

# Mark Scheme (Results) January 2011

GCE

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](http://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 speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **0844 576 0034**

January 2011

Publications Code

US026455

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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-5 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 8-10 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 13-15 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 18-20 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> 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 answers 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><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> 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 both 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><b>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> 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 to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Taken at face value Sources 1 and 2 suggest that the Conservative leadership raised the issue and offered support for such a stand in order to support Ulster, undermine the move to Home Rule and/or create pressure for a General Election. Source 3 suggests that the Army was provoked by an 'absurd' lack of tact, and that the crisis was not caused by political passion. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. However, if the sources are cross referenced and interpreted in context, the conflict can be explored and an overall judgement developed. The resolution in Source 1 is a direct attack on the government's right to use armed force to deal with resistance in Ulster. The demand for an election before the army was deployed could be an attempt to challenge the government's existing mandate, or could be seen as an attempt to delay the implementation of Home Rule. The telegram in Source 2 speaks of a plot between Ulster, English politicians and the army. Neither source makes an explicit link between the Conservatives and the mutiny, but the provenance of Source 1 refers to discussions between Bonar Law and senior army officers and the content of Source 2 hints at support for this, although its provenance should be appropriately considered. Source 3 offers a more complex picture. The writer makes some claim to impartiality, so his evidence may be considered reliable. However, he is reporting on what he observed, and may not be aware of why such actions were taken. His claim that the mutiny was not caused by political passion seems to refer to the actions of the officers, not to those who organised events. He believes that the cause was an 'absurd' lack of tact, which provoked a reaction. This would appear directly to challenge the claim in the question, and the content of the source supports this interpretation - a 'bolt from the blue' and instant resignations, leaving a residue of more widespread resistance to being used to enforce Home Rule, even among officers who were not opposed to it. However, if Source 3 is cross-referenced with the provenance of Source 1 and the content of Source 2, it could be suggested that the 'lack of tact' was deliberate, and designed to provoke a reaction and/or 'defeat the will of the people' by preventing Home Rule. This would support the argument that the mutiny was deliberately provoked for political reasons. However, this cannot be proven. Given the build-up of rhetoric in Source 1, it is also possible that the 'lack of tact' arose from an overreaction within the government, rather than for any political purpose. Candidates can therefore argue that while there was a political campaign to undermine the Government's ability to enforce Home Rule, and to support resistance in Ulster, the mutiny itself may well have been an accidental outcome of the tension and hostility surrounding the issue. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim in the question, 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 both support and challenge the explanation in the question of Gladstone's failure. Source 4 suggests that he had a good understanding of Irish problems, linking religion, land and education to the deeper issue of 'Protestant Ascendancy', and stating the intention to address the whole 'system of ascendancy'. This challenges the claim of 'too little, too late'. However, Sources 5 and 6 both offer support for the claim. Source 5 says that the 1870 Land Act was 'not what Irish tenants wanted', offering compensation rather than security, and Source 6 indicates that before 1880 effective reform had been 'denied to reason and justice'. However, it also hints at another reason for failure, the impact of violence and the use of coercion. Candidates may also contextualise the source by pointing out that Gladstone had been out of power for the previous six years and could not have responded at an earlier point.</p> <p>These points can all be developed by the use of cross-referencing and contextual knowledge to support and challenge the representation in the question. Source 4 explicitly refers to land, but if cross-referenced with Source 5 the evidence is weakened because the effectiveness (too little) of his measures is raised. Using contextual knowledge, candidates can explain the problems of the Irish system, the lack of tenant rights, and the power of the landlords in the English parliament, to explain why the Act was inadequate. However, they can also point out that the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland was a fundamental reform, addressing related issues. Source 6 demonstrates that by 1880 the situation had worsened, supporting the claim, but it also refers to the agricultural slump as the reason. Using contextual knowledge candidates can show that the policies of the Conservative ministry under Disraeli bore much responsibility, and consider the influence of Fenianism, the impact of the Land League and the attitudes of Irish officials to show why Coercion was necessary. In this context it can be argued that Gladstone's Land Act of 1880 was far from 'too little' (Source 6) but was nevertheless already 'too late' to achieve pacification. Further reference to contextual knowledge can take the response beyond the sources to show the impact of violence and extent to which the situation had gone beyond what could be achieved by measures of pacification.</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 reasons for Gladstone's failure in Ireland, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. The provenance of Source 9 states that Brugha was 'reputed to be very jealous of Michael Collins' and candidates may well refer to Collins' links with the IRA/Volunteers and Brugha's position as Minister of Defence to support the argument of rivalry. In addition, both Sources 7 and 8 indicate a sense of mistrust and betrayal among the Irish leaders. This centres to a considerable extent on the role of de Valera as described in Source 8 - his authorship of 'Document No.2', his insistence that it should be followed while knowing that the British would not accept it, his decision to remain in Ireland, his accusations that the negotiators betrayed their promise, and his desire to 'rally' the anti-Treaty Republicans. Candidates can draw on contextual knowledge of events before, during and after the signing of the Treaty to develop these points. Reference can be made to the summer truce and the exhaustion of the Irish forces, the pressure from popular opinion to find an end to the violence, the threat from Ulster, divisions between northern and southern Republicans, and the difficulties of communication between London and Dublin to suggest that de Valera knowingly put his rivals in an impossible position and sought to shift responsibility for failure. His role in the hostilities that followed and the deaths of Brugha, Griffiths and Collins in the course of the Civil War can support the claim that the violence was fuelled mainly by a political power struggle.</p> <p>However, the sources also indicate that there were other reasons for the violence, which can be supported and extended by contextual knowledge. Source 7, cross-referenced with Source 8 (the 'tricks of Lloyd George') raises the issue of British pressure and Lloyd George's determination to maintain some control of Ireland. Candidates can refer to strategic considerations, the role of Ulster, British military power and the personality/actions of Lloyd George himself to argue that the Civil War resulted from British pressure. Similarly, they may consider events from 1919 to suggest that there was a climate of violence in Ireland, in which both British and Irish leaders secretly condoned the behaviour of unofficial and often uncontrolled paramilitary forces, and in which those who were dissatisfied were always likely to resort to violence and acts of brutality. The sources also highlight the importance of issues, above and beyond personal rivalries. Source 7 raises the issue of sovereignty, and all three sources suggest that in this area, principled beliefs made agreement and compromise genuinely impossible for some. In the context of wider knowledge as indicated, candidates can therefore argue that personal conflicts and political convictions caused violence to erupt in an essentially impossible situation and/or that personal conflicts encouraged a search for scapegoats to take responsibility for unavoidable failure.</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 reasons for violence 1921-22, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

## D2 Britain and the Nationalist Challenge in India, 1900-47

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources both challenge and support the claim made in the question. The statement is made explicitly in Source 10, and supported in Source 11 by the statistics which demonstrate the dominance of an educated group at the annual conferences of the INC. On the one hand, candidates might see 'other' as meaning other than educated, and point out that the educated elite ranged from 98% of the total attending conferences in 1906 to 75% in 1900. Candidates might, however, point out that 'other' might include others who are part of the educated elite. Candidates might also comment on the dominance of lawyers in all of the annual conferences. The nature of Source 11 should give rise to a range of comments on its reliability. Candidates might also comment on the dates of the sources and compare the fact that Source 11 is located before the First World War to the dates of Sources 10 and 12 which are both post-war. The statement is challenged by Source 12, which refers to the 'unthinking multitude', suggesting that there is mass support for change. The image of Gandhi driving the masses like 'a flock of sheep' can be used to infer that Wacha is not referring to an educated elite. This, coming from a leader of the Indian National Congress throughout the period in the question, suggests that neither Congress nor those to whom O'Dwyer refers in Source 10 trust the people as a whole and view government as the province of an educated minority. Candidates who rely on these statements are likely to be operating at L2, but those who develop inferences about the political attitudes implied in Source 12 may well move into L3. However, if the sources are cross-referenced and interpreted in context, more complex arguments can be developed. Source 10 suggests that the western-educated elite, which dominated Congress at this time, could be seen as an 'educated and self-interested minority' pursuing changes that would give them the 'power and position' that O'Dwyer sees as the natural ambition of the Indian elite. This is confirmed by the attitude of Wacha in Source 12. The reliability of Source 10 can be challenged, since O'Dwyer was a British officer who disliked the 'Bengali Babus', and Source 12 shows that Gandhi is extending political activity beyond the elite in 1920, also challenging the statement. However, it can be argued that this was a recent development, disapproved of by men like Wacha. Candidates might also comment on the relationship between nationalism and constitutional change, with the former more directly linked to Source 10 and the latter to Source 12.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Source 13 summarises evidence both for and against the nationalist view that economic development in India, both before and after 1900, was dictated by Britain's needs. The source provides a list of features that can be developed and explained by reference to contextual knowledge. The extent and nature of British investment in India, returns on such investments, tariff policy regarding British goods, the costs of both military and civilian administration, which was largely borne by the Indian economy, the development of infrastructure, and the nature of industrial development are all relevant to the debate. Measures to improve living standards for the Indian people can also be considered. However, Sources 13 and 14 also raise the issue of economic development in terms of population, famines and the need for modernisation, especially the agricultural/industrial balance. Source 13 suggests that this was the result of an economy 'tailored to Britain's needs' and Source 14 demonstrates the link between economic and political issues. Nehru defines India's problem as being caused by 'a predominantly agricultural' economy which, according to Source 13, was maintained to benefit Britain. Reference to British economic policy, and the influence of the Anglo-Indian community can further develop this, but candidates may also address the difficulties of reform and debates within the Indian National Congress. It can be argued that Gandhi's vision of India was as influential as the Raj in maintaining traditional ways and attitudes. Source 15 introduces another aspect of this argument, relating to the impact of change and the measures that would be needed. Candidates can evaluate the significance of British control in terms of a 'balance sheet' as in Source 13, but they can also base a judgement on their understanding of Britain's priorities. However, Source 15 also suggests that British rule could affect development, not on the basis of British self-interest as Sources 13 and 14 suggest, but simply because 'foreign power' could not undertake the kind of social transformation that was required.</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 what drove economic development, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question of whether conflicts and hostility between different Indian communities was deliberately encouraged by the British in a policy of 'divide and rule' has been raised by a number of commentators, as Ashton suggests in Source 16. Both Sources 16 and 17 offer evidence to support this claim, which can be further developed by reference to contextual knowledge. The work of Syed Ahmed Khan and relations between the British and the Muslim League, as well as British patronage of individual Muslims at different social levels, is relevant. The process of negotiation over the Morley-Minto reforms, the status of the Muslim community in the various plans for self-government proposed by the British throughout the specified period, the reaction of the Muslim League to Congress' withdrawal at the outbreak of the Second World War and Britain's relations with the Muslim League throughout the war itself, can all be used to suggest that Britain did influence relations among the Indian communities for its own purposes. However, Sources 17 and 18 also suggest that there were other reasons for Hindu-Muslim hostility. The reference in Source 17 to a 'precarious alliance' hints at traditional divisions, which can be described and explained by reference to contextual knowledge and examples. Taken together, Sources 17 and 18 suggest that responsibility for the conflict can be attributed to the behaviour and attitude of the Hindu-dominated Congress. This can be developed by explaining Jinnah's efforts to negotiate, Gandhi's claims to represent all Indians at the Round Table Conferences, and the behaviour of Congress officials in the aftermath of their election victory in 1937-38, and during the war. The terms of the question exclude the events of 1946-47. However, candidates can also use contextual knowledge to challenge the claim by describing the attitude demonstrated by leading Muslims towards independence and increasing determination to establish a 'Pakistan'. To achieve an overall judgement they might weigh up the relative importance of the different factors, or show that problems arose through interaction. It can be argued that while some British politicians and officers saw 'divide and rule' as a valid option, those who genuinely sought to take India towards greater self-government were always placed in difficulty by the communal hostilities that existed, especially the growing conflicts between Hindus and Muslims.</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 reasons for political hostility, 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 [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US026455 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH