



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel

In GCE History (8HI0/2F)

Paper 2: Depth study

Option 2F.1: India, c1914-48: the road to independence

Option 2F.2: South Africa, 1948-94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation'

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2022

Publications Code 8HI0_2F_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid set of exams at AS Level Paper 8HI0/2F which covers the options India c1914-48 (8HI02F.1) and South Africa 1948-94 (8HI0/2F.2). The latter option attracted more entries than the former. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

In common with the previous series, candidates tended to find Section A more challenging than Section B. Some candidates were still not clear on what was meant by 'value' and 'weight' in the context of source analysis and evaluation. Candidates are reminded to read the information given about the source and think about the value, rather than repeating rote phrases. Performance in Section A was aided by the detailed knowledge base that many candidates demonstrated, although the contextual material was not always used so successfully to support/challenge points derived from the sources. Most candidates did use their time effectively and, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions in both sections. The ability range was diverse, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Section B, most responses had an analytical focus and there were very few that were wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured and demonstrated a secure knowledge base. Many Section B essays were of a high standard.

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

Q1a

The majority of responses dealt reasonably well with the content of the source, successfully identifying Gandhi's response to the Communal Award based on what the source said. Candidates clearly understood the value of a letter written by Gandhi in the circumstances outlined in the caption.

Q1b

Understanding of the source was generally solid. For many candidates, the focus tended to be on content and on limited evaluation of this being 'from the time' or simply factually accurate in terms of political opinions. A number of candidates did not fully consider the limitations of the source and generally little weight was placed by candidates on Hoare's characterisation of Indian views.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

Sec A b

(This is for part (a)). Source 1 is valuable to an historian for an enquiry into Gandhi's response to the Communal Award of 1932 as it has a lot of provenance and is contemporaneous. This was a letter written by Gandhi himself so this means it is a first hand account into his thoughts and feelings on the matter of the Award; this was also written in August on the 18th in 1932 meaning that it is highly contemporaneous and true to the time as it was written in the current events of what was happening. The letter was also written whilst Gandhi had just got back from the failed Second Round Table Conference and he was passing his time in Yervada jail, so this letter may have had exaggerated feelings of anger and resentment due to the fact he got put in jail, but it still shows how willing Gandhi was to fight for what he believed in even though he was fighting from jail. So it is valuable to the historian because it is a primary source and it is of the time so it can be trusted to draw facts from.

Also it is valuable in terms of content as well. Gandhi felt so strongly about protecting the rights of his feelings and showing how deeply he felt about the decision to represent the minorities that he had to "resist with my life" which he almost did and that shows a true belief in his own thoughts and actions. Gandhi declared "a fast-unto-death

(This is for part (a)) "from food of any kind" to prove to the British government that what they were doing was wrong, that they had no authority to rule over India anymore and Gandhi wanted to demonstrate this with his life, proving to them that ~~by not doing this~~ it will become a chain reaction of Indians doing this if they do not cease their oppressive rule. So this is valuable as it proves how willing Gandhi was to risk his life for what had been laid out in the Communal Award, as well as being contemporaneous too.

Overall Source 1 is highly reliable into the enquiry of Gandhi's response to the Communal Award of 1932, it shows the true dismay at the British governments actions, as well as showing how angry Gandhi felt too.

(This is for part (b)) A reasonable amount of weight can be given to the evidence of Source 2 for an enquiry into attitudes ^{towards} proposed constitutional changes in India in 1935.

Firstly, this was a speech given by Samuel Hoare, the Secretary of State for India and this speech was given on the 23rd of January 1935, this means that this information is highly contemporaneous as it is of the time and is from the speech written by Hoare himself. The content can also be given a considerable amount of weight as attitudes "to avoid the disastrous results which may occur if the changes are too hurried" was a feeling felt by both British and Indians. There was already enough tension in the country already, and no one wanted tensions especially between Hindus and Muslims, to be heightened even more. Hoare was right to acknowledge that "Indian critics are worried that the Government will be a dictatorship" as they were starting to feel they were owed more after all they had done over the years for the war effort. ~~enough~~ more than half the Allied troops were made up of Indian soldiers, so they felt that because of sheer commitment that they made to the war alone they should be granted their freedom; so the fact that Hoare acknowledge how Indians might have felt restless shows how he was willing to at least try and give the Indian people what they want, whilst still trying to keep the British happy. So this shows that Source 2 can be given a reasonable amount of

(This is for part (b)). Weight into the attitudes towards proposed constitutional change as it shows how Hoare felt on the matter and how he inferred what the Indians were thinking in regards to their feelings and also how there was an all over feeling that no one wanted to have increased tensions over this Act, however there are a few flaws that made these tensions inevitable.

The Speech given by Hoare was given in Oxford, which shows that he was not directly speaking to the citizens this Act was going to affect the most, it was also introduced into the House of Commons, not a Government in India like Congress, which again shows how the Indian people were being overlooked and attitudes towards proposed constitutional power quickly went sour as many Indians felt short changed in what they were receiving. Hoare in his speech stated that "Indians do not wish to deprive themselves of the advantage of our experience and our help" this was untrue, the Indian people wanted to start to get away from the harsh oppression of the British Raj, they felt like minority citizens in their own land and this was not how they wanted to feel; they wanted to be in charge of their own lives and their own governments, not have a Government thousands of miles away decide their future for them. It was also said that "Reasonable people here in Britain are ready to accept this" however this was not the case. Winston Churchill believed Indians to be incapable of governing themselves, so to give them

(This is for part (b)) any form of self-government, or anything close to that, would be a fatal mistake. He set up the Defence Against India group in which him and 50 other Tory MPs, firmly denied and didn't agree with anything that was to be passed in favour of the Indians being granted some measure of freedom. So this shows that a considerable amount of weight can be given to evidence into an enquiry for certainly negative attitudes towards proposed constitutional change as it shows how, in fact, the British were in still not being able to properly communicate with the Indian people.

Overall, Source 2 can be given a substantial amount of weight as it was contemporaneous, it shows how both sides, to a certain extent, felt about the proposed constitutional change, but it doesn't properly show how the Indian peoples attitudes changed and that is why it lacks in weight and validity into enquiry about the true attitudes of all

This effective response meets the demands for level 3 in part a, and level 4 in part b. In both parts of the question, it demonstrates understanding of the sources and it draws out supported inferences that are rooted in an accurate context. It shows a sense of the values and concerns of the society from which each source is drawn. It is slightly weaker in both responses in its handling of the third bullet point

Q2a

The content of the source was generally well used by candidates to discuss and explain how and why the Muldergate scandal affected the trustworthiness of the Botha administration. Many responses were able to use this to link to contextual knowledge of the impact of international opinion through the provenance of the source with some of the higher-level responses able to tease out the link to a debate on their application. However, some responses focused almost entirely on content and struggled to ascertain which elements of contextual knowledge to bring in.

Q2b

Most responses were able to use Mandela's position effectively to set out why he would respond in the way that he did to Botha's offer of freedom, but some seemed less certain of what the offer had been, even with the information in the paper. A sizeable minority of responses described aspects of Mandela's incarceration and his position before 1961 in the ANC without building it toward evaluations of value.

Source 3 is valuable to the historian for an enquiry into the importance of the scandal due to its content. This source argues that this scandal was very important and significant as it had both 'international and domestic consequences'. It involved the purchasing of a 'pro-apartheid' newspaper, which was certainly the case as they had bought the English publication 'The Citizen' to promote the apartheid regime. Furthermore, the source emphasises the fact that the government and 'Mulder' were untruthful and tried to deceive its own supporters. This again was certainly the case as the year before this scandal, president Vorster ~~regi~~ resigned, citing ill health, but subsequently after this Muldergate scandal was discovered, it was found that Vorster was implicated in this, hence his resignation. It also suggests that due to this scandal, the government ~~lost support~~ lost significant

(This is for part (a)) support from the Afrikaners. This again was the case, as for many Afrikaners decided to support other political parties which saw the growth in the progressive party from 1 to 17 seats in the 1978 elections. Furthermore, ~~due to this scandal~~

This source also suggests that the apartheid government were getting more worried about the unstable ~~part~~ environment in South Africa and abroad, and thus 'Botha' tried to 'keep details of the scandal a secret' from my knowledge, I can confirm

that in the late 1970s, there were 'domestic' and 'international' problems such as the ~~market~~ economic crisis, boycotts and mandatory embargoes such as the arms embargo in 1977; ~~the~~

The ~~same~~ source suggests that the scandal had made these problems worse with more 'angry responses from the Afrikaner supporters'. This was the

case, as the National Party had internal divisions, with one wing wanting more reform and the other wanting more conservatism. This scandal had sped up the split in the apartheid party as in 1980, the Conservative party

(This is for part (a)) was formed led by ~~Carrie~~ ~~who~~ which was started by Mulder. Therefore this source is valuable for an enquiry into the importance of the scandal as it tells the historian that the 'deceit' and 'manipulation' involved in the scandal significantly worsened of 'domestic and international problems', hence making it a very important event.

This source is also valuable due to the provenance. This source was an article in the New York Times newspaper.

This makes it valuable, as it is a newspaper that is very famous and therefore has credibility. Furthermore, it is an international newspaper and thus the article ~~was~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~ isn't going to be biased towards apartheid and is going to be more truthful as it is intended for all demographics. Furthermore,

this article was written in 1978, which also makes it valuable as it was written when the scandal was first discovered and thus is more likely to give objective ~~and~~ and factual detail.

ON CONTINUED ON

(This is for part (b)) rather than subjective opinions which are common in articles commenting on the past. Therefore this source is valuable to the historian as it was written by a credible source, wasn't directly influenced by the apartheid government as ~~the scandal~~ involved ~~corruption~~ in the late 1970s, USA started to impose sanctions on South Africa as the Communist threat diminished and was written right after the scandal and may it is valuable.

2b)

This source can be given weight for an enquiry into the reasons why Mandela would not accept Botma's offer to release him from prison in 1985, due to the content. The source suggests that a reason why Mandela rejected Botma's offer was because apartheid laws were still enforced and so people won't be able to protest and thus still were not 'free men'. This was certainly the case as although Botma did start to remove some petty apartheid laws

(This is for part (b))

Such as repealing the mixed marriages act of 1949 in 1985, many apartheid laws were still enforced such as the population registration act (1985) and in 1985 people 'may be arrested on a charge under the pass laws' as the pass laws were still not abolished (were abolished in 1986.) Furthermore, Mandela states suggests that Botha has a lot of power over him as he wants Mandela to 'enter into [a] construct' and thus Mandela despite being released still wasn't be a 'free man'. This from my knowledge, I can confirm as Botha did agree to release him if he was stopped the armed struggle and opposition and lived in a Bantustan in Transkei. In addition to this, the source suggests that Mandela wants proper democracy before he is let out as he wants 'people to decide who will govern them'. This was certainly the case as Mandela only got released when talks of holding real democratic elections with everyone having a vote were being held with in the 1990s.

(This is for part (b))

Therefore his source can be given weight for as it explains a variety of reasons why Mandela did reject Botma's freedom proposals including the fact that despite him being released from prison, he would still be restricted and so will other people and therefore it wouldn't make sense for him to accept his proposal as he would be sacrificing his and other people's freedom.

This source can also be given weight due to its provenance. This was a statement made by Mandela himself and therefore can be given weight as he explains himself, the reasons why he rejected Botma's offers. Furthermore, it was simply a statement that he would have made in prison and thus would not have been untruthful as it wasn't an official source that was going to be published and was going to be sent internationally to increase the pressure against the government.

(This is for part (b))

However, this source has limited weight also due to its provenance and content. Even though, this statement was never intended to be published by Mandela, it was intended for a large audience. The source was a statement was read out to a United Democratic front meeting in Soweto. The UDF comprised of 575 organisations that worked together to oppose apartheid and this was a very large group; in addition to this, it was given in Soweto, which was one of the biggest townships and was known for the apartheid protests like the Soweto uprising in 1976 and thus it's safe to assume that Mandela's daughter was addressing this statement to a very large audience. This limits the weight it can be given as since it's for a large audience, Mandela would try to make himself look selfless and to consolidate support. This is seen in the content where it states 'I care even more for your freedom', and this limits the weight as it can be seen

(This is for part (b)) as a way of gathering mass support, rather than it being a completely truthful statement that addresses the reason he rejected Borna's offers. Therefore, the source has limited weight due to it being an address intended for a large domestic audience and thus a possible attempt to gain mass support, rather than being ~~an~~ a statement that addresses the reasons why he rejected Borna.

This is an excellent example of a response that score level 3 in 2a and level 4 in 2b and was awarded full marks. It engages fully with the question, showing a secure understanding of the sources and developing inferences and evaluation supported by strong contextual knowledge.

Q3

Approximately equal numbers of candidates tackled questions 3 and 5. Most candidates knew the impact of the First World War on India, but a number of them struggled to link that to the question of whether Britain was able to reinforce its control. Narratives of events dominated, with the conclusions serving to link the knowledge deployed to the question asked. However, a sizeable minority of responses were analytical throughout and made valid, if weak, links to the question and between factors meaning that, on the whole, the responses were strong and able to access the higher levels.

It can be argued that the consequence of the First World War was to reinforce Britain's control of India in the years 1914-1919. Whilst this statement can be supported with evidence of India's contribution during the war, it can also be argued against through the extent of how the nationalist movement grew throughout these years.

When Britain entered the First World War, there came mass support from India. 1.5 million Indian soldiers fought for Britain, and showing their loyalty to Britain despite the British government and India not being on the best of terms at the time. India also contributed to the war by sending millions of pounds to Britain for resources that would make them financially secure to fight in the war, by sending things like resources. With these examples, it can be said that the consequence of the First World War was to reinforce Britain's

control of India during 1914-19, as India's contribution in the War showed how they were still firmly under control.

However, it is during the years of 1914-19 that Britain starts to lose control over India. This can primarily be seen through the events of the Amritsar Massacre, where thousands of Indians gathered in the city of Amritsar (despite mass gatherings being banned) and saw General Dyer command his soldiers to open fire on the Indian people despite no Indian ~~act~~ using violent measures against the British. Hundreds of people were killed, thousands were wounded and over 300 rounds of ammunition were used towards the Indians in Amritsar. There was a general feeling of Dyer going way too far, as which led to the establishment of the Hunter ~~Report~~ Committee which concluded that Dyer's actions were unacceptable, which led to him leaving his role of General. The use of violence in order to "control" India meant that authorities were scared of another rebellion, one ~~like~~ to the scale

of the Great Mutiny in 1857. From happening, showing that Britain was starting to lose control of India.

After the Amritsar Massacre, a mass amount of support came to India as millions of people joined the nationalist movement in order to be free from British rule. Therefore, it can be said that ~~that~~ the Amritsar Massacre undermined the movement as shortly after the first civil disobedience campaign (1920-22) was established which impacted the Rai to a great extent. In summary, the consequences of Amritsar led to the growth of the nationalist movement and would therefore be an example of Britain starting to lose control over India.

Despite the large contribution ~~and~~ made towards Britain during the war, fighting in the war for Britain would basically guarantee independence of some form from British rule, meaning this could have been India's motive towards their contribution in the war and whilst independence from British rule was still far away from

happenings contributing in the war set up the establishment of independence, meaning as a consequence of the First World War, Britain would eventually lose control over India.

Britain re-established control over India through the passing of the Government of India Act of 1919, firmly still being in rule of India, despite having to make some compromises. Through this statement, it can be seen that it wasn't only the consequences of World War One that led to Britain reinforcing control over India.

In conclusion, it can be said that whilst the First World War ~~still meant Britain~~ ~~had control~~ saw Britain reinforce their control over India to some extent, through India's physical and economic contribution to the war. The years 1914-1919 can be mainly seen as the beginning of the end of British control over India as factors such as the Amritsar Massacre ~~can~~ being the spark

of the growth of the nationalist movement (shown through the mass support given as a result of Amritsar) was a demonstration of Britain starting to lose control over India. On top of this, contributing in the war would mean India would gain independence of some form even if long-term this meant Britain would no longer be able to rule over India.

This response achieves a level 3/4 borderline mark. Although it is quite descriptive in its approach, it does have some range and always links that description back to the focus of the question.

Q4

Insufficient candidates tackled this question to comment meaningfully.

Q5

Approximately equal numbers of candidates tackled questions 3 and 5. Most responses were able to focus on the question set. Responses were evenly split between those that focused on the role of Mountbatten and the Labour government and those that focussed on sectarian violence as alternatives to the role of the Second World War.

Whilst it is fair to say that the British decision to leave India in August 1947 ~~was~~ a consequence of the impact of ~~but~~ the Second World War (WW2) but it is important to consider other factors as well into why the British decided to leave India for good. The criteria I will be using for this is how all that happened affected the people of India's quality of life.

WW2 had a profound impact upon the British's decision to leave India. The Indian people stated that if they were to fight for the British in this war and risk more lives, ~~and~~ especially after Linlithgow committed 300 million unknowing Indians to battle after consulting a single one of them, then they demanded their freedom in return. This was the final ~~the~~ action they swore to take for Britain and if they were not given it then they would have no choice but to make themselves as ungovernable as possible. Also just before the war began, and even as the war was going on, President Roosevelt played a massive part in pressuring the British Government to allow the Indian people to be granted their freedom. Roosevelt met with Churchill in August 1941 on board a ship called Augusta to sign the Atlantic Charter which was to give Indians some form of self-governance.

however Churchill refused and stated that this 'self-governance' would not apply to ~~the~~ any country under the British Empire. So dreams of freedom were quickly dashed there. However Roosevelt still applied pressure on the British government during the war by saying they would refuse to give them as much help with weaponry or etc. if they did not grant the Indians some form of self-government; this finally led to the British government thinking about what steps forward they should take and how to give the Indian people what they wanted without taking too much power away from the British. There were still certain people who did not agree with this, for example Churchill, he fought in India in 1857 in an infantry division and the view he gained of them there never changed and he was never going to attempt to change it either. This led to many difficulties getting laws and acts passed in government. So in conclusion this shows that British decision to leave India in August 1947 was quite significant and ~~imposed~~ the war definitely impacted the decision to ~~make attempts~~ to leave, but the war alone and what happened during it wasn't enough to push the British out as they still had that preconceived thought that they still needed to keep a significant amount of fail-safe power just in case self-government in India was granted but then fell through the cracks in the shaky surface of India's foundations.

It could be fair to say that British decision to leave

India in August 1947 was a consequence of V. Mountbatten and him being coming into power as Viceroy. Mountbatten wanted to be able to grant the Indian people their Independence and partition the country as quickly as possible so he could return to his mediocre naval career. He was a charismatic, but pretentious man who always had the blackmail card of his cousin being the King and would use this in talks with the Princes and other politicians in India just to get his way. However throughout Mountbatten's viceroyship he was poorly advised by many people, some telling him partition and Independence were the only option for India and others told him under no circumstance should he waver and grant independence; many people ~~some~~ knew Mountbatten had left-wing tendencies so rightwing politicians felt he could not be trusted as he would just sympathise with labour and always be swayed by their view. In conclusion this shows that Mountbatten being viceroy was definitely a consequence as to why Britain decided to leave India in August 1947, they felt embarrassed by what he had done and backed into a corner by his actions and what he had proposed, he was not the man they needed for the job at that time and he only made the situation worse.

This response achieves mid-level 3. It discusses some aspects of the impact of the Second World War and goes on to consider the role of Mountbatten, although this is not always convincingly argued. It lacks some range of explanation and has not left sufficient time to write a conclusion.

Tip

Aim to leave enough time to write a conclusion to draw your differing explanations together

Q6

This was the most popular choice of question in this section and candidates were clearly very knowledgeable about both the powers of the state and other factors that weakened the anti-apartheid movement in this period. The majority of responses understood the focus of the question. Narratives were very rare, with most candidates able to develop an analytical approach.

During the years 1948-61, there was an increase in the rise of anti apartheid groups in South Africa who fought against the apartheid system however the successes of the groups were limited and they most failed to achieve their goals.

Some may argue that the reason as to why anti-apartheid movements were weakened is due to factors such as lack of unity and lack of co-ordination between the groups as they failed to be on the same page. Yet it seems more convincing to argue in fact that the anti-apartheid movement was restricted due to the powers of the state in which they had a profound impact on limiting the powers of these groups.

The National party government was a key reason as to why anti apartheid groups failed at achieving their aims and were greatly weakened as the state introduced laws which would limit their daily lives in every aspect. This is evident from the number of legislation which was introduced by the government over

as the 1949 mixed marriages act which prohibited the marriage across the races and acted as the first set of legislation which was implementing the race boundary. Also, the National party introduced the 1952 Native abolition of passes which restricted and controlled the movement of black people in South Africa and limited their freedom of movement. This clearly highlights how the power of the state is what weakened opposition groups and which led them to ultimately not meeting their aims of getting rid of the apartheid system. In addition to this, it clearly shows how the government had a profound impact on controlling these anti-apartheid movements as well as limiting their freedoms by implementing a variety of legislation throughout the years of 1948 to 1961 which would essentially lead to 'great apartheid' and full separation. Some may argue that anti-apartheid movements did not stick to legislation and aimed to go against legislations as a way of resistance such as the 1952 Defiance campaign which saw thousands of volunteers willing to break restriction, in the hope that it would overwhelm the police and courts. Yet, despite this form of

resistance and the aim of these groups failed and their desired outcome failed to be accomplished showing how despite aims the government had a profound amount of control.

Some may argue that, the fact that anti-apartheid groups lacked unity was the main reason for the ~~states~~ weakening of these movements. This was clearly highlighted in Sophiatown where the ANC failed to show unity in whether tenant owners were more important or those who lived there. Also, in 1958 we also see a divide in the ANC and PAC (two anti-apartheid movements) following the arrest of 156 members of the Congress Alliance. This shows how one could argue that the lack of unity among these opposition groups led to the failure and the weakening of the movement. This is because it seems that anti-apartheid movements lacked a clear goal/aim such as what they hoped to achieve, the type of movement which would be used whether it be peaceful protest or armed struggle. Thus showing that it could be argued the lack of communication

which led to lack of unity is what led to the weakening of anti-apartheid movements. Yet, it seems more convincing to argue that the States ability to oppress and control these movements led to their failure and weakening as the States imposition of a great number of legislation such as the 1960 State of Emergency following Sharpeville which prevented groups from meeting had a profound impact.

The state control had a profound impact on weakening anti-apartheid movements as it was able to stop groups from getting together whether that be taking leaders from their groups or mass arrests. This can be supported in 1956 in which 156 members/leaders from the Congress Alliance were arrested in dawn raids for high treason. This clearly demonstrates how the state was able to impose control over these anti-apartheid movements by arresting and taking control of any resistance that they would come across to prevent these movements of getting any slight successes and further weakening them by taking their leaders away from the protesters. Thus showing how the States powers and ability to

rid off any opposition led to the weakness of these campaigns. However, some may argue that at the end these leaders were not charged and were acquitted of their crimes and also used the stands in court to empower and attain support for their movement as it was televised. However, the state had greater and controlled movements, weakening the for the long term as the ISG members were in a trial which lasted 5 years which may and led to movements operating on their own without a leader to dictate how to act, thus showing how the states control is what weakened the movement.

The lack of unitedness about whether the anti-apartheid movement would or would not allow white people to be a part of their movements also acted and could have led to the weakening of anti-apartheid groups. This is because both the ANC and PAC had different ideas as to whether those who weren't black should be allowed to fight in the campaign. This can be supported as the ANC allowed for white people to campaign and sympathise the movement

such as Helen Suzman who greatly campaigned for improved conditions for prisoners and anti-apartheid leaders who were treated so poorly by the government. Whilst, the PAC was greatly critical and argued that the movements should not associate with those who are part of the oppressors and argued that white people should be expelled. This shows how the anti-apartheid movement lacked unity and didn't agree on numerous aspects which would have led to their being a realness and something which led to failure of opposition groups. Yet again, it seems that the government and state imposed a great deal of control on anti-apartheid movements which was evident as in the 1960's there was 309,000 arrests under pass laws alone and furthermore there was over 3 million criminals in the years of the 1950's-60's which shows how the state's ability to control and oppress these groups is the main reason for their failure.

In conclusion, it seems clear to argue that the states powers and ability to control the number of anti-apartheid movements led to their weakness. ~~That~~ The state had both a profound impact but also impacted groups in the long-term. Although it could be argued that the lack of unity and co-ordination may have contributed to their weakness and failure. It seems more convincing to argue that it was the states power by imposing legislation after legislation in all aspects and numerous arrests which weakened groups.

A very secure level 4 response. This answer covers a range of issues that are generally linked to the question. The line of argument is well-supported by contextual knowledge.

Q7

This was the least popular question in this section. Insufficient candidates tackled it to make valid comments.

Q8

This was the second most popular question in this section. Responses here tended toward a two-sided argument of Biko's importance contrasted with 'other factors'. Many candidates were able to effectively discuss the impact of Biko in terms of galvanising domestic opposition versus the apparently limited immediate impact. Some very impressive answers were seen, with clear evidence of secure planning.

To a large extent, the role played by Steve Biko in challenging the National Party was significant. Biko was an influential figure who spread the idea of Black Consciousness in South Africa, as well as creating SASO, which mobilized the younger generation as well as provoking mass international reaction and condemnation and thus was a very significant figure.

Firstly, Biko spread the idea of Black Consciousness. This was the idea of Black people embracing their culture and history. This was significant in challenging the National Party as this movement encouraged a lot of people, especially the new younger generations to fight against apartheid and the National Party. Furthermore, he created SASO (South African Students Organisation) in 1969 which was

based around the Black Consciousness movement. This mobilised the students and the younger generation and this led to a lot of protests undermining the apartheid regime and putting pressure on the National Party for example the Soweto Uprising in 1976. Members of SASO and SASM as well as ordinary students, inspired by Biko revolted against the school system, which led to year long mass protests which involved the burning down of schools as well as student strikes. This disrupted the National Party as it contributed to the evergrowing domestic problems that the National Party were dealing with during this period. Such as the economic crisis due to the 1973 oil crisis. Therefore, Biko was significant in challenging the National Party as he helped mobilise and influence the younger generation which led to the Soweto uprising which contributed to the substantial domestic problems the National Party were dealing with as well as providing

International condemnation e.g. the UN passing a resolution condemning the apartheid governments

Furthermore, Mingo's significance in challenging the National Party could also be seen when he died in police custody in 1977. This provoked more frustration amongst the public, particularly the younger generation which led to even more protests. The government blamed his death on a self-induced hunger strike and him falling against a wall. This was not very factual and this blatant lie contributed to further government international condemnation. His death led to mass protests in the USA and this led to encouraged US businesses to start closing down their firms which they started to do in the 80s. Furthermore, because of his death, the UN passed another resolution and created a mandatory arms embargo, further challenging the National Party and weakening it.

However, it could be argued that Biko's role played in challenging the regime was limited. This is because the Soweto uprising, ~~which~~ was influenced by Biko and SASO, it only really happened in 1976 due to the minister of education provoking the African students by making half lessons be taught in Afrikaans, the language of the oppressors. Furthermore, the townships in which they lived suffered from overcrowding and students were frustrated with the schools teaching them how to access but the most menial jobs. High school enrolment also increased by 150% amongst Africans in townships between 1970-76 and this ~~led to~~ contributed to overcrowding. Therefore, it can be argued that although Biko influenced the students, they were only started the mass protests due to the government's incompetence and further repression and also SASO started demonstrations during Soweto and many of their members

were influenced by the Black Consciousness
and were infact ANC members.

Furthermore, it can be argued that
international condemnation played a
more significant role in challenging
the National Party. The UN passed
a ~~new~~ a mandatory army
embargo in 1977, which made
it very difficult for South Africa
to obtain weapons, ~~weakening~~ ^{weakening} their
defence which contributed to the
fact that they couldn't impose
UNITA on Angola as their
military wasn't strong enough. ~~Further~~
in 1977 no global agreement
was passed by the Commonwealth
forbidding its members from competing
with South Africa in any sporting
activity. This would have reduced
morale in South Africa and ~~therefore~~
reduced African support for the
National Party.

In conclusion, To a large extent, Steve
Biko's role in challenging the National

however
only pushed
after
Sovets,
which
was
influenced
by
Biko
this
meant
that
South
Africa
had
external
problems
as
they
had
less
friendly
states
and
groups
such
as
the
Mk
had
their
bases
of
operations
in
Angola.

Party was significant. This is because he influenced younger people and spread the black consciousness movement which contributed to many protests including the Soweto Uprising in 1976. Furthermore, although it could be argued that his involvement in the actual uprising which challenged the national party was limited, he still influenced a ~~whole~~ generation as he created SASO and mobilized the student activists. Furthermore, his death and his actions led to international ~~sanctions~~ condemnation and contributed to the implementation of sporting boycotts e.g. Ceneages agreement in 1977 and a mandatory arms embargo passed by the UN and thus Biko's role in challenging the power of the National party was ~~to a~~ to a large extent very significant.

An exceptionally strong answer, that thoroughly deserved to be awarded a mark at the top of the level.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

Value of Source Question (1(a)/2(a))

- Candidates must make valid inferences rather than merely paraphrase the source

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

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

- Candidates should be prepared to assess the weight of the source for an enquiry by being aware that the author is writing for a specific audience. Be aware of the values and concerns of that audience.
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to use contextual knowledge to support/challenge statements and claims made in the source
- In coming to a judgement about the nature/purpose of the source, take account of the weight that can be given to the author's evidence in the light of his or her stance and/or purpose
- In assessing weight, it is perfectly permissible to assess reliability by considering what has been perhaps deliberately omitted from the source. However, simply stating that a source is limited because it does not cover certain events or developments does not establish weight since no source can be comprehensive.

Section B

Essay questions

- Weaker responses lacked range and sometimes depth – candidates should have sufficient supporting evidence
- Pick out three or four key themes and then provide an analysis of (for e.g.) the target significance mentioned in the question, setting its importance against other themes rather than providing a description of each
- Pay careful attention to key phrases in the question when analysing and use them throughout the essay to prevent deviation from the central issues and concepts
- Try to explore links between issues to make the structure flow more logically and the arguments more integrated.