Raj and why the British was able to keep control over the subcontinent.



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) Finally, source 13 suggests that the British would see "our [India's] condition will [not] be any better by exchanging British rule for that of any other nation." This would be suggesting that the Indians actually benefited from British rule, although WWII brought about a lot of damage to the human population of India. The massive rise in exports to Britain boosted the Economy massively, in fact India was one of the only countries not to experience the depth of recession that other countries did after WWII. Therefore Britain was able to keep control over the subcontinent due to Indians accepting them due to them benefiting from British rule.

To conclude, I believe that the main reason why Britain kept maintained control over the subcontinent was due to the policy of liberal reforms in India. Although, as some the scholars, these reforms were more "measures of consolidation than a serious move towards representative government" the measures were seen by congress "interpreted as such" by many in congress. This allowed the moderate in congress and the extremists to meet that there were not a building rebellion as predicted by the fascist of the British government and they maintained control.



## **Q2bii**

This was the less popular of the two questions in this section of the examination. Most candidates confined their comments to the chronological parameters of the question. There were some highly impressive answers that combined secure analysis led by the content of the sources with outstanding own knowledge to support the analysis. There were, however, also a number of responses that relied almost exclusively on the content of the sources and had very limited own knowledge to support the arguments. Despite the fact that the issue of addressing AO2b has been referred to in numerous Principal Examiners' reports, there remain a number of candidates who discuss, sometimes at great length, the provenance of the secondary sources. There is no credit to be gained for this under AO2b.

### **Example script**

This answer achieves level 3 in both assessment objectives because it has made valid use of the sources as the basis of its argument and identified some relevant issues. Whilst there is some support from the candidate's own knowledge this is not extensive.

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

(b) In the late 1920's the possibility of partition has been of great debate. On August 14<sup>th</sup> 1947, two dominions India and Pakistan were created. However is this clear to happen in the late 20's? I believe both sides can be argued.

You could argue that division was a real possibility. Source 17 says "Congress was unwilling to grant the Muslims concessions". This would have angered Muslims and made them feel as though Muslims rights are not respected so they would fear when the British left. It also ~~shows~~ comes to a clear conclusion that "by the end of the 1920's partition was becoming a real possibility". This is because Muslims wanted a "guarantee that their voice would be heard in whatever constitution emerged for an ~~independent~~ independent India". The Muslims "would not accept" anything less than this. The fact that Congress was a Hindu organisation meant they didn't respect the Muslims so the Muslim League would have never accepted a united India. It can even be argued partition is clear in 1905 in the Partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon. Curzon Partition Bengal as it got too big



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 9 2 0

9  
Turn over ▶



((b) continued) although his real motive was to divide Hindu west Bengal and build up Muslim East Bengal as a counterweight to the nationalist movement when this happened Hindus reacted violently and there was a boycott of British goods called 'Swadeshi', an upsurge in terrorism and handspun cotton was burnt publicly. However Muslims were happy with their Muslim majority provinces and were shocked by the Hindu reaction. This actually led to them fearing for when the British left so in 1905 70 Muslims went to Simla and the Muslim League was created. This event shows how Muslims were happy being separated from Hindus and the possibility of them wanting India to be partitioned is already high in 1905, let alone <sup>late</sup> 1920's.

you could also argue that partition was not a real possibility in the late 1920's. Source 17 is a speech made by Jinnah in 1928 and said "nothing will make me as happy as to see the Hindu-Muslim union". This is significant as this is the leader of the Muslim League and the same man who in the future argues for the creation of Pakistan. In this you can see Jinnah wants India united and later says



((b) continued) "there will be no progress for India until Muslims and Hindus are united". Again this shows Jinnah wants India "united". The fact this source is 1928 so late 20's, and Jinnah himself is saying he wants a united India shows there is no possibility of partition. Source 18 believes that "in 1931 there was not yet a mainstream demand for partition". Instead it believes "the call for Pakistan would only come to prominence as a result of the alienation of India's ablest Muslim politician". This has some truth as Jinnah only actually thought of Pakistan in 1940 in his Lahore resolution where he said he wanted an autonomous area for Muslims to live. By the late 20's he hadn't really thought about a separate nation so it was unlikely to happen. Also due to the Lucknow pact of 1916 Muslims and Hindus got along well. This is because they agreed how to deal with British reform, that Muslims would have proportional representation. This means <sup>the</sup> Muslims voice was included in British reform, and that Muslims were happy in India with Hindus as ~~there~~ they had a say as well as Hindus. This shows partition wasn't a reality in the late 1920's.

To conclude I believe partition wasn't a real



P 4 3 8 8 7 R A 0 1 1 2 0

((b) continued) reality in late 1920's. I feel source 18 summarizes my view perfectly in saying "The call for Pakistan would only come about to prominence as a result of the alienation of India's ablest muslim politician". Essentially in the late 1920's there were issues between muslims and Hindus, however partition had not be thought of until 1940 in the Lahore resolution. I believe the partition of India only became a real possibility in the late 1930's when congress behavior caused muslims to fear for the future. This desire for partition would come later.



## Summary

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

### All Questions

1. Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination, and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
2. Too many candidates use certain phrases, such as ‘using the sources as a set’, as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.
3. Engaging with the sources needs to go beyond accepting the content at face value and to test it for validity considering provenance in part a and by testing the opinions in part b with knowledge set in the context of the period.

### Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making stereotypical comments about the provenance that could apply to any source and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable and thus negating any conclusions drawn. The key to a successful response is the ability to weigh the sources to reach a final judgement.
4. The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.
5. There are no marks available for knowledge in part a. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited and often impacts on the amount of time they have available to complete part b.

### Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.

3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
  
4. Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

