



# Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced  
Subsidiary

In History (WHI02) Paper 1A

Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

India, 1857-1948: The Raj to Partition

## **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 2018

Publications Code WHI02\_1A\_pef\_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## **Introduction**

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

It is pleasing to note that in Section A many candidates understood what was meant by 'value' in question 1a) in the context of source analysis this year. However, many still continue to write about limitations to the source and since this is not covered by 'value' and hence not rewarded in the mark scheme, means that candidates disadvantage themselves in terms of the time take to develop such arguments which impacts on the time they have to spend on the rest of the paper. Many candidates also struggle with the concept of 'weight' in question 1b). Candidates need to approach weight by considering the reliability of the source. This can be measured in terms of the trustworthiness of the provenance and/or the accuracy of the content. Hence candidates should explore the strengths and limitations of the source and on then, based upon their judgements ascribe weight to the source. Many candidates use the term 'weight' as interchangeable with 'value' and refer to 'adding' and 'subtracting weight' throughout their answers. This approach makes it difficult to develop judgements based upon valid criteria and hence reach a final evaluation based on weight. Finally candidates do need to consider the use of contextual knowledge. Most candidates used context to confirm or challenge matters of detail in the source and thus achieved level two. Candidates are advised to use their contextual knowledge to explain and develop inferences which will enable them to focus discussion on what can be gained from the sources and so access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

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

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

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

### **Question 1a)**

There were some good responses that achieved high Level 2 or beyond. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained. Most candidates who failed to reach Level 3, did so because of either questionable assumptions regarding the provenance or a tendency to repeat the caption without any development of the value that it would bring to the investigation. Some candidates focused on its limitations and this was not rewarded. Many candidates used contextual knowledge merely to expand on detail, and those who focused on the mistakes made in the partition of Bengal tended to lose focus on the purpose of the question by considering Curzon's failings rather than his achievements. There were also a number of responses with very limited contextual knowledge which impacted on those candidates' understanding of the source.

Source 1 is incredibly valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the achievements of Lord Curzon as Viceroy in the years 1898-1905 due to the provenance of the source which suggests that the information it carries is likely to be accurate and reliable. The source is also valuable as it clearly highlights Viceroy Curzon's actions and their impacts and since it compares his achievements with those of previous Viceroys.

The source is greatly valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the achievements of Lord Curzon due to its ~~ex nature~~ origins and purpose which ~~suggests that the information~~ makes the source far more reliable. For example it is written by an individual based in India or it is by the The Brisbane Courier's 'Correspondant in India'. Therefore since the writer is based in India he is likely to be far more aware of Viceroy Curzon's activities and the impacts they had on Indian life and so the writer is able to analyze his achievements in a more accurate way. This increases the value of the source as the ~~the~~ source is more likely to carry reliable information <sup>due to</sup> the ~~writer of~~ origins of the source, ~~which is~~ ~~suggests that~~ further, the purpose of the source is also in order to explore Viceroy Curzon's

activities. For example it is said that this extract is from an 'assessment' of Lord Curzon's years as Viceroy. Therefore it is more likely that the source will be far more ~~info~~ detailed and descriptive ~~and so the increase~~ as it is solely intended to focus on Viceroy Curzon's achievements and work. Therefore the purpose of the source together with ~~the~~ <sup>its</sup> nature and origin further enhance the value of the source as the source is likely to be far more accurate, detailed and informative about Viceroy Curzon's achievements due to its ~~purpose~~ <sup>nature</sup>.

Moreover the source is also immensely valuable to a historian as it is an enquiry into Viceroy Curzon's achievements as it clearly highlights these achievements. For example the source indicates that one of his achievements were that he fulfilled his desire to involve 'almost every branch of government'. Contextually, this evidence is supported by the fact that he ~~moved the control of railways from the~~ introduced new positions in government such as the director general of archeology, made the governing process of certain areas easier by creating new provinces such as the North West Frontier province and also looked into <sup>improving</sup> the defence and security of India such as by creating a buffer zone along the Afghan frontier to protect India from Russian forces in Afghanistan. Therefore since the source directly points out the achievements of Viceroy Curzon such as his hands on approach which ~~benefitted India~~ <sup>benefitted India</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>greatly</sup> benefitted India and made the governing of India easier, the source is greatly valuable to a historian.

Further, the source is <sup>truly</sup> valuable as it compares Viceroy Curzon's time as the Viceroy with the work of previous Viceroy, thus, highlighting his achievements and enabling the historian to get a clearer understanding of the impact of Curzon's work. For example, the source states that previous Viceroys were ~~to be~~ unwilling to ~~reform~~ pass any significant reforms ~~due to~~ <sup>by</sup> due to 'traditions'. This in fact is true as Viceroys such as Viceroy Lytton <sup>who served in the late 1870s</sup> continued to ~~not~~ refuse to pass any reforms even when up to 5.5 million people died under the Bangalore famine during his period as Viceroy. Clearly, previous Viceroy's were not in favour of passing any major and impactful reforms even in the light of recent events under their administration. However Viceroy Curzon was far more radical and ~~was~~ pushed through significant reforms such as the decision to partition Bengal <sup>as in order to</sup> make the governing of the 78 million people <sup>by reducing bureaucracy</sup> here easier. The source is incredibly valuable to a historian as it clearly identifies these achievements and ~~present~~ <sup>and justifies</sup> such as his measures to remove 'excessive beauro-bureaucracy' ~~such as in the case of Bengal~~ and presents it impactfully to the readers by comparing ~~the~~ <sup>his</sup> Viceroy Curzon's work with the work of previous Viceroys.

~~In sum~~ In summation, the source is immensely valuable to a historian into an enquiry into Viceroy Curzon's achievements during his period as Viceroy due ~~the~~ <sup>to</sup> the provenance of the source which enhances its reliability and thus its value and due to the fact that it clearly highlights these achievements in a direct, clear and ~~under~~ <sup>analytical</sup> manner by comparing his work to his predecessors.

This is an excellent level 3 response achieving level 3 on all the bullet points in the mark scheme. It develops an effective inference on the second page about

the way that Curzon made the governing process easier and develops this inference with well selected context. It makes valid points about the provenance of the source to establish the value and makes a clear judgement in relation to the question.

### **Question 1b)**

The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Candidates often used accurate contextual knowledge but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some perceptive answers looked at the origins of the source and considered its nature as a secret report, the importance of accuracy and the vested interests that the British may have had in playing down the extent of repression in contrast with the violence on the part of the Indian protestors. A number of candidates developed the Amritsar massacre from their knowledge and many of these became distracted from the main focus of the task which was the evaluation of the source for an enquiry into the reasons for the army's repression. Candidates do need to remember that stand alone knowledge is not rewarded in A02 and that knowledge is used with the source material to reach judgements about the weight that can be attached to the source.

This source is from the British War Cabinet Report which is meant to summarize reaction to the announcement of the Rowlatt Acts and includes an early account of events in Amritsar on April 13, 1919.

As it is a war cabinet report, it gives us moderate weight as information and details on the report are most likely to be ~~the~~ true.

This report's ~~was written by~~ details were gained from the ~~the~~ Viceroy of India at that time who was Lord Chelmsford. As the source is coming from the Viceroy, ~~only as~~ the details are very likely to be accurate as the Viceroy is responsible for all events that occur in India. Thus adding on weight to evidence in source.

By looking at the date that the report was ~~at~~ done, it was only 2 days from the ~~the~~ Amritsar ~~Massacre~~ Massacre and also from the other events that occurred, which means that <sup>the events</sup> ~~it~~ would still be fresh in the mind of the Viceroy, ~~the~~ thus making the source quite reliable.

The Viceroy gave reasons as to why the army was needed to subdue the protests and campaigns.

Such that of the 'humiliation and prayer' campaign where the whole country would fast and pray, which was sparked by Gandhi in protest and revolt against the Rowlatt Acts. The Rowlatt Acts were very repressive as it allowed imprisonment ~~without~~ without trial, trial without jury and even declare house arrests on suspects.

According to the Viceroy, the 'more' serious rioting started on the 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> which involved loss of ~~life~~ lives.

Thus causing the Viceroy to use army to subdue the protests.

Furthermore, the Viceroy states that mobs were burning banks, govt. buildings and railway premises and also burned alive 3 bank managers. As this gave the Viceroy another reason to deploy troops to repress the protests.

Moreover, ~~the Viceroy~~ the tone of the source is such that it ~~gives~~ gives an appearance that the British troops were only putting down protests and trying to ~~are~~ ensure peace and that the Indians were completely guilty of what they had done.

However, this source seems to be biased as first of all the Viceroy claimed that the Satyagraha Sabha was an 'extremist society'. While, in actual, the whole concept of Satyagraha was brought about Gandhi who was strictly against violence and extremism. And also that Satyagraha means 'peaceful soul', so there isn't any possibility that the Satyagraha Sabha was an extremist group. Thus ~~is~~ reducing the weight of the source by a large margin.

Also, the source was ~~not~~ reported on the 15<sup>th</sup> April, 1919, which was 2 days after the Amritsar Massacre and the source includes nothing of the Amritsar Massacre and nothing about General Dyer massacring ~~more~~ more than 1000 people at the Jallianwala Bagh. Thus proving that the Viceroy was trying to hide the bigger truth ~~is~~ making the source biased and significantly less weighted.

Moreover, the facts outlined by the Viceroy was such ~~as~~ that emphasis was given on British deaths and hardly any importance to Indian death. "5 Europeans were killed, at least, ~~1~~ 1 British soldier was killed". Showing how irrational and untrustworthy this source is as it doesn't display how many ~~to~~ millions of Indian deaths have happened due to the repression of the British Army, making the source intolerably biased and should be severely underweighted <sup>by historians</sup>.

This response enters level 4. It includes developed inferences and considers both the strengths and limitations of the source. The interrogation of the source is developed using contextual knowledge and it has a sense of the values of the society from which it originates demonstrated on page 3 in its discussion of the purpose of the protest and hence the reason why the claim about 'extremists' should not be accepted.

## **Question 2**

This question had the least answers in this series. Those candidates who did answer the question showed some awareness of the second order concept – consequence – and were able to draw on evidence of the reorganisation of the army including the recruitment of Sikh and Muslim sepoy, the change in the ratio of the Indian component in the army and the control of the Crown and contrasted this with other consequences such as the establishment of the Raj and the development of the Indian Civil Service. The most common problem which limited achievement in this answer was candidates who focused on a description of the causes and events of the Mutiny and thus did not focus on the main consequence' as specified in the question.

In the years 1857-1900, ~~the~~ one of the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny was the reorganisation of the Army. This is evident as the British had around 80000 troops, ~~and~~ reduced the number of Sepoy's and reduced the number of Hindus in the Sepoy army. This shows that the British have reorganized the Indian Army. However, the Government of India Acts of 1858, 1861, and 1876, ~~the~~ removal of import tariffs, establishing the Indian Civil Service (ICS) show that the British aimed to establish firm control over India in order to derive economic ~~best~~ benefits.

In the years after the Mutiny of 1857 the British, in order to reduce conflicts within the Indian sub continent reduced the ~~the~~ number of Sepoy's, to a great extent. Sepoy's who had been against the British were

punished while those in support of British policies ~~remained~~ were still employed. This shows that the main consequence of the Indian mutiny was the reorganization of the Indian Army.

In addition, the fact that the number of Hindus were reduced and Muslims were hired instead shows that, the Indian Army has been reorganized to a great extent. Therefore this too shows that the main ~~consequence~~ consequence of the Indian Mutiny was the reorganization of the Indian Army.

Furthermore, the presence of ~~200~~ around 80,000 troops shows that the British aimed to have a strong army in order to rule India. Therefore this too shows that the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny was reorganizing the Indian Army.

However, though the ~~main~~ British aimed to reorganize the army, ~~the~~ many changes were introduced ~~in~~ in order to establish firm British

control over the Government of India in order to derive economic benefits. The Government of India Act passed in 1858 ~~enable~~ set up the post of "Viceroy". This enabled the Viceroy to rule the country in a way that was profitable for the British. This shows that the British aimed to establish firm control over the government of India in order to derive economic benefits. therefore the ~~the~~ ~~reg~~ reorganization of the army was not the only consequence after the mutiny.

Furthermore, the Government of India Act of 1861 enabled Provincial legislatures be set up. They were permitted to discuss legislation but could not enact them. This shows that the British aimed to introduce policies in a way that they maintained firm British control in order to derive economic benefits. therefore the main consequence of the Mutiny of 1857 was not the reorganization of The Indian Army.

In addition the Government of India Act of 1876 which was passed, appointing Queen Victoria as the "Empress of India" & enabled her ~~not~~ introduce policies in a way that benefitted the British needs. Therefore this further signifies that the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny ~~of~~ was establishing firm British control. Therefore the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny was not the reorganization of the Indian army.

Furthermore, another consequence of the Mutiny was establishing the Indian Civil Service (ICS). Joining the Civil Service required people to pass a test held in London. As Indians needed around £1000 to attend the test, many Indians were prevented from doing so. This limited the <sup>influence</sup> ~~access~~ that Indians had on local government affairs. This shows that the British aimed to establish firm British control over the government of India. Therefore, the reorganization

of the Indian Army was not the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny.

In addition, after the Mutiny the British wanted to ~~observe~~ <sup>practise</sup> ~~great~~ economic benefits policies that benefitted them. For example the removal of tariffs in 1882 enabled ~~British~~ imports flood the Indian markets, driving out Indian producers. This shows that after the Indian Mutiny of 1857 the British aimed to practise policies that aimed to benefit the home economy.

Last of all, ~~the British~~ after the Mutiny of 1857, the British opened the Suez Canal in 1869. This made communication between Britain and India faster. Furthermore, this improved trade between the two countries. Britain was able to ~~derive~~ ~~eco~~ obtain cotton, indigo, spices and metals required for the British economy to flourish. Therefore this shows that the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny was not to reorganize

the Indian Army, but to have firm control over the government of India.

In conclusion, as the British introduced many acts such as the ~~Of~~ Government of India Acts of 1858, 1861 and 1876, and limited entry to the Indian Civil Service. it is evident that the British aimed to establish firm control over the government of India in order to derive economic benefits, therefore the main consequence of the Indian Mutiny of 1857 was not the reorganisation of the Army but establishing ~~the~~ firm British control over the government of India to derive economic benefits.

This is a secure level 4 response. There is a clear exploration of the reorganisation of the army and a consideration of a range of consequences including the Government of India Act 1861 and the establishment of the Indian Civil Service which are explored in sufficient detail to address the question. The judgement is based on valid criteria.

### Question 3

This was the most popular question. The best responses developed the impact of the division of Bengal and additionally explored a range of alternative reasons for the growth of nationalism including the role of Congress, the Morley-Minto reforms and the impact of the First World War. Lower scoring responses tended to describe the Partition of Bengal rather than focus on its impact on the growth of nationalism. Some candidates did not take note of the time period and extended their responses into the 1920s and 1930s.

The impact of the division of Bengal was a significant reason for the growth of nationalism in India as it increased opposition to British rule and made the Indians feel as if ~~they were~~ their views are not respected under the British. However there were also other key reasons for the growth of nationalism such as the failure of the government of India Act of 1919 and the Morley Minto reforms to bring about great change and the <sup>anger caused by</sup> repression used by the British such as the Rowlatt Acts. However, World War I is undoubtedly the main reason for the growth of nationalism in India.

The effects of the partition of Bengal, namely, the use of Swadeshi, greatly increased nationalism in India. For example, in response to the partition, Indian leaders urged that the Indians avoid all British goods and services. This was a direct rejection of all things British and so subsequently there was a growth in demand and support for Indian ~~made goods~~ items. For example there was a heavy boycott of Lancashire cotton cloth <sup>by the Indians</sup> in order to demonstrate their opposition towards the decision of the British to split Bengal and so in turn the Indians began supporting all things Indian such as Indian made goods. This dramatically increased nationalism as it created this idea and movement to reject

anything that was British in favour of all things Indians. In effect, the Swadeshi, which was used to show opposition to the partition of Bengal had the unintended consequence of increasing nationalistic feelings during this period as more and more people <sup>Indians</sup> began showing support 'all things' Indians. In 1900, such support for Indian things were not seen because ~~in it~~, for example, in 1900, 92% of the cotton cloth ~~market~~ market in India consisted of cotton cloth brought from Britain. However ~~for~~ due to the high demands for British items. However Swadeshi made people avoid British everything that was British and in turn show growing support for all things Indians. In effect, Swadeshi, which was used to show opposition to the partition of Bengal, had the unintended consequence of increasing nationalistic feelings as more and more Indians began supporting 'all things Indian' instead of 'All things British'.

~~for~~ Further, the partition of Bengal, also ~~increased opposition towards British rule itself~~ increased opposition to British rule itself and so in turn increased 'nationalism' during this period. For example many were angered by Britain's use of the divide and rule policy and so terrorist activities towards British rose. In 1908, 2 ~~British~~ people were killed by a bomb intended for a <sup>British</sup> judge and in 1909 an ~~Indian~~ Indian man seeking ~~for~~ martyrdom shot an individual outside the Indian office outside London. Therefore there was a clear growth in opposition to

British rule due to the partition of Bengal. As a result, as more and more people began to oppose the decisions of the British and British rule, support for British rule faded whilst support for Indians to make government political decisions rose and many ~~also~~ believed that the British were not working in the best interests of their Indian subjects.

Therefore there was a growth in nationalism due to the partition of Bengal as more ~~the~~ Indians began opposing British rule and <sup>which they believe was not beneficial to them</sup> instead began believing that a government run by Indians would be <sup>for</sup> more beneficial for them.

Further, the partition of Bengal also made many who had previously agreed with British rule to question their position and question the motives of the British and so this too increased nationalism. For example, Gokhale, the leader of the moderates who had previously acknowledged that British education was a liberating influence also began reacting, due to the ~~poor~~ lack of Indian consultation prior to the partition, whether Indians would truly be treated as equals under British rule. Indians were a minority in government and previous reforms such as the Indian Councils Act of 1892 which had increased Indian involvement in political decision making seemed insignificant in the light of the partition as not a single Indian had been involved in this major decision to partition Bengal. Therefore even moderates such as ~~as~~ Gokhale questioned the progress made thus far

and many began to realise that Indians may never truly be treated as equals under the British even though the British were passing reforms to, although the British seemed to be involving Indians more in the political process because Indians were completely ignored when it came to making far greater political decisions. Therefore nationalism in India grew due to the partition of Bengal as the partition revealed the fact that even with the ~~many reform~~ progress made towards greater Indian involvement in government, Indians would still be treated unfairly by the British ~~and~~ and so many questioned their support for British rule and instead became more nationalistic and supportive of Indian rule over India.

However there were also other key reasons which led to the growth of nationalism. The failure of the Morley Minto reforms and the government of India Act 1919 to bring about lasting and satisfactory change were two of the key reasons nationalism increased. For example, during this period there was a surge in demand for change and <sup>the idea of</sup> greater power for Indians over their own affairs. The Morley Minto reforms did in fact attempt to fulfill some of these ~~existing~~ demands of the Indians as it gave appointed 60 Indians to the Viceroy's legislative council and enlarged the provincial council. However yet, the Indians remained a minority

in government and so these reforms were seen as worthless in satisfying the demands of the Indians further, ~~during~~ the home rule league of 1916 led by Tilak and Besant grew ~~to~~ incredibly fast with up to 60000 members which showed how ~~unsatisfied~~ the Indians were with British much more ~~power~~ the Indians demanded in terms of power and a voice in their own affairs. The Government of India Act of 1919 was therefore an attempt to <sup>fulfill</sup> ~~give~~ the Indians some of these wishes by establishing a system of dyarchy where Indians had more power over education. However, this too was seen as merely window dressing, <sup>and insignificant</sup> and so it left many who had demanded self rule under the home rule ~~leg~~-league disappointed with British rule. Therefore the failure of the British to meet the demands of the Indians resulted in a growth in nationalism.

Moreover the Rowlatt Act followed by martial law in 1919 also greatly increased nationalism. For example the Rowlatt Act and the Martial law which followed were deliberate repression of Indians and ~~and a complete~~ their lives. The Rowlatt Act imposed ~~conditions~~ on the Indians such as ~~the~~ unlimited detention by ~~judges~~ trials with judges sitting without juries and the Martial law further intensified this repression by forcing the Indians in certain areas to ~~be~~ <sup>have</sup> curfew and ~~also greater~~

further restricted their lives as all forms of transport were commandeered from Indians. Therefore more and more people began opposing British rule as they saw that they were clearly being treated harshly by the British and because they were being increasingly repressed and restricted. As a result many Indians ~~felt as though~~ ~~a though~~ were felt as though British rule was not the ~~to~~ most beneficial for them and in turn increased opposition to British rule. Subsequently, there was a growth in support for ~~to~~ Indian rule over India as many Indians ~~were~~ had to face such harsh, repressive conditions under the British. As a result there was a surge in support for nationalism because Indians who had begun to believe that the British may become far more ~~trust~~ <sup>the</sup> respective of Indians saw that these hopes were crushed by the repression seen during ~~the~~ due to the Rowlatt Acts and the Martial Law.

In summation ~~there~~ there were various reasons for the growth of nationalism in India such as the failure of partition of Bengal, the failure of British reforms to satisfy Indian demands and the use of repression which further angered the Indians but it was World War One which was the main reason for the growth of nationalism. For example it was Indian participation in World War One which had made many Indians believe that the British would now

break them better ~~and so more~~ ~~the~~ It was World War I that triggered the growth of the home rule leagues as many believed that they should be respected for the aid they provided to Britain and it was the war that made many expect greater change. Therefore the failure of British reforms and the repression used had much greater and more significant impacts on nationalism in India as the war had made many Indians expect far more than they eventually received under the British. ~~It was also~~ Therefore the war was the main reason for the growth of nationalism ~~as it had an impact~~ in this period.

This is a level 4 entry response. The key issues relevant to the question are analysed, although the material on 1919 is out of period. There is a good range of reasons and some explanation but the criteria for judgement are not sufficiently developed and this also means that parts of the argument lack coherence.

#### Question 4

This was a popular question and produced some well-informed answers. The best responses had a secure focus on the question and its second order concept of 'change'. These responses demonstrated a consideration of changes including the switch from civil disobedience in the focus on social welfare in the 1920s and the move from non-cooperation in the 1930s to the direct challenge to the Raj in the Quit India campaign in the 1940s. Continuities such as the principles of *satyagraha* and the method of filling the jails were also considered in order to reach the judgement. Lower scoring scripts tended to be descriptive rather than focusing on change and in some cases candidates provided a survey of events in the period without a focus on Gandhi's methods. These responses tended to be rewarded in level 2.

S.O.C = change

changed

Ques ① Satyagraha (20-22)

- Upholding principle
- ended which violent protest

② Salt March

- Symbolic
- Political strategy

③ Quit India

- Political strategy

X change

- Core beliefs in Satyagraha

- Quit India any violent because

⊗ (changed due to changing social circumstances not due to Gandhi)

Gandhi's methods of campaigning <sup>against British rule</sup> changed to a limited extent throughout the time period 1920 to 1947. This is demonstrated through the differences in his three major <sup>Satyagraha</sup> campaigns. However, Gandhi's core beliefs never changed which is what makes the change limited.

Firstly,

Gandhi's methods of campaigning changed <sup>between</sup> ~~from~~ his first Satyagraha campaign ~~and~~ to his second, the Salt Satyagraha. Gandhi's first <sup>(from 1920 to 1922)</sup> Satyagraha campaign involved a series of hartals, non-payment of taxes, refusal to vote and ~~as~~ ICS members and lawyers withdrawing from official government posts. It ~~also~~ involved Gandhi spearheading a series of demonstrations and protests whereby the concept of civil disobedience and peaceful non-compliance was emphasised. This Satyagraha campaign focused on practical methods to

pressure the British Raj to give Indians more independence. ~~But~~ However, Gandhi's salt satyagraha was different in that it was more symbolic and Gandhi adopted a different method during this campaign. Gandhi walked 240 miles from his Ashram to Dandi along the Gujarat coast, <sup>in March 1930</sup> attracting thousands of supporters along the way. He then broke the law ~~prohibitions~~ that stated that the Raj had a monopoly of all the production of salt and therefore could charge a salt tax. The effect of this campaign was purely symbolic ~~time~~ as the tax only cost Indians 3 annas a year and accounted for 4% of the Raj's total revenue ~~and~~ as Gandhi wanted to make the statement that the British cannot control ~~and~~ a precious, universally used Indian resource.\* Therefore, unlike from 1920-22, the salt campaign used far more symbolic methods.

Gandhi's methods further changed ~~during~~ ~~when~~ when he chose to make the Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931 and agreed to attend the ~~first~~ Second Round Table Conference in London. The pact ~~and~~ agreed that Gandhi would call off his civil disobedience campaign in exchange for a loosening of ~~various~~ emergency restrictions and Gandhi's <sup>agreed</sup> ~~agreement~~ to attend the Second Round Table Conference, in addition to the pact is evidence of Gandhi adopting a more co-operative methods of ~~campaign~~ campaigning against British rule ~~at~~ at the start of the 1930s.

Gandhi's methods also changed during the Quit India campaign. After being sanctioned by Congress on the 8th of August 1942, Gandhi and other members of Congress were ~~and~~ arrested the following

day. Thus, the Quit India campaign which was ~~designed to be~~ ~~to be the peaceful non-violent satyagraha campaign~~ ~~proceeding its~~, immediately dissolved into violence with "1000 Indians dead and 3000 seriously injured. The violence took the form of derailling trains, <sup>and</sup> attacks on police stations and which ultimately resulted the RAF to fly series over protest and use machine guns to disperse the crowds on the 14<sup>th</sup> of August. Hence, the Quit India campaign used more violent methods of campaigning against British rule.

\* Furthermore, during the salt march, Gandhi protested in the cause of purna swaraj (total independence) as a result of lobbying by the 'Young Hardians' (Bose, Tagore and Nehru) whereas, he did not support total independence in its extreme during 1920-'22 satyagraha campaign.

<sup>although</sup> However, ~~also~~ Gandhi's methods may have changed according to the circumstances that they took place in, his core beliefs and methods of peaceful non-cooperation and civil disobedience stayed essentially the same. Gandhi's philosophy of satyagraha was that each individual ~~was~~ was on a journey to find their own personal 'truth'. Hence, violent methods would compromise on another's ability to find their 'truth'. Therefore, Gandhi's core beliefs and methods stayed the same but only changed because he eventually lost control of his followers. For example, the Quit India campaign was only more violent in its methods than

In conclusion, Gandhi's methods changed slightly between campaigns but overall, his core methods of non-violence, civil disobedience and satyagraha remained strong. Therefore, there was limited change in Gandhi's methods of campaigning against the British from 1920 to 1947.

In other campaigns because Gandhi was arrested a day after the campaign and started and because the campaign was in response to Britain's involvement in World War Two which caused widespread hardship and anger in India. Hence, if ~~the~~ Gandhi had been free to lead the campaign he may have been able to better affirm his ~~methods~~ core methods of personal civil disobedience and the campaign may not have adopted violent methods. Hence, there is a core distinction that exists between Gandhi's methods which he intends for the campaign to adopt and the methods that his followers adopt. Therefore, <sup>it can be said that</sup> Gandhi's methods stayed relatively the same due to his strong belief in the concept of satyagraha.

Moreover, Gandhi eventually became less and less popular closer towards India's independence in 1947. This is because India as a whole became more violent with the mass <sup>million</sup> migration of refugees / migrants from Pakistan to India (and vice versa) and the frequency and intensity of riots and killings. Therefore, this inverse relationship between India's tendency towards violence and Gandhi's popularity shows that his core methods of non-violence stayed strong.

In conclusion, Gandhi's methods changed slightly between campaigns but overall, his core methods of non-violence, civil disobedience and satyagraha remained strong. Therefore, there was limited change in Gandhi's methods of campaigning against the British from 1920 to 1947.

This is a secure level 4 response. The plan at the start indicates the candidate's awareness of the demands of the question and the candidate then proceeds to explore the changes in some detail with good explanation and support before considering the continuities. The conclusion tends towards summary rather than a developed judgement based on criteria.

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

#### Section A

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

#### Section B

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

- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Essay questions are set over a period of at least ten years; candidates need to address the whole time period set in the question
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

