



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level

In History(WHIO2) 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

Summer 2022

Publications Code WHI02_1A_2206

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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

Introduction

It was pleasing after the disruption of the pandemic to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHIO2 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.

In common with previous series, candidates found Section A more challenging than Section B. Some candidates were still not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. For some candidates, performance in Section A was also affected by the absence of the detailed knowledge base required to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the sources. Most candidates did use their time effectively and, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions both sections. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, most responses had an analytical focus and there were fewer responses that were wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, 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. This meant that some candidates wrote at length on topics that were only peripherally related to the question or which did not cover the whole time period.

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)

The majority of candidates produced answers that achieved level 2, a significant proportion achieved level 3 and only a limited number of responses fell into level 1. The most common reason for falling into level 1 was the failure to address one of the bullet points in the mark scheme – the application of relevant own knowledge being the bullet point most often ignored. Most candidates understood the question and were able to comprehend the source and comment on what it revealed about the reasons for the significance of the Indian Councils Act 1861 in the governing of India. Candidates were able to draw out valid inferences from the source evidence, for example the developing role and authority of the Viceroy. The best answers developed the inferences with well-selected context

to establish their validity. Candidates would do well to remember that contextual knowledge does need to be used to explain and develop the inferences drawn from the source and not just to provide free-standing knowledge. Lengthy passages about the 1857 Mutiny were often not applied relevantly to the source material. In some cases, candidates confused the 1861 Act with later legislation such as the 1909 Act or the Ilbert Bill. Some candidates did not use any contextual knowledge and this did depress their achievement within the levels. Some candidates were able to use the attributes of the source effectively to develop their ideas about the value of the Indian Councils Act in establishing and developing British control. Those candidates who discussed the limitations could not be rewarded for that part of their answer as it is not the focus of part a responses.

SECTION A

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Source 1 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 (a) Why is Source 1 valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the significance of the Indian Councils Act 1861 in the governing of India?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(10)

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 was a bill passed in the British Parliament under the reign of Queen Victoria. This specific action not only aligned Britain's overall objective with the British Raj and Subcontinent but specifically arranged and arguably reorganised the political structure ~~at~~ at a both local and national level.

The source could arguably be seen as valuable to the likes of a historian enquiring into the significance of the Indian Councils Act of 1861 for a vast number of reasons but most notably due to the source's context. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 is set upon the backdrop of the fall and decay of the previous ruler of the Subcontinent, the East India Company. The East India Company had established control of India in the early 17th century amidst conflicts with counterparts such as the Dutch trading company as well as Portuguese Princes. However, the corporation gradually started to lose control, as famously, Sepoys had staged a mutiny in which

The Sepoys (Indian soldiers serving the EIC) refused to use their Enfield rifles due to the possibility of the bullets being lubricated by pork fat, a substance forbidden in both ~~the~~ Islam and Hinduism. Due to this instability, the British Government had decided to take over India from EIC rule, 'incorporating' the subcontinent into its vastly growing empire.

Another reason to why the source is valuable ~~is~~ ^{in regards of} understanding the governance of India is that it mentions extremely significant reforms, such as, the viceroy and his prominence. The source clearly states "the (commander-in-chief) shall rank second on the council after the viceroy" and "the Viceroy in Council shall have powers to make laws and regulations for all persons." This ultimately means that in regards to the establishment of a reform council, the Viceroy is the head and most senior position as well as the fact that he ^{has} the ability to make laws and regulations exclusively. Moreover, we also know that the Viceroy of India succeeded the previous Governor-General position held by the East India Company.

Furthermore, the source is arguably to be very valuable as it clearly is written by an individual with a clear knowledge of the Act as well as the clear composition of the

act's aspects and key features. It is also mentioned that the "Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Forces in India" can be appointed as an additional member of the council, furthermore, he shall rank as second on the Council after the viceroy." This signifies the British government's will and desire to have a strong foothold in India in a military regard almost as politically, which is also evident in later incidents regarding the use of brute force bordering ^{out of} a military state.

In conclusion, I believe that the Indian Councils Act of 1861 is extremely valuable to a historian of whom is forming an enquiry into the governance of the British Raj. This is for a number of reasons but most notably due to the fact that the source itself is clear as well as informative, furthermore, the source clearly states not only the roles of the council and its members but how they rank in regards to the head, the viceroy, as well as what their responsibilities are.

This is a secure level 3 response. It has a strong contextual understanding of the Act although it is more limited on the specifics of the Council. It draws a number of clear inferences, for example, on the role and authority of the Viceroy on p.2 and on the significance of the commander-in-chief on page 3. Inferences are developed with well selected knowledge – a key attribute for responses achieving level 3 in the use of contextual knowledge. The evaluation is not fully developed with some lack of precision on the origins of the source but it does have a very secure focus on value.

Question 1 (b)

Candidates understood the source material and were able to select from it to develop some inferences about the reasons for General Dyer's actions at Amritsar. Most candidates achieved in level 3 and a good proportion of candidates accessed level 4. There were some effective answers that weighed up the strengths and limitations of the source and used this as a basis to reach a judgement about the weight that should be attached to the source for the enquiry. In some cases, candidates still approach the consideration of weight by writing about adding and subtracting weight rather than considering the strengths and weaknesses of the source material and then reaching a judgement about the weight that the source would bear in an enquiry. There was a noticeable trend this summer for some candidates to structure their answers around the nature, origin and purpose of the source. This approach tended to produce answers that gave little consideration to the content of the source and the inferences that might be drawn, as well as making limited use of contextual knowledge to develop the analysis and evaluation. Candidates would be better to adopt a more flexible approach appropriate to the source with which they are confronted rather than utilise a formula that stifles their ability to demonstrate their skills and understanding. There were some fine answers where candidates used their contextual knowledge to interrogate the content of the source and then used that as a basis to distinguish between fact and opinion which they then used in reaching an overall judgement on weight. This is a very effective way of tackling the part b question.

Study Source 2 in the Sources Booklet before you answer this question.

(b) How much weight do you give to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into the reasons for General Dyer's actions at Amritsar in April 1919?

Explain your answer using the source, the information given about it and your own knowledge of the historical context.

(15)

The Amritsar Massacre was a terrible blight upon British rule in India, as in April 13th 1919, General Dyer ordered his battalions of mainly British Indian and British Muslim men to fire upon peaceful unarmed protestors of whom had no point of escape.

The source in question is heavily filled with detail upon the events and is arguably very significant in regards to an enquiry for the reasons of the Amritsar massacre of 1919.

Firstly and most notably, the origins of the source itself is written by the perpetrator of the atrocities, General Reginald Dyer. This in itself provides incredible weight to the source for an enquiry into Dyer's reasons as it is a first hand perspective of the day's events. The General states,

"I was faced with a dense mass of men, evidently holding a seditious meeting". However, there are many conflicting reports as to the motivation of Indians killed in the square as the protest was led by a holy man of whom preached peace and furthermore, the day of the event, April 13th was a Hindu holy day of which was arguably one of the reasons for attendance.

Furthermore, the general then goes on to state,

"There was no reason to talk with the mob. It was clear that they were here to defy the law." However, there was no solid proof of 'seditious activity' or possible revolt nor any dialogue between Dyer and organisers, however there were evidential reports of Reginald Dyer ordering possess forbidding any organising of large groups of people to be put up in the town.

Reginald Dyer also says, "If I gave the order to fire, I wanted it to be effective", this is on top of the fact that he ordered his troops to fire no warning shot and was reported to have said to his subordinate, "they've had their warning". As well as "too little firing would be an act of criminal foolishness" which is accurate in his regard as it was later reported that the soldiers only ceased firing when bullets ran out, which really puts the words of the Disgraced General into context.

"I had the choice of carrying out a very hurried duty or of neglecting to do my duty of suppressing disorder and of becoming responsible for all future blood shed." Dyer used the words, 'carrying out' and 'duty' which would give one the impression that General Dyer was given orders by his superiors to specifically shoot unarmed civilians in Amritsar Square, which was not the case.

In fact, the Viceroy, an Anglo-Irish lawyer by the name of Viceroy D'Arcy did not give any specific orders to General Dyer to fire upon unarmed civilians, however due to the outrage and scandal of the incident, he later resigned from his position under the pressure.

Moreover, General Dyer says "My duty as military instincts told me to fire." which is quite significant as it reflects to the general's mindset, of which was one of an honoured World War one soldier of whom fought in the Somme besides the likes of Field Marshal Douglas Haig, an individual renowned for his ferocity and aggressive barbarity. It proves that Dyer didn't see the gathering in Amritsar like that of a politician or lawyer but a likely shell-shocked PTSD affected soldier.

The General also goes on to speak of a likely gathering soon of one thousand before in the same town of which started the protest gathering. "I was fearing that could turn into a rebel army by the following day." However, there was no armed protesting or gatherings of militias, furthermore, the gathering was mostly religious as it was led by a holy man of the Hindu faith and was on a holy Hindu day.

General Reginald Dyer does however acknowledge to his military superiors, that he "did not act with undue severity" and that he had to produce a suitable effect from a military point of view throughout the Punjab." Therefore, the General does acknowledge that the aim of the killings were to be an effect and an example set to the rest of the Punjab region to not revolt.

"I fired and continued to fire until the crowd dispersed" said Dyer in his letters of which was later proven by his review board to be a lie as the soldiers of whom were mainly of Muslim/Pakistani origin were ordered to keep firing until the bullets ran out. Furthermore, the unarmed civilians could not possibly disperse or flee as there was only one possible exit of which was blocked by a machine gun mounted upon a truck which could not pass through the gates. This ultimately forced men, women and children to jump into the only possible source of cover from constant fire, which was a well, in which many drowned in or fell to their deaths.

In conclusion, I believe that give a lot of weight to the evidence of source 2 for an enquiry into the Harrow for Dyer's actions in Amritsar in regards to it being a first hand account of the day, however I don't believe it provides an accurate reason and I would suggest for any historian

Looking for a reason into the incident to look at
the original enquiry's verdict on the matter as it
compiles first hand accounts, witness testimonies and
evidence of which was reinforced by the House of
Commons which took a vote ~~of~~ led by Sir Winston
Churchill of which leaving condemned Rajar and his
actions.

This is a level 4 response. It is very focused on interrogating the evidence and distinguishing between fact and opinion. It uses good contextual knowledge which is deployed to evaluate the source. There is a real sense of the values of the time The issue of weight is not fully developed.

Question 2

This question had the fewest answers in this series. Those candidates who did answer the question showed awareness of the second order concept – significance– and were able to draw on evidence of a range of developments in the Indian economy including irrigation (the given factor), railways, the use of tariffs and the development of the cotton industry. There were many good responses with the majority of candidates achieving the higher marks in level 3 and accessing marks in level 4. The best responses focused firstly in irrigation and then contrasted its significance with alternative developments. This organisation allows a much sharper focus on relative significance. Those candidates who began by examining the importance of railways were not able to show this precise focus until they considered the significance of irrigation later in their responses. It is always advisable to deal with the given factor first. In some cases, it did appear that candidates were addressing a previous question that they may have covered in their taught courses and revised in preparation for their examination. It is important that candidates are sufficiently flexible to apply their learning to a new question.

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 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Plan what was the most significant investment in the development in the economy 1857 - 1914

Railways $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1900-60s \\ \text{skilled jobs} \\ 1900-60s \end{array} \right.$

irrigation $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{on site} \\ \text{gave india irrigation} \\ \text{drainage} \end{array} \right.$

Imports < exports

port facilities $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{cannals} \\ \text{heavy goods} \end{array} \right.$

industry $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tariff} \\ 1870-7\% \\ 1890-3\% \end{array} \right.$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{British} \\ \uparrow \end{array} \right.$

Between the years 1857 ~~to~~ 1914 there was a lot of investment made by the British into the Indian economy. Due to the 1858 government of India act making India a direct colony and placing the crown as ^{in charge of} ruling India, British investors felt ^{more} comfortable investing ^{in India} as they believed the same laws & ^{reputation} would apply like in England through the government. This opened up many more investment opportunities for India. Some investment included: railway, irrigation and drainage, port facilities, industry ~~(including tariffs and the fluctuations)~~ and ~~lastly imports~~ exports. The most significant investment in India between 1857 - 1914 was the railways because they opened countless opportunities for the Indians aiding the growth of the economy. The second

most significant investment was in irrigation & drainage ^{as} it allowed India to ~~become~~ have an industry in agriculture, this helped the economy grow dramatically.

The most significant ~~was~~ investment ⁱⁿ to India to help the economy ^{develop} grow was the investment in railways. In 1854 the ~~India~~ ~~and~~ ~~company~~ got British investors funded the project ^{as} as they were guaranteed a return. By the late 19th century there was over 40,000 km of rail in India. This was a massive benefit to the people as it gave job opportunities to Indians in modern industry like mining & engineering. This meant more Indians were ^{qualified} allowing the economy to grow. ^{as} The railways also helped ~~transport~~ transport goods in industry & agriculture to the ports. If these railways weren't built then agricultural investment wouldn't have been as large because the British only ~~invested~~ invested heavily in India to exploit their economy for ~~the~~ the British benefit. In one affect the railways was the ^{basis} ~~base~~ for the growth in India's economy as it made transportation of goods ^{a lot} cheaper ^{in comparison to other} ~~than~~ by using port facilities, it allowed people to travel round the country, ~~then~~ it ^{also} allowed more people to have jobs which translates into more tax being paid, this enabled the economy to grow as the government can invest the money & further help the economy grow. Overall the ^{investment} railways was the most significant investment made by the British in allowing the economy to develop, it gave ^{more} opportunities to the industry.

< agricultural industries to be exported to other countries which overall helped the economy develop. The next < therefore is the most significant ~~factor~~ investment

The second most significant ~~factor~~ investment was in irrigation & drainage. (Agriculture.) many parts of India ~~was~~ suffered from flooding like in the projects < near the ganges. This caused crops to die. By the British building irrigation drainage systems to prevent flooding and the using the water to feed the crops on the irrigated land became beneficial to the economy as it allowed crops to grow < for Indians to ~~have~~ export their produce and make tariff money on it.

Over 1/4 of Indian land was fertilized < could grow crops. There was 10 million acres of land which the British irrigated. The benefits to the economy was that it reduce famine occurrence rates as there was ~~more~~ ^{more} food in the country. This helped the economy develop because it meant less money had to be spent providing relief for citizens and they could use that money to invest into the country. Another benefit to the economy was that the ~~British~~ ^{British} paid tariffs on ~~their~~ goods in 1870 which enabled the Indian economy to grow more as their goods became cheaper than the British. The link between rail & agriculture was that the farmers ~~or~~ ~~fact~~ could grow the crop < then they would get taken by the train to the ports < exported. The reason why the railways are more significant ~~factor~~ investment in allowing the economy grow is

without the ability to transport the goods the Indians couldn't sell them abroad which meant they would make less & it wouldn't have as great an impact on the economy. Nevertheless Agriculture still had a huge significance on the economic development in India between 1853 - 1914, it gave India access to the foreign market and allowed them to make money & small profit off their goods.

A third investment which was less significant was the investment in water for canals & facilities to move heavy objects through India in the 1850's was a struggle so to combat this the British built more water canals & facilities to allow the ships to make their routes more direct into inland cities. This boosted the economy as goods were cheaper to buy. However the railways isn't as significant as the railways because the railways were more cost effective, they were cheaper to transport goods & more time efficient. By the late 1800's the railways had become the most effective use of transportation of people & goods in India causing investment to decrease in water canals.

The last investment factor which was significant to grow was the import/export, this included trade & taxes. In the 1830s Britain was always against tariff and their for their allies didn't have tax. This allowed Britain to export Indian economy very easily. However by the 1850s a viceroy called

Mayo passed the tariff act which placed a 7% tariff on imported goods. This made British goods more expensive for Indians to buy which caused their to fall. This gave opportunity for Indian industry to grow. By 1871 there were 11 cotton mills in Bombay. Exports were increasing, this helped the economy developed massively as the industry grew, unemployment fell and India was making money from exports. However later on in around the 1890's a victory introduced an excise on Indian goods which in effect was a tax on goods exported. This caused the industry in India to fall because British goods became cheaper. Subsequently between 1870 - 1890 Indian industry ^{agriculture} grew and the economy allowing it to grow. However none of this would have been possible without the investment in railways ^{agriculture & industry} because then their would have been nothing to export.

To conclude the most significant investment in India was the development of Indian economy was through railways, because it gave job opportunities in modern industry, which caused more tax payers, it allowed for raw prices to become cheap and for exports to increase, without the railways the economy wouldn't have grown as much, because it made Indian goods very cheap to transport & therefore it beat the world market due to its cost efficient. Regarding irrigation schemes in India it was very significant as it allowed India to become a world power in exporting crops however this wouldn't

have succeeded so much if the railway didn't allow the cost of transporting the goods to be so cheap, even though it reduced profits and gave the government more spending it wasn't as significant as the railways investment in allowing the economy to grow, largely was the investment in exports. The reason why this isn't as significant is because it generates a lot, at one point Indian goods are cheaper & then they are expensive overall it wasn't very decisive when allowed the economy to develop therefore the investment in railways was the most significant investment in allowing the economy to grow.

This response is low level 4. It has clear focus on the development of the economy and looks at a range of factors. It is limited by its tendency to address the question without a sharp focus on irrigation and in places it lacks precision but its overall achievement is clearly level 4.

Question 3

This was the second most popular question on the exam paper and prompted many good answers with most candidates scoring in level 3 and level 4. Most candidates displayed secure knowledge of the key developments in the government of India and were able to analyse the significance of the Morley-Minto reforms by contrasting with other developments in the governing of India such as the Ilbert Bill, the Indian Councils Act 1893 and the Montagu Declaration of 1917. The most common errors in answering this question included a failure to take note of the date range which meant that some candidates wrote at length about events in the 1920, 1930s and 1940s which could not be rewarded. Some candidates approached this question as a consideration of the growth of nationalism and that did tend to draw them away from the focus of governing India.

1850 - 1918 -

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 2 Question 3 Question 4

The Raj and its governance in India can largely be represented via its legislative acts and the development of political concessions, repression and overall facilitation of Indian involvement in the Government of India. It can be argued that the Morley Minto was a salient contributor to the ~~governance~~ development in the governing of India. However, at the same time factors of the First World War, ~~increase of repression~~ ^{development of other political entities} and other legislative acts and promises also acted as significant developments for the Raj in governing in India.

Firstly, the role of the Morley Minto reforms in India should not be ignored as a heavy contributor to changing the political landscape of Indian governance. After the partition of Bengal in 1905, and the creation of the Muslim League in 1906, the government ^(Raj) was convinced that certain concessions needed to be upheld to control the growth of nationalism in India. The Muslim League vouched for the Simla Deputation in 1906 in which they discussed with Viceroy Minto to increase their representation in Councils. This later transacted into the Morley Minto reforms of 1909. It had 4 main provisions-

Firstly it enlarged the legislative council to have over 60+ Indian representatives. This was a massive concession by the Raj and acted as an impetus to heighten Indian involvement in the governance of India. Secondly, it enlarged Provincial councils and more importantly initiated the idea of separate electorates. This was a major turning point in India as it showcased a policy of divide and Rule but at the same time gave the Muslims concessions they had asked for. Lastly, it also added 2 Indians to Morley's UK Council. This act was significant because it was the first time that Indians could have representation overseas with the Secretary of State and introduced better representation for minorities in India. The Morley Minto reforms were once large contributors to the development in the governing of India as it increased political concession, allowed more Indian involvement and increased the quota for minorities. However, the antagonism that the separate electorate clause initiated stirred up hostilities between the Congress and the Muslim League. Congress refused any divisions in the government because they knew it would lead to limited unity. This antagonism was a drawback of the Morley Minto reforms which limited development to a certain extent. Due to the divisions it caused between the Hindu and Muslim communities it acted as

a duplicitous Act which served Indian interests only partially.

Conversely, there were other contributing legislations and facets initiated during 1880-1918 in India which did significantly lead to development in governing India to a certain extent. For example the Indian Councils Act of 1892 increased members in provincial and legislative councils and for the first time allowed Indians to be a part of discussing annual budgets and finances of India. It also allowed local bodies to send elected representatives to the legislative council. ~~By 1905~~ This act was significant in developing the governance of India because Indians were finally part of the consultative process which allowed them to share some responsibility with the Raj. However, similar to the Morley Minto reforms - this created a division between the Muslims and Hindus. This was because Muslims could not gain enough representation to send their elected representatives to the legislative council due to overwhelming Hindu majority. This limited the scope of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, but at the same time furthered the development in Indian government compared to before 1892. One could also argue that the Partition of Bengal via Curzon in 1905 led to heightened nationalism and created mass unrest in

India which ~~then~~ prompted the Raj to make political concessions. The Montagu reforms of 1909 were a cause and effect of the ~~then~~ agitation aroused by the Partition of Bengal and can thus be a contributing factor to the growth of governance in India. In addition, it can be contended that the influence of political groups such as the Indian National Congress (INC) and the Muslim League played ~~imp~~ imperative roles in strengthening development of governance in India. The INC formed in 1885 was a large driver of national movements in the country. It facilitated the 1905 Swadeshi movement and "anatholism" against Curzon's division of Bengal and advocated for the rights of many Indians ~~during~~ until independence. Their role is significant as it prompted the Raj to make concessions after the Partition in 1905. Without the influence of Congress's swadeshi movement, the partition would not have enough weight as it did. INC members called ~~for~~ off tax payments, ordered boycotts and ~~at~~ initiated nationwide hartals in India which ~~only~~ further influenced the Raj to facilitate growth of development in governance of India to avoid further mass protests. Additionally, the influence of the Muslim League, and Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in ~~searching~~ for the reforms in the Simla Deputation also led to the Montagu reforms. Hence it could be

argued that the Partition of Bengal, formation of the INC and the Muslim League were all central reasons why the Montagu Chelmsford reforms were possible in the first place. Allowing for better development in the governance of India in the years 1880-1918. Additionally, the 1892 Councils Act also increased growth of involvement in India despite its communal drawbacks.

Furthermore, the impact of the first world war from 1914-18 also instigated some form of political concession in India. Which later led to ideas of swaraj and home rule, only forcing the Raj to rethink its imperial narratives in India. Firstly, impositions such as the rise of Bolshevism from the Russian revolution made Britain fear that India may follow the same fate. Consequently, failures in Mesopotamia and the siege of Kut also raised nationalist propaganda alongside the Khaddar movement during the 1915's. In addition, the independence of Iraq made given by Britain made many of Indians question why they were denied the same right. Furthermore the war exposed European barbarity. All of these aspects had pushed the moral highground of Britain into blood-soaked trench warfare. This led to increasing demands back home for Home Rule initiated by Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Annie Besant in 1916 which created mass agitation across

the Country during an international crisis. Furthermore the developments between Congress and Muslim League in their historic "Lucknow Pact" in 1916 also threatened the Raj to make political concessions which were significant in the growth of governance in India. ~~the 1917 pact~~ Furthermore political implications of the war had initiated Woodrow Wilson's 14 points highlighting the right of Independent nationhood which the allied party preached. It outlined the hypocrisy of the Empire which was fighting for democracy, and freedom in WWI but failed to grant it to their own Indian subjects. All of these factors played integral roles in facilitating progress towards the governance of India because it led to the Montagu Declaration in 1917.

Issued by Edwin Montagu - it promised ~~to~~ India with Dominion Status after the war which later led to a series of events which portrayed this as a false promise. Despite its vague and ambiguous nature, the Montagu Declaration was significant because it showcased that the Raj was moving towards concessions which would allow India to gain more control of herself. Due to these significant implications of the war, the Morley Minto reforms were only adequate until the 1910's however as the after effects of the first World War played a

an equally - if not greater role - in achieving development in governance of India because of 2 reasons. 1) It changed the relationship between the Raj and India because Indians now demanded home rule and 2) because it promised a conciliation which if they did not keep would lead to further nationalism and growth of unrest, which would have to be followed by more concessions.

Overall, the Morley Minto reforms not the most significant development which contributed to the governance of India from 1880-1918 however its importance should not be ignored. Other notable facets which influenced the development in the governance of India include the Indian Councils Act of 1892, the Partition of Bengal in 1905 (and its after effects), the rise of political groups such as the INC and ML and the impact of the first world war on India - British relations and the Montagu Declaration.

This response achieved a very secure level 4. Its consideration of the Morley-Minto reforms is thorough. It explores an excellent range of factors which are developed in considerable detail with well-selected and precise knowledge. It sustains the argument throughout the answer.

Question 4

This was the most popular essay question on the paper. It prompted a number of effective responses. Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge of Gandhi's approach to independence – both in terms of his ideology and his actions. Candidates tended to be a little less secure on Nehru's approach and in some cases confused him with Jinnah. Most candidates did approach this question by comparing the approaches of the two men and thus did address the second order concept. There was a lack of precision in some candidates' work but overall most were able to draw on some secure knowledge to support their answers. The best were really able to consider similarities and differences in approach and to draw judgements from this.

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 2 Question 3 Question 4

Gandhi's mission

Similar

para 1 - ~~Some historians may deduce that Gandhi's approach~~ Campaigns Salt march

para 2 - ~~to independence was similar to Nehru's. This is~~ Salt march Mrs

para 3 -

Some historians may deduce that Gandhi's approach to independence was similar to Nehru's. This is supported by the campaigns that they both took part in such as the salt march and the Quit India movement.

This is also supported by the pressure the (I.N.C) Indian national congress put on Britain in the year 1949 for the Simla conference at which time Nehru was the leader of I.N.C. This pressure resonated with

the pressure Gandhi placed in ~~the 1930s~~ ^{the rejection of the round table conference} by turning Indians against the British.

as he was critical of it. Although Nehru and Gandhi do differ slightly in their approach to independence due to their reaction to the declaration of war 1939, therefore Gandhi and Nehru's approaches towards independence is similar to a large extent.

Firstly, ways in which Gandhi and Nehru approach was similar ^{to a large extent} was due to their inclusion of Satyagraha campaign. This includes the salt march and the Quit India movement. The salt march occurred ~~in~~ in 1930, where a base of 100 members (Gandhi and (Innan)) marched 376 kilometers to the coast of India to protest against British salt tax. This was an approach ~~against~~ towards independence as it was an act ^{against} ~~against~~ British rule. This resulted in a withdrawal of salt tax as Gandhi ~~continued~~ encouraged the mass - facture of salt. This highlights how Gandhi and Nehru approach to independence was similar - within Satyagraha campaign. Additionally, the Quit India movement occurred as a result of the failure of the Cripps mission. Similarly Gandhi and Nehru both were involved in this movement. This was ~~at~~ in August 1942 and resulted in 1000 deaths. The aim of this movement was to push Britain out of India - Nehru and Gandhi were arrested until 1944. The fact that they were imprisoned emphasises the accuracy of stating that Gandhi and Nehru took a similar approach to independence. Although this can be contradicted as Gandhi was known as a pacifist and Nehru was known as a anti - fascist. ~~But~~ ^{It} emphasising how the statement of Gandhi's approach to independence was partially true.

UNION APPROACH

Furthermore, ^{rejection of act are} ~~the~~ ways in which Gandhi's approach to independence was similar to Nehru's to a large extent. After the imprisonment of both Gandhi and Nehru from the actions of the Quit India campaign, they were released in 1944. In 1945 Gandhi and Jinnah were invited to ~~at~~ the round table conference to approve the ~~of~~ Wavell Plan. ~~the~~ The Wavell plan suggested that they would gain eventual self rule ^{after the war}. Nehru placed pressure on the British by rejecting this act as he wanted immediate self rule. Likewise Gandhi placed pressure on the British government ~~at the 1945~~ ~~table conference where~~ he demanded no differences ~~between~~ ~~the~~. Similarly to Jinnah he put the government under pressure and threatened them as an outcome was due to the Montagu declaration ⁽¹⁹¹⁷⁾ and the Rowlatt act 1919. Gandhi ~~also~~ posed a threat to British government as ~~he~~ he encouraged people (INC) to be critical of the Montagu declaration. This is because it proposed a vague offer of self rule - but provided no official law. Moreover in the Rowlatt act Gandhi started a mass civil disobedience - ~~at the~~ the Rowlatt Satyagraha, ~~which~~ which went against the conditions of the Rowlatt act. Ultimately both Gandhi and Jinnah rejected the reforms to paint the British in a bad light. This was a similar approach they used towards independence.

Although Nehru and Gandhi were not totally similar in their approach to independence. This is inferred through the declaration of war September 1922-1939. Nehru supported the declaration of war as he was an anti fascist, although Gandhi opposed this. With Gandhi's influence INC left the government in protest of the war and wanted to exchange the fight of the 2 million Indian soldiers for dominion status. This depicts how much their campaigns would be different if Gandhi led them, or if Nehru led them. Supporting this point, whenever Nehru was imprisoned ~~there~~ ^{for example in 1942} there tended to be more unrest suggesting he condones violence and perhaps in a way of approaching independence. This emphasises that Gandhi and Nehru may not approach independence in the same way to a small extent.

To a large extent it is accurate to say Gandhi's and Nehru's approaches towards independence ^{the same} was similar. This is depicted through their involvement in ^{proach} civil disobedience, when they were ~~both~~ at one point the leader of congress. Furthermore they rejected many acts with their influence at different times of their careers. This infers that they are similar in the ways they advocate for self rule. However the reason a historian cannot be truly accurate by stating

They had the same approach to independence is because of Gandhi's intolerance towards violence and Nehru's ~~ethnocentric~~ ignorance towards violence. For example in the Quit India when 15 officers were burned to death Gandhi stopped the movement. However in the Quit India campaign there were 1000 people were killed. If Nehru did not put it to a ban or attempt to therefore to a large extent it is accurate to say Gandhi and Nehru approached independence in similar ways.

This is a level 4 entry response. It has a focus on the question and is supported with relevant knowledge. It draws out a range of comparisons, both similarity and difference. The criteria for judgement could have been further developed.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

Value of Source Question (1(a))

- Candidates must be more prepared to make valid inferences rather than to paraphrase the source
- Be prepared to back up inferences by adding additional contextual knowledge from beyond the source
- Move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source e.g. look at the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Avoid writing about the deficiencies of the source when assessing its value to the enquiry.

Weight of Source Question (1(b)/2(b))

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to use contextual knowledge to support/challenge statements and claims made in the source
- Try to distinguish between fact and opinion by using your contextual knowledge of the period
- Knowledge should be integrated with the source evidence, to discuss the inferences drawn and their validity in the light of the contextual understanding of the period.
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, take account of the weight you may be able to give to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source. However, simply stating that a source is limited because it does not cover certain events or developments does not establish weight since no source can be comprehensive.

Section B

Essay questions

- Candidates must provide more factual details as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Take a few minutes to plan your answer before you begin to write your response
- Pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Pay more careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Pay careful attention to the date range in the question. Plan the answer with a focus on this range and avoid lengthy exploration of events outside of the time period set
- Try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.