

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

GCE History (6HI02/D)

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

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

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

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code US028147

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which, strands of QWC are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However, candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award, unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|-------|---|
| 1 | 1-5 | <p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 2 | 6-10 | <p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 3 | 11-15 | <p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|---|
| 4 | 16-20 | <p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p> |
|---|-------|---|

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|------|---|
| 1 | 1-6 | <p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> |
| 2 | 7-12 | <p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|---|
| 3 | 13-18 | <p>Candidates will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> |
| 4 | 19-24 | <p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> |

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

AO2b (16 marks)

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|--------------|--------------|---|
| 1 | 1-4 | <p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 2 | 5-8 | <p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 3 | 9-12 | <p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 4 | 13-16 | <p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p> |

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

| Question Number | AO1a and b Marks | AO2a Marks | AO2b Marks | Total marks for question |
|--------------------|------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Q (a) | - | 20 | - | 20 |
| Q (b)(i) or (ii) | 24 | - | 16 | 40 |
| Total Marks | 24 | 20 | 16 | 60 |
| % weighting | 10% | 8% | 7% | 25% |

D1 Britain and Ireland, 1867–1922

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 1 (a) | <p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. Taken at face value Sources 1 and 2 are primarily concerned with land issues and the achievement of the '3Fs', as demonstrated in Source 3. However, Source 3 also indicates the presence of Fenians in the representation of the Land League, and in Source 2 Davitt claims that the League 'virtually rules the country' and refers to both buying arms and regaining 'freedom'. Responses that develop these points can reach L2, but the arguments can be developed much further if the sources are interpreted in context and cross-referenced.</p> <p>Source 1 is clearly focused on the issue of land reform, with Parnell attempting to encourage his audience to focus their 'activity and energy' to ensure that the 'land question is settled in a way that will satisfy you'. The method of achieving this is by 'boycotting' and the concerns are unfair rents, evictions and public support. This does not suggest any hidden political purpose. Source 2 is less clear cut. Davitt's references to growth and power, 'ruling' the country and 'having' to take a moderate line indicate that he may have other aims. In the context of Ireland in 1880, these hidden aims would involve political independence, as indicated by his reference to regaining Ireland's 'freedom'. In addition, he speaks of people 'buying arms', which may imply a willingness to use violence. This is certainly the implication of Source 3 – the Fenian figure was always used to indicate Irish nationalists, and the weapons being held suggest violence. It can therefore be argued that Sources 2 and 3 support the claim in the question. However, if provenance is considered, Source 3 is from an English magazine, and may reflect English assumptions about Fenianism rather any intention within the Land League to initiate a political revolution, violent or otherwise. Davitt is writing to an American, also with Fenian associations, whose support he wishes to maintain. It can therefore be argued that neither of these sources is reliable as evidence, and that the sources therefore suggest only that a hidden agenda may have existed among some sections of the League, or that English opinion feared, and American supporters hoped, that it did. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the explanation in Source 2, while those at L4 will offer an overall judgement of 'how far'.</p> | 20 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|------------------|---|------|
| 1 (b) (i) | <p>The sources offer evidence to support and challenge the claim in the question, which can be further developed by reference to contextual knowledge. Source 4 suggests that Conservatives and Imperialists like Churchill had their own reasons for 'playing the Orange card' and if cross-referenced with Source 6, this can build a strong argument in support of the claim. Candidates can draw on wider knowledge to show how Home Rule split the Liberal Party and brought the Conservatives to power in 1886, and how resistance to Home Rule in Ulster was built up by Conservative support and leadership. The roles of Churchill, Chamberlain and later Carson, Craig and Bonar Law can support this, while Source 6 refers explicitly to 'the scale and intensity' of their opposition in 1911-14 as coming from a 'thrice-defeated political party' in 'revenge for the Parliament Act'. The argument that English political rivalries influenced the situation can be strengthened by reference to Source 5, as evidence of the 'deal' to which the Conservatives objected, and of the rivalry between the English parties. Candidates can extend this argument by explaining the context of the 1909 Budget and Lords' Reform, and the desire of Conservatives to take 'a defiant stand' using Ulster as a convenient and winnable issue.</p> <p>However, Source 6 also suggests that attitudes were shaped by something more than party rivalry and that there were genuine convictions in the way of achieving Home Rule. Contextual knowledge of the situation and attitudes in Ulster, belief in the Empire and the role of Liberal Unionists, public opinion in both England and Ireland all posed obstacles to Home Rule, as did other priorities and events like the Boer War and social reform. Equally, Sources 4 and 5 both offer evidence that Irish movements were not always passive recipients of English intervention, but actively sought it. In Source 4 the Ulster Unionists 'turned to English Conservatives' for help, while Source 5 shows clearly that the Liberal Party was manipulated by Redmond and the nationalists to support Home Rule for their own survival. Again, these points can be developed by contextual reference to explain the impact of these relationships on the prospects for Home Rule. The sources therefore both support and challenge the representation in the question, while the best responses will suggest that the prospects for Home Rule depended on a complex interaction of party rivalries and political convictions across both England and Ireland.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the main obstacles to Home Rule in the period 1885-1914, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p> | 40 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 1 (b) (ii) | <p>The question is focused on the reasons why Irish opinion shifted between 1914 and 1918, from widespread support for self-government within the United Kingdom to a demand for independence from Britain. The question claims that the primary reason was the impact of war. Source 7 shows that from the earliest days of the war the more radical elements wanted to dissociate Ireland from fighting for Britain, especially overseas, while Redmond and the Home Rule parties claimed that Ireland should demonstrate its loyalty by sending volunteers to fight. Using contextual knowledge to develop the point, candidates can show the widespread support for Home Rule, and demonstrate the limits of support for the divided factions that made up the Irish volunteers. Reference can be made to the many Irishmen, from both North and South, who served in the British Army, and the initial response to the Easter Rising in 1916. However, Source 8 suggests that by 1916 this support was waning, as recruitment became more difficult, and also indicates that resistance to it was increasingly associated with support for Sinn Fein and independence. Candidates can refer to Sinn Fein propaganda against 'England's war' to explain the reference to 'fighting for England' as well as the impact of casualty figures, conditions in France and elsewhere, and the threat of conscription, to explain the changes in attitude. This can be further developed by reference to the conscription crisis of 1918, the threat to impose it with the implementation of Home Rule, and supported from Source 9 to show how the issue gradually undermined the position of Redmond, the Irish (Home Rule) Party, and their moderate supporters, so that in the election of 1918 they were swept aside by Sinn Fein.</p> <p>However, Source 9 also indicates that recruitment and the war were not the main reason for the shift in Irish opinion. Even though Sinn Fein itself did not initiate the Easter Rising, the participation of known members and the internment of its leaders in the aftermath of the Rising led to perceptions that it stood for independence that the party was able to exploit in order to gain support and 'a series of spectacular by-election victories'. Candidates can develop this argument by reference to the events and impact of the rising, the brutality of the British response and the mishandling of its aftermath, to argue that it was not the war, but the Easter Rising, that transformed Irish attitudes to Britain and created the demand for independence rather than Home Rule. In this context it can be argued that Sinn Fein were well placed to exploit Irish resentment of Britain and overtake the Home Rule parties in winning political support. The best responses may well demonstrate the impact of both factors, and show that Sinn Fein's radical associations and opposition to participating in 'England's War' enabled it take advantage of the anti-British backlash that followed the Easter Rising to win political control of Ireland in 1918.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and</p> | 40 |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for changing political support, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view. | |
|--|--|--|

D2 Britain and the Nationalist Challenge in India, 1900–47

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 2 (a) | <p>Sources 10 and 11 clearly suggest a change in Indian attitudes towards the British, and although neither explicitly refers to Amritsar, the dates of the sources and the references to military repression and martial law establish a clear link to events in the Punjab and at Amritsar in 1919. Source 11 also refers to British attitudes and the provenance of both sources makes reference to the debates and reactions that included defending Dyer. Both sources contain strongly worded attacks on the integrity of Britain and British rule, and can be used to support the claim in some depth. However Source 12 gives a very different picture of Anglo-Indian relations in the 1920s and after, suggesting that the Muslim community was more hostile to Hindu claims than to British rule. All of the sources can be challenged in terms of reliability. The authors of Sources 10 and 11 are nationalist politicians addressing an Indian audience, and could be argued to be exaggerating their views for political effect, while Source 12 is the view of an Indian Muslim who has recently suffered from Hindu extremism, and is dated some years after Amritsar. He does not speak directly about the impact of Amritsar, and he is not uncritical of the British, but he clearly feels that British rule remains necessary for the safety of the Muslim community. If the sources are cross-referenced it can be argued that the demands expressed in Sources 10 and 11 pose problems for some sections of the Indian people, and that, at the very least, Sources 10 and 11 do not fully represent 'Indian attitudes'. However, it can also be pointed out that, as politicians, both Nehru and Gandhi were in a position to influence Indian attitudes, and regardless of their purpose, this would be evidence of change. It is clear, therefore, that the sources are directly in conflict, both as sources of information and as sources of evidence/interpretation. The conflict may be addressed in order to assess 'how far' attitudes changed by considering the timing of the sources. Sources 10 and 11 relate to the period immediately after the Dyer affair, and may express immediate anger, while Source 12 is a decade later and may reflect some recovery of respect for the British administration in the light of new problems. Source 12 suggests that the campaigns that resulted from the attitudes in Sources 10 and 11 may well have overshadowed Muslim anger about Amritsar and forged new links between British rule and the Muslim community. Certainly the sources demonstrate that 'Indian attitudes' could vary. Candidates can therefore weigh up the various factors suggested by the evidence to judge 'how far' Indian attitudes changed. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the stated claim, while those at L4 offer a judgement as to 'how far'.</p> | 20 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 2 (b) (i) | <p>The focus of the question is the quality of Gandhi's leadership during the struggle for Indian independence in the years from 1920, when he emerged as a leader, to 1945. The end date is selected to include the Quit India campaign of 1942, but to exclude the complex shifts and manoeuvres that followed the end of the Second World War, when the status of his leadership was also complex. Sources 13 and 15 challenge the claim in the question, testifying to his political skills as both an organiser and a popular campaigner. Candidates can develop these arguments by considering Gandhi's relations with the Indian National Congress and other leaders, and by reference to his campaigns in 1920-22, the Salt campaign in 1930-32, and the Quit India campaign in 1942. These events can be used both to support and challenge the statement. His ability to gain, mobilise and maintain support, his importance regarding civil disobedience, his quasi-religious status and his ability to negotiate with a number of different British representatives can be used to argue that he was, in fact, an effective and skilful politician. On the other hand, the abandonment of some campaigns because of violence, mistakes such as his claim to represent all Indians, the refusal to compromise or to accept partial progress (such as the Government of India Act, 1935), his periodic disappearances and the worsening relations with the Muslim League can all be used to suggest that he did lack certain political skills. In addition, Source 14 does support the claim, suggesting that Gandhi was 'remote from practical politics' and implying that his cast of mind was divorced from political and social realities. This can also be developed within the references cited above, but it can be further strengthened by consideration of Gandhi's economic and social programmes, which failed to convince even some of his allies, such as Jawaharlal Nehru, and by the fact that crucial political developments across the period relied on the work of others. The reliability of Source 14 can be questioned, but it is clear that Irwin was not hostile to Gandhi, only rather puzzled. This can be seen as reflecting his own political mindset, or as a reflection of political realities, or both. Candidates can develop an overall judgement by weighing up Gandhi's strengths and weaknesses as a leader, and/or by setting his particular contribution in the context of other factors affecting the prospects of Indian independence.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the contribution of Gandhi, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p> | 40 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-------------------|---|------|
| 2 (b) (ii) | <p>The claim in the question is primarily based on the verdict given in Source 17, which can be developed and supported by reference to events in 1947. Reference can be made to Mountbatten's relations with Congress, in particular with Nehru, his attitude towards Jinnah (demonstrated by his comments in Source 18) his treatment of the Indian princes and their states, his refusal to accept advice from people like Corfield and his anger when they opposed him, and his interference in the work of the Boundary Commission. Since the question specifies 'violent' as well as hasty partition, reference to the Boundary Commission in the Punjab, the splitting of the Sikh homeland and the impact of Mountbatten's interference on the movement of population that lay at the heart of much violence, as well as the role of British troops in 1947, is also relevant. However, Sources 16 and 18 also allow the claim to be challenged. Source 16 does make reference to the speed of withdrawal under Mountbatten, but it also demonstrates the difficult situation that he inherited and the attitudes shown by others. Nehru's role in the failure of the Cabinet Mission, Jinnah's reaction and the Calcutta violence sparked by the day of Action, the refusal of either Congress or the Muslim League to compromise further and their willingness to contemplate large-scale loss of life all testify to the fact that Mountbatten's judgement and strategies may well have been justifiable in the circumstances. In that context, Source 18 can be reinterpreted to show the difficulties that he was facing. Wider reference can include the difficulties faced by Britain at the end of the Second World War, and the determination of the Attlee government to proceed with British withdrawal. Candidates may also choose to refer back beyond 1946 and explain the depth and longevity of communal hostilities in India, to suggest that partition was unavoidable long before 1945. However, they can combine this with an argument that while partition may have been inevitable by 1947, it did not have to be 'hasty' or 'violent'. They can form an overall judgement by this means, or by weighing up the relative significance of Mountbatten's decisions in the context of other factors, or by exploring the interaction of Mountbatten with other personalities to produce the end result of both 'hasty' and 'violent' partition.</p> <p>Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of reasons for partition, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p> | 40 |

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US028147 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

