



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary

In History (WHI02) Paper 1D

Breadth Study with Source Evaluation

South Africa, 1948-2014

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 2018

Publications Code WHI02_1D_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a range of well-informed and well-written responses from candidates on IAS Paper WHI02 1D which covers the option South Africa 1948-2014. The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory two-part question for the option studied, each part based on one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance.

It is pleasing to note there has been considerable improvement in candidates' handling of the source material in this option since IAS exam began in 2016 and the vast majority of candidates do focus their responses on source analysis. In Section A many candidates understood what was meant by 'value' in question 1a) in the context of source analysis this year. However, many still continue to write about limitations to the source and since this is not covered by 'value' and hence not rewarded in the mark scheme, means that candidates disadvantage themselves in terms of the time take to develop such arguments which impacts on the time they have to spend on the rest of the paper. Many candidates also struggle with the concept of 'weight' in question 1b). Candidates need to approach weight by considering the reliability of the source. This can be measured in terms of the trustworthiness of the provenance and/or the accuracy of the content. Hence candidates should explore the strengths and limitations of the source and on then, based upon their judgements ascribe weight to the source. Many candidates use the term 'weight' as interchangeable with 'value' and refer to 'adding' and 'subtracting weight' throughout their answers. This approach makes it difficult to develop judgements based upon valid criteria and hence reach a final evaluation based on weight. Finally candidates do need to consider the use of contextual knowledge. Most candidates used context to confirm or challenge matters of detail in the source and thus achieved level two. Candidates are advised to use their contextual knowledge to explain and develop inferences which will enable them to focus discussion on what can be gained from the sources and so access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

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

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

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

Question 1a)

There were some good responses that achieved high Level 2 or beyond. These responses demonstrated an understanding of the source material and an ability to draw and develop inferences from the material using their contextual knowledge to explain inferences as well as expanding on matters in the source. Valid comments were made on the provenance of the source and value explained including Joseph's personal experience of the apartheid system. Some very well-crafted answers made use of both the attributes in the caption and Joseph's own claims in the source to justify their evaluation of the source. Most candidates who failed to reach Level 3, did so because of description of the content of the source rather than using it to draw inferences and establish value. There were some lengthy descriptions of white opposition or aspects of apartheid that were not used to develop and explain inferences that could be drawn from the source and this limits the achievement as well as using up valuable time. There were also answers that explored limitations which is not relevant to part a).

source 1 comes from a British woman, Helen Joseph, who was an anti-apartheid activist and a co-leader of the Federation of South African women. In this source she describes the "utterly invalid privilege" of white people and her opinion about the "injustice" of apartheid. This source includes some valuable information an enquiry into the reasons for white opposition to apartheid.

To begin with, in the first paragraph Joseph points at the ~~comfort~~ superior position of whites in terms of living conditions. As we know, this "comfortable white life" was partly caused by the Separate Amenities Act which segregated amenities for whites and blacks. Then she highlights injustice of this segregation. She states that "simply because of the colour of their skins" whites lived in much better conditions. This "invalid ~~privilege~~" was the reason for her becoming an anti-apartheid activist, thus, becoming an opposition to apartheid. In the second paragraph, Joseph highlights the reason for her to be ~~an opposition~~ ^{opposite of opposed} to apartheid; she manages to notice those "forgotten" black people, "whose suffering she heard" herself she describes ^{presumably} blacks as those "forgotten people" whose stories of "injustice and suffering" she heard herself. This ^{presumably} can be counted as a reason for the white

opposition.
Moreover, her opinion^{in this source} is also valuable because she was not passive, she was leading a protest against the pass laws, she was one of the accused in the Treason Trial. Presumably, that only emphasized the extent to which she was opposed to the apartheid because of its "its" injustice.

~~✗~~ In conclusion, this source provides some valuable information for ^{an enquiry into the reasons for} white opposition to apartheid. As stated by Helen Joseph, one of the reasons was an "invalid privilege" of whites and segregation/apartheid which caused "suffering" that she had heard herself.

This is a secure level 3 response achieving level 3 in all the bullet points in the mark scheme. It has good contextual knowledge and is effective in drawing inferences such as the reference to the 'superior' position of whites on the first page which is supported by reference to the source and developed by contextual knowledge of the separate Amenities Act. The evaluation is substantiated.

Question 1b)

The best responses were written by candidates who successfully made reasoned inferences, evaluating the weight of the source in relation to the enquiry and using contextual knowledge to illuminate limitations of what could be gained. Candidates made good use of the authorship of the source and its implications to develop an evaluation and judgement that was based on valid criteria e.g., by referring to the value of Mphahlele's personal experience and the freedom of expression that was enabled as a result of his exile. Most candidates who did not achieve Level 4 failed to do so due to making inferences that were not fully developed or reasoned. Many candidates used accurate contextual knowledge but this was usually only included to confirm/challenge details rather than going the step further to illuminate what could therefore be gained from the source. Some candidates took the source at face value and some attempted to turn it into an essay on apartheid. Many candidates missed opportunities to consider whether Mphahlele's experience was typical - as a teacher he would certainly have been at the higher end of the employment system.

The source's authorship, being an African, makes him a reliable person to talk of the black South African experience of apartheid. His being a university educated school teacher in itself shows one of the injustices of apartheid apparent in the ~~total~~^{specific} employment of blacks, ~~in good jobs~~ as a university degree-holder, in a country with only 24% literacy rates in Africans in the 1950s, his status would be expected to be higher. However, not only was it reduced but it was also diminished by banning him from teaching and his eventual life in exile, which reflected the lives of many black South Africans in the 1950s, with many choosing to live in exile over living under unjust conditions.

His experience with registration for a Regional Pass document shows the thoroughness of the apartheid regime in expelling Africans from the cities, where job opportunities are high. With the highly opposed Native Abolition of Passes Act implemented in the 1950s, all male adult Africans were required to have a ~~pass book~~ reference book. Hendrik Verwoerd, the ~~Native~~ Minister of ~~Native~~ Native Affairs at the time and the architect of apartheid, stressed the importance of implementing pass laws.

for enforcing apartheid. Ezekiel's encounter, while seemingly only tackling a very limited subject, is actually tackling the core of apartheid: the separation of the races. The "big man" mentioned with the ability to "force a man to quit the city" emphasizes how easy it was for the government to upheave a black man's life, forcing them to relocate to far blung ~~land~~ townships, in as little time as a mere "24 hours." The government's control over where Africans live and how long they stay there is one of the most oppressive of laws implemented under apartheid.

The scarcity of jobs in South Africa for blacks is emphasized further through Ezekiel's talk of how ~~easy~~ losing his job could easily mean his having to relocate, and go through the "same process" of thorough checking. ~~While blacks encountered other oppressive laws in the 1950s, the wage of this specific law in the source renders it valuable for a historian's understanding of apartheid a black man's experience of apartheid in the 1950s.~~ The big man's duty, as mentioned in the source, is to "reduce the number" of "redundant natives," in other words, the government's policy of influx control to protect the cities from cheap black labour. The movement of Africans was hence extremely limited, and so was their job opportunities and their wages, as the cities had higher paying jobs. Although these pass

laws didn't stop Africans from migrating to the cities, ~~it~~ ~~made their lives more the African~~ ~~the~~ urban African population only increased in that time frame, it made all those urban African dwellers legally criminals, with the pass offence being ~~an~~ equivalent to weeks worth of wages. The source, despite its ~~best~~ inability to tackle a wider variety of struggles, has captured the main one, making it valid when assessing how blacks have experienced apartheid policies.

This is a level 4 entry response. It draws out a number of valid inferences that are developed by reasoned explanation and explored with contextual knowledge. It does not sufficiently consider the limitations of the source to achieve a secure mark in level 4. There is just a brief consideration of this in the final paragraph.

Question 2

This was a popular essay question and there were many secure answers that were supported with good knowledge. The best responses had a secure focus on the question and its second order concept of 'similarity and difference' and established criteria for judgement. Candidates drew out the differences in Botha's and de Klerk's use of the security forces and their relationship with Mandela and the ANC and with the outside world and contrasted these differences with their similar policy of negotiating with Mandela, their changes to the apartheid system and the use of the presidential system. At the lower end, some candidates provided wholly descriptive accounts of Botha's and de Klerk's policies that were treated separately. This restricted achievement in the levels.

Nowadays historians differ in their opinions concerning the extent to which P.W. Botha and F.W. de Klerk pursued very different policies in governing South Africa in the years 1978-1994. In my opinion, even though both Botha and de Klerk were prime ministers under apartheid in the periods when the whole system of it was going through serious changes, it is worth noticing that Botha was ~~at least~~ ^{openly} ~~largely~~ trying to save apartheid (with his Total Strategy), whereas de Klerk allowed the system to be abolished.

It is hard to deny that there ~~were~~ ^{are} some similarities between the goals of Botha and de Klerk that they pursued in governing South Africa. Firstly, during their premierships apartheid ~~had to~~ undergo serious changes. Botha himself introduced some changes and repealed a number of acts in apartheid ^{legislation}. He was pursuing the goal of modifying/improving apartheid in order to tackle different sources of pressure (pressure from the opposition, economic pressure). de Klerk himself took part in the CODESA negotiations which led to the abolition/fall of the apartheid. But the goal he was pursuing was also intended to get rid (at least partly) from a constant pressure put on South Africa because of the apartheid. For example, the time period ~~when Botha~~ when Botha and de Klerk were ~~prime~~ ^{prime} ministers ~~were~~ ^{was} ~~marked~~ marked with revolts in townships. The situation only worsened due to the rapid population growth among blacks. Moreover, sanctions and arms embargo were imposed on South Africa which can be counted as

~~economic pressure~~ economic pressure. Thus, both Botha and de Klerk wanted to cope with that pressure by modifying) repealing apartheid. Secondly, they both were trying to save their prominent position. In order to do that, Botha introduced "Total strategy" which increased the number of people ~~in~~ the police and strengthened the government by giving it control over townships (Botha ~~introduced~~ replaced black local councils with ~~the~~ the Joint Management committees). de Klerk during the CODESA negotiations was also arguing for the position of white people in the government.

However, it is important to draw a line between the way those prime ministers pursued those policies. Firstly, Botha was willing to only change apartheid, whereas de Klerk was ready to abolish it. ~~To create an image~~ In order to achieve his goal Botha, for example, introduced a bicameral parliament for whites, indian and ~~coloured~~ coloured. He repealed such acts as the ~~Imm~~ Immorality act and the mixed marriages act. He also introduced ~~such~~ changes to the Bantu ~~act~~ education act and to the Separate Amenities act.

However, he was not willing to abolish apartheid itself. In contrast, de Klerk actively took part in CODESA negotiations with Nelson Mandela and, finally, agreed to abolish apartheid. Secondly, de Klerk was not intending to practically save his power, he did not introduce any acts/strategies that would attempt to consolidate the power of the National party and the apartheid.

¶ In contrast, PW Botha introduced "Total strategies" which was operating on practice. For example, the number of people in the police increased almost 3 times in 20 years. Botha also introduced

~~State~~ ^{State} of Emergency which was intended to cope with the internal opposition. Moreover, in his attempts to save apartheid Botha was even trying to tackle ~~international~~ ^{external} international pressure by intervening ~~into~~ into the civil wars in such countries as Angola and Zimbabwe. He even organized a coup d'état in Lesotho to avoid any opposition from there by helping a white party to come to power. de Klerk was not pursuing a goal of retaining/saving or consolidating apartheid and he was not ~~not~~ intervening into civil wars of other countries to make neighbourhoods/neighbouring countries friendly as well, as Botha managed to do it. de Klerk did not try to ~~introduce~~ ^{not introduce} any factors that ~~helped~~ ^{would help} apartheid remain a stable system.

~~In~~ In conclusion, even though both Botha and de Klerk were arguing for a stable position of whites and during their premierships ~~the~~ apartheid ^{and the white's system} went through a number of serious changes/modifications, goals of these ~~two~~ ^{two} prime ministers were different in their willingness to maintain apartheid. When Botha was attempting to save apartheid, ~~and~~ de Klerk pursued a goal to negotiate. Furthermore, both during Botha and de Klerk there was a lot of pressure on apartheid. But it was de Klerk, not Botha, who finally agreed to replace the National Party with ~~the~~ the ANC in order to cope with all the pressure ~~etc.~~

This is a level 4 response. It is fully focused on similarity and difference and takes an analytical approach. It has sufficient knowledge to develop the argument. Some criteria for judgement are developed, although not fully, and its conclusion is supported.

Question 3

There were only a few responses to this question. Those candidates who did answer the question showed some awareness of the second order concept – significance – and had some knowledge on the opposition to the new South African state in the years 1994-2014. The best responses considered the threat posed by Terreblanche and the AWB and contrasted it with the threat from Malema, the EEF and the DA and established criteria to reach a judgement as to which was the most significant opposition. However, there were a number of scripts that were ill-informed and struggled to develop material relevant to the question.

Question 4

This was a very popular question. The best responses developed the rise of the USA as an economic partner, including the importance of the export of uranium, the value of the mining industry to the USAS and the attitude of US presidents, and additionally explored a range of alternative reasons for declining influence of Britain as an economic partner including the establishment of South Africa as a republic, the development of the Anti-Apartheid Movement and the impact of sporting boycotts. Lower scoring responses tended to describe rather than focus on explaining the reasons for the declining influence and some erroneously saw the USA as a bastion of racial freedom in this period.

Britain
- Commonwealth 1961
- criticized apartheid.
+ NP not British → Afrikaner
↳ UP
- Boycott movement

USA
- criticism

USA
- cheap labour
- oil
- loans in SA at
- 70% foreign investment
↳ gov.

1977 arms embargo .

Least
commonwealth + NP not British

Very
B criticised + UN + Arms embargo

most
USA - loans bank's oil

During the 1960s and 1970s South Africa's dependence on Britain began to decline. This declining influence is due to many reasons such as the rise of the USA as an economic partner, Britain's criticism of apartheid and South Africa leaving the Commonwealth in 1961.

~~Britain's~~ ~~influence~~ The least important ~~of~~ reason for the decline in British influence during the 1960s and '70s is because ~~they~~ ~~to~~ Verwoerd decided South Africa would leave the Commonwealth and ~~in~~ ~~1961~~ become a republic instead. This meant ~~it~~ ^{South Africa} cut the ~~final~~ ^{political} ties with Britain that it had.

Originally the United Party (~~British~~ mostly British members) had encouraged British immigration to South Africa but with their loss of power in the ~~first~~ election ~~Britain~~ ~~no~~ ~~longer~~ ~~had~~ South Africa no longer had ^{British} ties in government, obviously decreasing ~~their~~ influence.

~~however~~ ^{but} they could still use the Commonwealth as a tool. However in 1961 when South Africa became a republic, ~~to~~ due to 68% of the population agreeing to in a referendum, Britain ~~could~~ ~~not~~ ~~longer~~ ~~have~~ ~~any~~ ~~political~~ ~~influence~~ ^{had any} in South Africa. Therefore the loss of any political ^{power} ~~influence~~ meant Britain had less influence in South Africa, however since many

British were still moving over it did not make that much of a difference in the long run.

More important was Britain's increasing opposition and criticism of apartheid that drove ^{South Africa} ~~them~~ away. In the early 1960s the Boycott Movement was strong in Britain, this meant with less of the public buying South African products there was no reason for Britain to import them. As a consequence Britain's and South Africa's economical relationship weakened as Britain imported less and less. This continued in 1977 when Britain helped the UN pass a mandatory arms embargo for South Africa as well as other sanctions. ^{affecting them economically further} In total it's estimated that South Africa lost \$3-40 billion on lost exports and sanctions. ~~However~~ ~~the~~ ~~less~~ ~~prosperous~~ ~~neighbouring~~ ~~African~~ ~~countries~~ ~~were~~ ~~completely~~ ~~dependant~~ ~~on~~ ~~South~~ ~~Africa's~~ ~~raw~~ ~~materials~~. This meant that ~~by~~ ~~now~~ ~~South~~ ~~Africa's~~ ~~economy~~ ~~was~~ ~~strong~~ ~~enough~~ that Britain's decreasing imports and embargo sanctions did not actually affect South Africa as much as it would have in the 1950s or earlier. ~~When the leader of the ANC had told~~ ~~This~~ ~~lack~~ ~~of~~ ~~investment~~ ~~in~~ ~~South~~ Britain's influence obviously declined ~~therefore~~ quite drastically ~~therefore~~, as they ~~is~~ had very weak economic partnerships, this meant they couldn't influence ^{South} ~~them~~ Africa with

trade and the constant criticism of ~~the~~ apartheid, by both the British government and public made South Africa unwilling to ^{strengthen or continue} ~~strengthen~~ partnerships with that would have increased Britain's influence. Therefore it was Britain's anti-apartheid campaigns and sanctions that strongly decreased their influence.

However, most important ~~was~~ ~~the~~ in the decrease in Britain's influence during the 1960s and 1970s was the rise of USA as an economic partner. Many companies in the USA were deciding to invest in South Africa as ~~the~~ ^{for} the bad wages and lack of workers' rights resulted in more profit for the large companies. ~~During the 1960s and 1970s~~ ~~the~~ This meant that the USA were now not only investing through ^{The import of} South African goods but ~~also~~ also direct investment within the country. This was vital in the decrease of British influence because with ~~the~~ the large amounts of American investment South Africa no longer needed that of Britain. Additionally, South Africa were getting huge loans ^{from} ~~the~~ the USA that allowed them to ^{be} further economically stable enough to ~~to~~ lose ~~the~~ investment of one of their biggest investors in the past, Britain, ^{and by} ~~by~~ 1976 South Africa's American loans amounted to ~~£~~ 2.3 billion. Not only this but with the USA's increased investment in South Africa, the USA ~~were~~

continued to veto most of the mandatory sanctions that were being proposed by the UN. ^{as it would affect their profits} Again this allowed for the South African government to have enough money that they didn't need Britain to invest even though foreign investment made up 70% of the state budget. Therefore the rise of the USA was ~~the~~ vital in ~~the~~ ^{Britain's} lack of influence as they supported the South African economy enough that ~~they~~ ^{South} Africa could afford to lose ~~them~~ as Britain as an economic partner in order to preserve apartheid and so they had less influence.

~~To~~ In conclusion, the rise of the USA as South Africa's economic partner was the most important reason for the declining influence of Britain during the 1960s and 1970s. This is because they bolstered the South African ~~of~~ economy enough that they could afford to lose Britain's investment to continue with apartheid, as well as reducing the amount of sanctions placed upon South Africa. Britain's own anti-apartheid campaigns lack of investment and loss of political influence also contributed but had USA not helped South Africa so much they would have had a bigger effect. For that reason USA's rise as an economic partner must be the main reason for the decline.

This is a secure level 4 response. It has a good range of knowledge including the decision to leave the Commonwealth, the growth of the boycott movement, and the rise of the USA as an economic partner. Clear criteria for judgement are developed and hit has a supported conclusion.

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

Section A

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

Section B

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

