

Examiners' Report
June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 2F

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_2F_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates continue to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 2F which deals with India, c 1914-48: the road to independence (2F.1) and South Africa, 1948-94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation' (2F.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. 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 and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continued to comment on the fact that a significant minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge which was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is pleasing to note that last summer's advice was taken on board by many candidates and there were fewer examples this summer of candidates suggesting that weight can be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the vast majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. This summer there was some evidence of more candidates using often extensive contextual knowledge to drive an answer to the enquiry, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the source. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates often engaged in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. It continues to be the case that not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates continue to explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement. There was some tendency this summer, in all sections of the paper, for some candidates to replicate the words and phrases of the mark scheme in their responses. It is the application of the requirements of the mark scheme that is crucial.

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

Question 1

Candidates at all levels were able to access both sources and respond to the question posed. Examiners were pleased to note that many candidates approached their responses from the sources rather than from learned material into which they inserted the sources. Many candidates made effective use of the sources together. Weaker candidates did not engage directly with the focus of the question – the nature of British government in India in the years 1918-20. Rather, they discussed how close India was to independence or the nature of Indian opposition to British rule. Some candidates also discussed events in Amritsar in some detail based on their contextual knowledge. Some candidates also mistakenly believed that Source 1 was an extract from the Montagu Declaration.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

The British government maintained its presence in India until 1947 and in the early part of the century showed no signs of relinquishing control. It's controversial to argue the sources ~~are~~ can be used to the furthest extent by a historian investigating the nature of the British government in India 1918-1920. In addressing this controversy it's important to consider what each source shows about the British government's nature in India and what they fail to show, along with the provenance of each source.

The sources are useful to a ~~moderate~~ moderate extent as both reveal factually accurate opinions or statements. For example, source 1 states 'We cannot immediately hand over complete responsibility' which suggests the British government was reluctant to relinquish its power in India and that it intended to stay as the country's dominating power. This greedy and unrelenting nature of the British government comes only a year after the 1917 Montagu declaration which

gave the promise of Dominion status but purposefully gave no time frame. However, the declaration was still ~~the~~ rather liberal in its promises which suggests there was some change in the nature of the British government in India during this time as it now stood in a firmly empire focused position. Source 1 also states the 'Indian Legislative Council should be enlarged and made more representative' suggesting a ~~g~~ more sympathetic nature of the British government in allowing India some greater ~~the~~ control. Notably, this control was given by the 1919 Government of India Act as the councils expanded to hold representatives from different castes and religions ~~is~~ - ultimately suggesting the nature of the British government was more sympathetic to ~~its~~ ~~was~~ India's nationalist cause. Source 2, shows a different ~~attitude~~ nature in its statements; such as 'the ~~perpet~~ punitive measures taken by General Dyer and other Officers were out of all proportion to the crime of the people' when talking about the Amritsar massacre which suggests the nature of the British government in India was, as previously mentioned, a relentless and unforgiving one. The

unlawful murder of around 400 Indians and the injury of around 1500 more reflects this nature successfully and show to a historian the British governments relentless nature, especially at the 1919 Amritsar Massacre. Furthermore the source also states the government 'excused sir Michael O'Dwyer's actions' which suggests ~~the~~ again the unrelenting nature of the British government in India as those responsible (such as governor O'Dwyer or Dyer) were not sufficiently punished for their crimes - with Dyer actually being celebrated as a hero by many back home in Britain. Therefore both sources do give ~~a~~ some clue into the nature of the British government in India and thus making them ~~3~~ useful to a historian, though to a questionable extent.

On the other hand, the sources are not useful due to what they fail to mention. For example, nowhere in either source is the Rowlatt Commission ~~or~~ Rowlatt (1917) or Rowlatt Acts (1919) mentioned. As these led to the indefinite continuation of the Defence of India Act 1915, they're

importance in examining the nature of the British government in India cannot be stressed enough. The Rowlatt Acts show Britain's continuation of its possessive control over India and how they had no intention of aiding independence as organisations (like Tilak or Annie Besant's home rule leagues) had been banned by the Defence of India Act and thus by continuing them Britain limited India's potential for a successful independence movement. Furthermore, the second source states 'Above all ~~also~~ you have ~~failed to~~ shown a shameful ignorance to the purport ~~of~~ events' which may suggest Britain's tyrannical actions were unregarded by the mother country. However, the Hunter Report shows Britain taking some responsibility and acknowledging its actions and thus disproving the source's statement. The source also retains a notable vagueness in its statements as although it states 'the ordinary method of agitating ~~away~~ by way of petitions, . . . will not change a Government', it fails to delve into the specific proposed actions - like Gandhi's

civil disobedience campaigns and satyagrahas that began taking place in 1920. By failing to mention ~~or by~~ wrong facts or details and by ~~mis~~ wrongfully accusing the British government in some ways, the two sources' ~~reliability~~ usefulness seem questionable ~~as~~ to a historians investigation as they cannot be ~~wholly~~ relied upon.

Finally, the provenance of each source must also be considered. ~~The author of Source~~ ~~1~~ comes from the Montagu Chelmsford Report comes from two important figures from within the British government who should be able to give an accurate representation of the governments nature in its time. Furthermore, as the Government of India Act was also named the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, their impact in the government cannot be overlooked as they so heavily impacted its future actions. The second source explores the impact of the government on India itself as Gandhi lived in and experienced British India so should give a balanced perspective of its nature

in India. However, as a movement leader and a strong believer in purna swaraj its likely his nationalist views may tint his vision of the British government's nature. Therefore each ~~of~~ source's provenance sheds some light as to why each takes its stance and its view.

In conclusion the sources can be used to a significant extent by a historian investigating the nature of the British government from 1918-1920. As both sources contain solid facts and their provenances created little doubt about their reliability, each source seems useful. However some vacant or vague facts do throw this usefulness into doubt. Nevertheless they're overall more useful than not.



This response achieves into level 4. The candidate has gone beyond level 3 in their development of inferences and supports and interrogates the sources on the basis of their contextual knowledge. However, the reference to what is missing earns no credit as this was not an intentional omission.

Question 2

Candidates at all levels were able to access both sources and respond to the question posed. Examiners were pleased to note that many candidates approached their responses from the sources rather than from learned material into which they inserted the sources. Most candidates made effective use of the sources together. Candidates also made good use of their contextual knowledge to develop their lines of argument. There was some effective discussion and assessment of the provenance of Source 3. Many candidates were more effective in discussing the provenance of this source than that of Source 4, although there was obviously a greater familiarity with Tutu.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

Source 3, a speech from British Conservative MP John Carlisle, and Source 4, a press statement from Bishop Desmond Tutu can both be used to investigate the use of international sanctions as a means of achieving change in South Africa in the 1980s. Firstly, Source 3, comes from the perspective of a British parliamentary member, who is speaking against the use of economic sanctions aimed at South Africa. As it is a speech made in parliament, its reliability may be questioned as aspects of the information could be exaggerated in order to persuade the House to agree. Also, it is from a British, Conservative perspective, which implies that Carlisle's ideology may have been in favour to continue trading with South Africa in Britain's best interest. Therefore, the Bill may be inaccurate in relation to achieving

change in South Africa, as it ^{may} only include ~~unreliable~~ unreliable information that would argue against economic sanctions, rather than information about the positive aspects of economic sanctions in South Africa. The Ten Minute Bill is used to get issues debated that aren't on the government's agenda. As a result, it can be seen that the government perhaps were not concerned with the issues of economic sanctions, and therefore the source content may be underresearched and inaccurate. This further suggests that the British government may not be interested in economic sanctions to achieve change in South Africa.

~~Source 3 states that~~ Firstly, Source 3 questions "the effect those sanctions would have upon blacks and many other people in South Africa". The phrase "many other people" suggests that Britain is concerned about the support of the white population of

South Africa. Therefore, Britain still continued to trade with South Africa, unlike America, who cut 35% of its South African operations and closed many American banks. ~~They~~ consequently, it may be seen that Britain was not interested in sanctions to achieve change in South Africa due to its own interests. Carlisle also states that "we must recognise that there has been reform", and that economic sanctions would stop reform. This however has proved to be untrue - economic sanctions highlighted to the South African government that change was needed. In contrast, Source 3 suggests that economic sanctions would not help to achieve change in South Africa. Finally Carlisle believes that "sanctions will create an enormous loss of jobs in South Africa". This suggests that economic sanctions would not create a positive change for black South Africans, as they would lose their

jobs. However, most blacks didn't benefit from the economic success - many were 'blue collar' workers.

This suggests that economic sanctions in contrast would create international pressure on South Africa; regardless of the loss of jobs, blacks would benefit more in the long-term, in terms of achieving change.

Source 4, a press statement from ~~the~~ Bishop Desmond Tutu, argues that economic sanctions would in fact help to achieve change in South Africa. This press statement may contain exaggeration in order to appeal to those outside South Africa to help by creating economic sanctions, therefore there may be aspects of unreliability. However, the press statement was made in 1986, making it accurate and relevant to the time period of events in terms of sanctions.

De Tutu was also a leading anti-apartheid activist, which suggests that he will be in favour of achieving change in South Africa, in contrast to Carlisle in Source 3.

Firstly, Tutu mentions all aspects of sanctions against South Africa, not just economic like Source 3. He states that "the sports policy changed only as a result of the sports boycott". This suggests that other types of sanctions did help achieve change, as South African was banned from international cricket, which deeply upset white South Africans. This suggests that all types of sanctions should be used to help achieve change in South Africa.

Tutu also states that there is "no hope of real change from the government unless they are forced". This demonstrates that the government will not change

unless sanctions are introduced. The government in South Africa need international pressure in order for change to be enforced in South Africa. This is in contrast to Source 3, which suggests that there is no force needed internationally in order to create reform. Tutu also disagrees ~~contrast~~ with Source 3 by suggesting that "over 1,200 blacks have died since 1984". Whereas Source 3 suggests that economic sanctions would cause violence, Tutu argues that sanctions would achieve change in South Africa and end the violence of apartheid.

In conclusion, Source 3 argues that the use of international sanctions will not achieve change in South Africa, whereas Source 4 argues that international sanctions are needed in order to force the government to change in South

Africa. Overall, Source 4 more accurately reveals the true reality for the need of sanctions, as it is from a black South African's perspective, whereas Source 3, from a British perspective, has Britain's best interests in terms of trade and business at heart. Source 3 can be seen as a possibly unreliable source, as it suggests that "Bishop Tutu has questioned whether disinvestment would have any real effect", but Tutu himself calls on "the international community to apply... economic sanctions". Consequently, Source 4 can be more useful to investigate the use of international sanctions as a means of achieving change in South Africa in the 1980s.



This is a secure level 4 response overall. The candidate has interrogated the evidence of each source in turn to draw out some reasoned inferences. There is clearly an understanding of the context, but this is not always fully developed. Evaluation of the sources is evident in the course of the response. There is some attempt to use the sources together, but this is not fully developed and sustained.

Question 3

Approximately equal numbers of candidates tackled both essay questions in this section of the paper. It is pleasing to note that that most candidates understood the demands of the question and were able to tackle the wider debate with varying levels of success. There were few examples seen of candidates merely engaging in biographies of the two individuals. Most candidates used Gandhi and Jinnah to represent the wider issues facing India and recognised their roles as leaders. Many candidates examined a range of aspects of Jinnah and Gandhi's political relationship, developing this with links to wider events

The period of 1920-40 saw religious difference and political hostility between Hindus and Muslims rise to new levels. The days of Hindu-Muslim unity following the Lucknow Pact of 1916 had begun to come to an end at the start of the era, and had been decimated by 1940. By observing the actions and differences of Gandhi and Jinnah, as well as the role of Britain and communal violence, it will become clear that whilst not the only factor, differences between Gandhi and Jinnah were the main reasons.

In 1920, Gandhi's relationship with Muslims was arguably at its peak. In the year prior, Gandhi had been elected as honorary president of the Khilafat Movement at its 1919 conference. The Movement's aim was to show support for the Sultan of Turkey - Muslim's Caliph. ~~Therefore~~ His embracing of the movement demonstrates he was far from causing political hostility at this point. However the differences between him and Jinnah had already started to emerge by this point. He was opposed to Gandhi's Civil disobedience and therefore Jinnah was largely left in the cold in the early thirties, until the collapse of the Khilafat Movement. Whilst the movement's collapse came as a form of relief.

to Jinnah, it would be the beginning of the end for Hindu-Muslim relations. The movement had legitimised Muslims' support for nationalism, and it was now clear they did not share the same aims as the British. - But at the time, however, it became clear that nor did they share the same goals as the INC - Gandhi's focus on Hindu revivalism ~~for~~ during the 1920s, whilst it may have brought him closer to the peasant masses brought him further away from Muslims, and in Jinnah too. 1921-23 saw the percentage of Muslim delegates in the INC drop from 10% to 4%. Tensions between Hindus and Muslims ~~which~~ were continuing to rise as his differences with Jinnah became much more profound. His actions at the second round table conference in 1931 demonstrate this growing divide. Gandhi's claims to represent 'all India' saw him clash with Jinnah significantly over safeguarding of Muslims' rights as well as over separate electorates. As the INC began to become more radical following the Lahore Congress of 1929 and the demand for ~~turn~~ ~~swam~~ the difference between Gandhi and Jinnah grew massively. By the late 1930s, the differences between Gandhi and Jinnah had become ~~so~~ so profound that any possibility of rapprochement was off the table. Ultimately Gandhi's continued insistence that the INC represented all of India, whilst simultaneously denying Muslims' rights to separate elections or protection of rights, increased the chasm between the two religions, leading to growing

hostility between the religions, as well as increasing divisions in opinion with Jinnah.

Jinnah's actions himself are significant too when considering his increasing differences with Gandhi, as well as growing hostility between Hindus and Muslims. Jinnah left the INC in 1920, in protest of Gandhi's non-cooperation movement. It is fair to say however that the 1920s saw him make numerous attempts to bridge the differences between him and Gandhi, and attempt to halt the growing hostility between the two religions. His Delhi proposals of 1927 as well as Fourteen Point Plan of 1929, were one to the INC's Nehru report, both aimed to come to a form of agreement or rapprochement but both of them failed. Whether that was due to the specifics of Jinnah's demands or the INC's refusal to take his proposals seriously, the rejection of them did lead to the differences in Gandhi and Jinnah grow significantly, and with that grew religious tensions. This violence persisted into the 30s with tensions frequently breaking out amongst Hindu and Muslim communities. Certainly the political hostility had grown and Jinnah's absence from India for most of the 30s did little to quell tensions or to the hostility was already in existence. The end of the period saw tensions greater than ever. The 1937 provincial elections produced

a resounding victory for the INC, yet the Muslims had failed to unite behind a single party meaning the Muslim League won just 106 seats compared to the INC's 700+. The consequence of this was Jinnah attempting to retain a distinct Muslim identity, leaving the country and retaining traditional events like the Eid-ul-Fitr day. This very much increased the difference between him and Gandhi, as it went against Gandhi's belief in a United India. The growing tensions between the two culminated with Jinnah's July 1939 offer of the INC resigning all their seats from provincial governments. The 'Day of Deliverance' as he called it, led in part to the Lahore resolution of 1940 where Jinnah for the first time explicitly laid out the demand for Pakistan. Thus by the end of the period the extent of the political hostility due to tensions between Gandhi and Jinnah could be seen. Gandhi dismissed the Lahore resolution plan as 'contaminant to the vivection of India'. It comes as no surprise that the increasing political tension came as a result for the increasing polarisation in the views of Gandhi and Jinnah. By 1940 the possibility of rapprochement therefore seemed pretty off the table.

But it is important to remember that growing political tension and hostility was not only the fault of Gandhi and Jinnah's

difference. For long had Muslims and Hindus faced divisions at a communal level and whilst perhaps the chasm between Gandhi and Jinnah may have widened them, they most certainly weren't the cause. Divisions were life, and often violent. In the 1920s saw Hindus in the Punjab region forcefully attempt to convert Muslims, by drowning them. Meanwhile in the Malabar region local Muslim leaders had declared a jihad against Hindus. Political divisions ran deeper than just the actions of Gandhi or Jinnah, even matters such as the slaughter of cows caused growing political hostility - with the Hindus setting up the cow protection society for example, and the antagonising nature that both people on both sides of the religion had. Movements like the Congress and Lok Sabha movements too increased political hostilities, and the British policy of the time which maintained separate electorates for example and continued Muslim representation at provincial level that, though may have been necessary, led to increasing tension and political hostility between the two. As such, political hostility can not totally be blamed on Gandhi and Jinnah's differences.

Ultimately however, it was the difference in beliefs between the two figures, that came to characterise India's progression to independence between 1920 and 40. Over the era, the two became more divided than ever and the culmination of the period with the Lahore Resolution

is arguably indicative of just how much political hostility had risen as a result. The possibility of reapprehension was simply too much, and the FWA would lead the country to partition as a result of the growth in hostility.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In this response which does achieve level 5, the candidate has produced an answer which demonstrates a secure grasp on the stated factor. This is explored in a fully analytical way based on extensive and detailed contextual knowledge. The counter arguments are less fully and effectively developed, although they are present.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure that in your planning you allow sufficient time for all aspects of the question that need to be addressed.

Question 4

Approximately equal numbers of candidates tackled both essay questions in this section of the paper. The effects of the Second World War were analysed in different ways with most responses tending towards an analytical rather than a narrative approach. Most responses were able to offer specific details and examples to support their points. However, there were some weaker answers where the responses did not cover much beyond a one-sided argument. A small minority of candidates confused the First and Second World Wars. Some candidates wanted to examine a range of other factors that had advanced India to independence; this was unlikely to address the focus of the question.

The Second World War (~~1939~~ hereafter WW2) had a major impact on the nationalist movement in India, and led to increased demands for self-determination. However, many historians would support the claim that WW2 hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence, as it arguably served to complicate discussions for a constitutional settlement, ~~and the economic position~~ It is somewhat controversial to ~~now~~ argue that WW2 hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence; many historians would argue that the economic position it placed Britain in did in fact help the advance of India towards independence. It is important to consider these arguments when assessing this.

Many historians would support the claim that WW2 hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence. Indeed, it could be argued that the differing responses of the two major nationalist movements (Congress and the Muslim League) to the war served to fragment the cohesiveness of the nationalist movement even further. For

example, Congress was wary to support fighting a foreign war after Linlithgow, the Viceroy of India, committed over 300 million Indians to the war without

consultation. Thus, they demanded 'purna swaraj' if they were to fight in WW2. They demonstrated their opposition to the war by withdrawing ministries from provinces where they had a majority.

In contrast, Jinnah supported the war and urged members of the League to give their service.

It could perhaps be argued, however, that the lack of cohesiveness in the nationalist movement

pre-existed the war and was largely a result of religious tensions. In particular, the Muslim

League and Congress could not reach an agreement on the issue of separate electorates, with

Gandhi maintaining that Congress was an inclusive party. Nevertheless, the war arguably had the impact of complicating the political landscape in India. For example, the outcome of the 1946

elections showed a considerable polarisation of support for Congress and the League. Despite the

fact that Congress won 40% of all available seats, the League won 75% of the Muslim vote. This demonstrated to the new India

Committee, charged with ~~assessing~~ delivering independence, that the Muslim League was a

significant political force, whose demands would have to be accounted for in any new constitution.

Furthermore, a considerable finding of the results of the 1946 election was that in the provinces where Muslims were a minority, there was more support for League candidates as opposed to candidates standing independently of the League. This indicated support for the League. Thus, it can be suggested that this complicated the task of finding a workable constitution and therefore hindered the advance of India towards independence.

Therefore, it can be argued that WW2 served to fragment the nationalist movement and further complicate the political situation in India, and therefore it can be considered to have hindered rather than helped the Indian advance towards independence.

On the other hand, many historians would refute this claim and argue that the economic impact of WW2 actually helped the advance of India towards independence. Indeed, by the end of the war,

Britain was in a desperate economic situation and was greatly in debt to India for goods and services borrowed during the war. ~~ANTAGONISM~~
Towards the end of the war, British war debt

In total had ran at £70 million per day, and on top of this, an ~~enormous~~ enormous reconstruction programme was needed at home. Thus, it could be argued that the administrative costs of India were too ~~much~~ ^{great} to be ~~sustained~~ ^{maintained} by Britain, ~~and this was a major factor~~ following the war, and therefore this was a major factor which helped the advance of India towards independence. On the other hand, it could be argued that ~~the economic difficulty of~~ ^{the economic difficulty of} maintaining India ~~was a major problem~~ ^{was a major problem} even prior to the war. For instance, the Indian importation of British goods fell drastically, from £83 million worth of goods in the late 1920's to £29 million worth ~~by~~ by the mid 1930's. At the same time, Japanese imports increased, creating a crisis for British trade. Nevertheless, it can still be argued that WW2 had a significant impact on Britain's economic situation, as they contributed £1.5 million annually to the costs of the Indian army during the war. Therefore, this ~~made~~ ^{put} Indian independence on the agenda for the British, and thus it can be said that WW2 helped the advance of India towards independence.

On the other hand, many historians ~~that~~ may argue that politically speaking, WW2 helped ~~rather than hindered~~ the advance of India towards independence. For instance, Roosevelt saw it as imperative that India was fully behind the war effort, and consequently put pressure on Churchill to grant some form of self-determination to India. This culminated in the Cripps Mission of 1942, which offered India dominion status and invited representatives from all provinces to join an interim government of national unity. However, this was rejected by Congress, as the Cripps Mission

In conclusion, many historians would refute the accuracy of the statement that WW2 hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence. Indeed, whilst it can be argued that WW2 hindered the advance to some extent by complicating the political situation in India and fragmenting the nationalist movement, this argument is limited as these

~~has~~ hindrances pre-existed the war. Furthermore, the economic and political impact of WW2 on Britain can actually be said to have helped Indian advance toward independence. Therefore, it is only accurate to a negligible extent to say that WW2 hindered rather than helped Indian advance towards independence.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response clearly understands that the focus of the question is on 'helped' and 'hindered'. The candidate explores a narrow range of key issues by a sustained analysis. There is sufficient knowledge employed and the response clearly reaches a judgement. Taken together, this response has done enough to access level 5.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Aim for both range and depth in your responses.

Question 5

This was significantly the more popular choice of essay question in this section of the paper. Stronger responses engaged in developed analysis which was well supported with evidence. Weaker responses tended to work through a sequence of events chronologically, with varying attempts to link this material to the question. Most candidates made some reference to the Sharpeville massacre, but were fairly evenly split between those that were able to use it to effectively argue that the ANC changed tactics as a result and thus became more of a threat and those that used it to argue that the ANC wasn't a threat due to not organising it. A minority of candidates mistakenly claimed that the ANC organised the protest. Some candidates wanted to examine the role of other organisations that had challenged apartheid; this was unlikely to address the focus of the question.

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4

Question 5 Question 6

Plan seriously challenged = shaken to core at point of collapse
challenged to extent but not seriously.

① ANC largely ineffective 1948-61. as peaceful protest — defiance camp
60 = violence but ANC was banned ∴ lack of leadership. SK but wanted permits

also when took violence gave gov excuse just to oppress again.

∴ leaders = exile — Tambo
Mandela = prison (Robben Island)
Luthuli = house arrest.

Ev. state of Emergency = some threat but prevented Ag.

② system itself didn't allow it to be challenged.

I largely agree with the statement that apartheid was never seriously challenged by the ANC in the years 1948-61. The word "seriously" is crucial when reaching this judgement, as the ANC never shook the system to its core where it was a point of collapse, nevertheless there were some occasions when the ANC challenged the system "yet it was limited. We can see due to the ineptitude of the ANC, particularly before they begin armed struggle, means they were unable to seriously challenge the system. Furthermore the system itself didn't allow the ANC to seriously challenge it, as the National Party had passed a huge amount of legislation in the 1950's such as the Defiance Camps

to maintain the system of apartheid, and the government took action to stifle the opposition throughout our period.

The system of apartheid was never seriously challenged by the ANC as it was largely ineffective in this period. There were clear splits within in the ANC, hence why the PAC was formed in 1959. This meant there was a lack of direction and leadership which meant they were never able to seriously challenge the system. In 1952 the Defiance Campaign took place. Although it can be argued that this challenged the system as 8,000 black south Africans were arrested, the aim of the ANC was to have the whole population of black south Africans, 8 million, arrested - this would have seriously challenged the system as the government ~~would~~ would not have been able to control this.

We can see that the system of apartheid was never seriously challenged even when the ANC declared ~~a~~ violence and Mandela founded MK in 1961. Following the Sharpeville Massacre, which was initially a PAC mass protest anyway, the ANC took the decision to carry out violence in the 1960's as ~~they~~ were the anti-apartheid movement ~~was~~ was being suppressed by government violence for peaceful protest anyway, so

the ANC effectively wanted to "meet fire with fire." The fact that this government violence took place and ~~basically~~ basically forced the ANC to turn to violence, gave the government an excuse to further oppress the ANC and maintain the system with acts such as the 1962 Sabotage Act. Although the ANC has begun violence throughout the 1960's it still never seriously challenged the system of apartheid as the government responded with further action, like banning the ANC, in order to keep the apartheid regime alive.

Another reason why I agree with the statement is because the National Party passed enormous amounts of legislation in the 1950's^{60's} that the ANC were unable to reach a point of being effective enough to seriously challenge the system. Undoubtedly the system must have faced some threat as the government declared a state of emergency following Sharpeville in 1960, however the legislation the government had in place already allowed the system to continue as the state of emergency was finalised by August 1960. Legislation such as the suppression of Communism Act of 1950 and the banning of Unlawful organisations

in 1960 onwards meant the ANC were never able to advance to a point where they posed a huge threat on the government in this period. When MK attempted to advance it led to greater issues such as the Rivonia Trial. Due to ^{the} government's successful legislation and tough action, they were able to imprison Mandela, put Leballo under house arrest and other ANC leaders went into exile such as Tambo. By removing the leadership, it meant the ANC ~~was~~ ~~are~~ were unable to organise effectively and therefore never seriously challenge the system.

In conclusion, I strongly agree that the system of apartheid was never seriously challenged by the ANC in the years 1948-68. Of course the ANC posed some threat to the system such as the Defiance Campaign, ~~the Freedom Charter~~ and their turn to armed struggle, however these threats hardly challenged the system of apartheid to its core. The system still remained due to successful government action and legislation which meant the ANC were unable to reach a point of 'serious' challenging the system. Furthermore the ANC itself was ineffective for the majority of this period and lacked clear

leadership. The system of apartheid was able to maintain and the government were able to continue oppressing the opposition movement.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response accesses level 5, although it also demonstrates some level 4 qualities. The candidate clearly has a very secure understanding of the demands of the question and attempts to directly engage with this. There is sufficient, although not extensive and not ranging fully across the period, knowledge to support the line of argument that is taken. There is an exploration of some of the key features, although this is clearly uneven.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Where dates are provided in a question ensure that you cover the entire chronological range.

Question 6

This was significantly the less popular choice of essay question in this section of the paper. However, there were some very impressive responses seen in answer to this question which, for example, weighed up white opposition in relation to other factors in reaching developed judgements pertaining to the question. Candidates often had extensive contextual knowledge which was deployed in a sophisticated way to show a strong understanding of issues that were relevant to the question and to make links between these issues. Weaker candidates lacked this extensive knowledge and often went beyond the chronological parameters of the question to try and find relevant material to use.

Chosen question number: Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Question 6

PLAN:

1 - white opposition

2 - ANC/NP lack of compromise

3 - Inkatha / PAC - suspended talks

CODESA 1 - 1991
CODESA 2 - 1992

1994 election

criteria: ^{led to - consequence} profundity
quantity

referendum
- minority

It is not completely accurate to say that the main obstacle to a new political settlement in South Africa was opposition from white South Africans. This is because African violence and a lack of compromise ~~and~~ between the ANC and the National Party during CODESA discussions were more profound in their impact. The lack of compromise between the ANC and National Party was the main obstacle because it led to ^{the} suspension of the CODESA talks, and it was more profound because these political parties were so important in being the ones to reach a settlement. The fact that the National Party's compromise led to white opposition shows that this reason has a vast quantity (as it touched the majority of white and black South Africans) and directly led to the other factors.

During the negotiations for a political ~~set~~ settlement, there

was much white opposition. The Afrikaner AWB led an incursion into Bophuthatswana at this time, and this was an example of violent white opposition. This was important because it undermined the political ~~discussions~~ discussions and therefore led to ~~black~~ black African discontent and less will to get along and settle the country. Also, white political opposition hindered progress towards a political settlement. De Klerk had to deal with conflicts within the National Party who disagreed with the settlement, ~~and~~ wishing to maintain white supremacy. This is significant because it meant that de Klerk was having to manage both his own party and the political compromises in the CODESA talks. Therefore, his attention was split and this meant that some of the compromises (or lack of compromise) in the talks were never very strong as he had to please both his party and the ANC. All this considered, it can be said that white opposition both caused ^{black} African resentment and a strain on de Klerk's ability to make the settlement, which was definitely a significant obstacle. However, the fact that the white South Africans were a minority shows that this problem wasn't very widespread, and therefore affected a smaller quantity of people; Especially since the majority of whites supported the settlement when de Klerk held a referendum. Thus, while white South African opposition may have affected the ability to ~~conduct~~ reach a settlement internally, it was not very widespread.

and did not represent a majority in the country.

The lack of compromise between the ANC and National Party during the CODESA talks is arguably more significant a reason. This is because ~~the~~ both CODESA 1 and 2 were suspended by the parties due to lack of compromise. The ANC rejecting sanctions proposed and the National Party's insistence on a 75% majority to ensure minority protection are some of the reasons why CODESA 1 was suspended. De Klerk's arresting of MK and Communist Party's members due to the fact that they had not suspended the armed struggle despite the ANC's suspension of it also showed a lack of compromise in these talks. These examples are significant because they ~~show~~ show disagreements between two very powerful and important parties that were arguably the only ones who could reach a political settlement. Therefore, lack of compromise threatened to mean that this settlement was not reached. Also, the ANC suspended CODESA 2 after Mandela accused de Klerk and the National Party of giving aid to opposition groups and vigilantes to undermine ANC authority and attack them to fragment Black African potential opposition and power. This is very significant because this was the main reason for the suspension of CODESA 2. The lack of compromise/agreement between these parties ^{actually} led to

suspension of talks. It can be argued that this reason is more significant than the others as it directly led to white ~~and~~ and black opposition/violence as some white South Africans wanted to maintain white supremacy and some black groups did not want to compromise or settle things peacefully ~~with~~ with whites. Therefore, the vast^{widespread} quantity of this impact, and the ~~logically~~ profundity of these powerful parties disagreeing, makes this reason more significant.

Black African violence and opposition ~~also~~ ^{also} was an obstacle to the political settlement. Inkatha and the violent opposition they posed, like^{the violence} between Zulu-speakers as ~~they~~ Inkatha rejected Zulus who supported the ANC, also undermined the negotiations. Inkatha violence was also a main reason ^{for} the ~~suspension~~ suspension of CODESA 1, which proves that it was significant as it led to the end of ~~significant~~ important negotiations. Also, the PAC's opposition and violence, like with the indiscriminate white ~~killings~~ and black killings, was significant as it was another ~~one~~ ^{group} by ~~party~~ that was opposing negotiations. The opposition from both the PAC and Inkatha ~~had~~ ^{had} a similar effect as white AWB opposition as the mass violence showed a rejection of the idea of peaceful settlement, and led to the suspension of talks. However, black opposition

was, again, more of a minority since most Black Africans supported the ANC in its attempts to negotiate and reach a settlement; the smaller quantity weakens its significance as a reason. It can be said, though, that this factor was more important than ~~the~~ white opposition as it affected a larger quantity (with larger Black groups, and the fact that Black Africans were the majority in the country) and it led more significantly to the suspension of talks. However, it is less significant than lack of compromise between the ANC and National Party as that was more widespread in its quantity, and more profound in its impact in suspending talks.

In conclusion, while white opposition was important in ~~being~~ being an obstacle to a new South African political settlement, it was not the main or most significant obstacle as, despite its ~~to be~~ undermining negotiations and making it harder for de Klerk to negotiate, it ~~was~~ affected and encompassed a far smaller quantity of people. Black opposition was similar in its small quantity, however, it did lead more substantially to the suspension of CODESA talks as it was a much more violent threat. Therefore, ~~the~~ the lack of compromise between the ANC and National Party during CODESA negotiations was the most significant obstacle to reaching a settlement, as it affected the majority of the

population, and it more significantly led to the suspension of talks as these parties were instrumental in the possibility of reaching a settlement. This lack of compromise also directly led to white and black opposition as the people protesting were dissatisfied with the way the negotiations these parties were engaged in, were going. Thus, it was more significant as it ^{partly} caused white and black opposition.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response ranges across the issues with secure supporting evidence and a sustained focus on the question, analysis and reaching supported judgements. It is a very secure level 5 response.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension of the sources
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature, origin and purpose of the source. Comments about this should be specific to the provided sources rather than generic comments that might apply to any source
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Section B

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally 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
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

