

Question 7(b)	Total marks
<p>Compare and contrast Item 1 and Item 2 as evidence for a historian studying the impact of Aurangzeb’s religious piety.</p> <p>Item 1: Bakhtawar Khan, a historian and advisor to the emperor Aurangzeb, writing in his account of the political, social and cultural aspects of the Mughal Empire <i>Mir-at-i ‘alam</i> [Mirror of the World] (seventeenth century)</p> <p>Hindu writers have been entirely excluded from holding public offices, and all the worshipping places and great temples of these infidels [unbelievers] have been torn down and destroyed in a manner so successful it has astonished people that such a difficult task has been completed.</p> <p>His Majesty (Aurangzeb) personally teaches the Muslim faith to non-Muslims with success, and all the mosques in the empire are repaired at public expense.</p> <p>Item 2: John Keay, a historian, journalist and presenter, writing in his general interest book <i>India: A history from the earliest civilizations to the boom of the twenty-first century</i> (2010)</p> <p>Aurangzeb’s supporters argue that Shah Jahan also discriminated against non-Muslims and targeted temples. Aurangzeb in fact destroyed few temples and to others he granted the ability to raise money. The sites which were damaged were chosen because they were a political or ideological threat ... Even the jizya (the tax on non-Muslims) was not unreasonable and the poorest were exempt from payment. Further, it seems unlikely that the tax was collected at all in the remoter regions of the empire.</p>	<p>[15]</p>

Indicative Content

Candidates may respond to the question by offering the following suggestions. This material is not prescriptive and other responses may be acceptable.

Comparisons:

- Both Item 1 and Item 2 indicate that Hindus and non-Muslims faced discrimination.
- Both Item 1 and Item 2 indicate that Hindu temples were destroyed during Aurangzeb's rule.
- Both Item 1 and Item 2 indicate that Aurangzeb promoted Islam.
- Both Item 1 and Item 2 indicate that there was religious and political motivation to the persecution of the Hindus.

Contrasts:

- Item 1 states that Aurangzeb treated Hindus unfairly, for example not allowing them to hold public positions, whereas Item 2 states Aurangzeb was reasonable and did not treat Hindus any worse than other Mughal rulers, for example Shah Jahan.
- Item 1 suggests that Aurangzeb's achievements (destruction of temples) were impressive given the difficulties of the task, whereas Item 2 suggests that Aurangzeb only damaged religious sites that were seen to be a threat and, in fact, few temples were destroyed.
- Item 1 states that Aurangzeb successfully taught Islam to non-Muslims, whereas Item 2 focuses more on him treating non-Muslims fairly.
- Item 1 is a focused history on Aurangzeb written by a contemporary advisor in praise of Aurangzeb's achievements, whereas Item 2 is a more objective account from a much broader book on Indian History written in the twenty-first century.

Band	A02	A03
5	<p>5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precise, convincing and accurate application of knowledge and understanding to address the historical concept in the set question. 	<p>9–10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precise, convincing and accurate analysis and evaluation of the items linked to the set question. Detailed and explicit comparisons and contrasts made with consideration of content and attributions Answer expressed clearly in continuous text
4	<p>4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and mainly accurate application of knowledge and understanding to address the historical concept in the set question. 	<p>7–8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear and mainly accurate analysis and evaluation of the items linked to the set question. Detailed comparisons and contrasts made with consideration of content and attributions Answer expressed in continuous text
3	<p>3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent application of knowledge and understanding to address the historical concept in the set question. There is some accuracy. 	<p>5–6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent analysis and evaluation of the items linked to the set question, with some accuracy Undeveloped comparisons and contrasts made with consideration of content and/or attributions <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed comparisons or contrasts made with consideration of content and attributions
2	<p>2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited application of knowledge and understanding to address the historical concept in the set question. 	<p>3–4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited analysis and evaluation of the items One comparison and one contrast made with consideration of content and/or attribution <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undeveloped comparisons or contrasts made with consideration of content and/or attributions

1	<p style="text-align: center;">1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal application of knowledge to address the historical concept in the set question. 	<p style="text-align: center;">1–2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal analysis and evaluation of the items • One comparison or one contrast made with consideration of content or attributions
0	<p>0 marks</p> <p>No response attempted or nothing worthy of credit.</p>	