



Pearson

Examiners' Report

June 2017

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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_2F_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the new A-Level paper 2F which deals with India, c1914-48: the road to independence (2F.1) and South Africa, c1948-94: 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 little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual 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 demonstrated an ability to draw out reasoned inferences developed from the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the question on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important that candidates appreciate that weight is not necessarily established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, commentary on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates were aware of this instruction and achieved it using a variety of different approaches.

Candidates are more familiar with the essay section of Paper 2 and in Section B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/ other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; many candidates lacked any counter argument at all. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

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

Question 1

Candidates at all levels were able to access both the sources and respond to the question posed.

There were some effective answers seen to this question, where candidates had developed reasoned responses with confidence. However, in some cases candidates failed to link the context effectively to their analysis of the material, using it in a standalone way. Candidates need to read the provenance of the sources carefully and use it to help evaluate the sources. A significant minority believed that Source 1 was about the Lucknow Pact and Source 2 was the Montagu Declaration. Some candidates concentrated their analysis on discussing what the sources did not contain, even where this would not have been possible, given that the sources were written before the events that it was being suggested they should have included.

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

Both Source 1 and 2 echo the same sentiment about the vast contribution Indian soldiers ~~made~~ made, and their overwhelming loyalty underpinning this. Both also talk about the sure steps ^{coming} towards self-government, although both differ particularly in their origin nature and purpose - as self-government was something the Raj had been delaying since their official takeover of India in the 1850's Government of India Act. The EIC trading company had unofficially ruled there since the 1600's, ~~the~~ claiming expenses of land. Therefore, one source shows ~~the~~ ~~recognition~~ ~~of~~ ~~India~~ India trying to gain self-government, the other's purpose represents widely, appeasement.

Both sources accurately depict the contribution Indians made to World War

One. As one source is trying to ~~address~~ speak out about ~~the~~ ~~self-governance~~ their rightful deserving of self-governance (a representative of Congress) it would surely highlight the contribution made, whilst Montagu, Secretary of State in Source 2 has been made to acknowledge it - due to the scale of sacrifice. ~~Furthermore,~~ Malanya in Source 1 talks of the depth of loyalty, 'loyally responded to ... what is right and for the Empire', whilst Montagu states ^{simply that} 'Indians have played their part'. This may sum up that Montagu is speaking for appeasement purposes.

Source 1 more ~~clearly~~ ^{deeply} delves in to Indians reason for fighting. The use of the words 'His Majesty' and 'Empire' ~~proves~~ ^{proves} that Indians were in fact loyal to their sovereign and respected their Empire. ~~The~~ ~~are~~ After all, Indians did ~~are~~ their careers and livelihood of the Raj, and ~~was~~ ~~co-existed~~ in India. To prove this loyalty ~~or~~ ~~existed~~, 827,000 soldiers of India alone enlisted, and 64,500 sacrificed their lives. In letter homes, Indian soldiers wrote that they were ~~looking~~ fighting for the 'Empire'. Sikhs especially were fighting for the

monarch, as ^{It was} poignant in their religion to honour
one's Emperor - 'May God grant long-life
to the sovereign master who rules their
'humble' soldiers. Thus, the depth of the
subservience and loyalty was staggering.

It was overall an ancestral tradition in
India to fight ^{or defend} for one's ~~Empire~~ Emperor *
Source 2 ~~partly~~ however, reinforces
~~some~~ particular sacrifice of Indians - in
Mesopotamia and Palestine, and a large
part in France! Indians ^{soldiers} had travelled
to see ^{the} ~~some~~ ^{primes} of war in deserts in the
Middle East, killing thousands, and had
often in battalions be made up much
or more of the allied force, e.g. ^{at} Battle
of the Ypres in France. ~~But~~ ^{As} showing
the historian the extent of sacrifice, both
sources together show most of the loyalty
that underpinned such selfless contribution.
The sources do not, however, speak
of the ^{making up} ~~the~~ ^{forces} ~~of~~ ^{the} home front of India
- 1.5m people ~~involved~~ ^{involved}.

* The fact that India did not rebel
when there was not ^{British} ~~any~~ ^{battalions} ~~in~~ ^{left} ~~in~~ India
proves loyalty also

Furthermore, this contribution gives good insight into why the war made Indians expectant of self-government. The readiness of loyalty and sacrifice deserved a reward. Also, the Indian revenue went up 16% as the British had to ~~cancel~~ ^{repeal} the shameful tariffs ^{repeal} on their goods (due to war) in 1919. This gave Indians the taste of economic flourishing without the economic exploitation of the Raj (regardless of that tax had to go up, negatively impacting the Indian people).

Therefore, Source 2 can only give a hint of this expectancy, as it acknowledges the contribution but the statement it was designed to ~~test~~ only appease the Indians. ~~It~~

Montagu states that 'self-government was an 'inexorable outcome of over 400 years of British rule', and the principles for reform had been existing already. This disingenuously represents the Raj - the rulers had kept their iron grip on India for centuries. It was only due to war that Montagu has had to issue concessions.

The assurance of principles may also be due to the fact that Montagu was a liberal man himself ^{and} he truly thought India should have reform - but overall, the source does not show accurately that the following Montagu Declaration was only concessions made by Britain because they had to. Source 1 however, more accurately implies that concessions towards self-government are always 'prolonged'!

That 'Montagu's steps towards self-government was only concessions' is backed up by the Montagu Declaration. Separate electorates were given to Muslims, a Vicroy Executive Council was created for Muslims to have their say - but the central power still lay with the British. Source 2 is ~~more~~ accurate about this truth that self-government ~~would~~ ^{was} not fully ~~is~~ planned to be ~~achieved~~ fully achieved, as ~~he~~ ^{Montagu} states that ~~it~~ ^{there} would be 'some' steps to develop self-government.

To conclude, source 1 and 2 together give insight into self-government being on Indian and British politicians' minds after the contribution of World War One. But, source 2 in particular

does not acknowledge that these were
merely concessions by the Raj to appease
the Indians



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Although this answer does have some weaknesses – for example, there is some drift away from the question focus in places, some irrelevant points are raised and not all the comments on the sources are securely rooted in what the sources say – nonetheless, there is sufficiency in the response for it to access Level 4 because of what it does well. There are inferences which are developed from what the sources say and confirmed by valid contextual knowledge. There are valid attempts within the answer to evaluate what the sources say. There is clearly an attempt to use the sources together.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure that the sources are fully understood before starting to answer the question and that all comments relate to what the question is demanding.

Question 2

Candidates at all levels were able to access both the sources and most were able to respond to the question posed. Candidates clearly understood that they were required to use the sources in combination and the majority attempted to do so, with varying degrees of success, with better responses moving between the sources within the answer. Some candidates struggled to develop inferences. Where inferences were identified, they were often developed from the content of the sources and with effective contextual knowledge of the problems of the early 1990s, such as violence and the tensions between Mandela and de Klerk. Some candidates were using contextual knowledge in a standalone manner rather than combining it with the sources. The use of the provenance varied considerably, from generic statements which had not fully understood the information offered in weaker responses, to highly developed considerations of how it contributed to an evaluation of the sources.

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

Both The New York Times newspaper (source 3) and the Amnesty International statement (source 4) address the rise in violent tensions as a salient problem for South Africa in transitioning to a fully democratic state in the early 1990s. However, it is the approaches to identifying primary sources of such conflict that differs, and when combined provide a comprehensive account of the role of Africans and the role of the government and security forces. Whilst individually the have purposes that colour them, this only adds to their usefulness as the two extremes work together - they may not explicitly help a historian in understanding the extent of political issues, however by 'problems' it must mean more the willingness of South Africans to support democratic negotiations, otherwise they would be for nothing. This is where the sources are particularly useful as they investigate this significant area of worry, and source 4 helps to legitimise source 3 by revealing the bias of the information provided by de Klerk is in fact accurate, if a historian utilises the angry rhetoric to demonstrate attitudes, not facts.

It is clear to a historian when analysing sources ~~one~~^{three} and four that ground tensions seem to be the largest hindrance to the formation or fulfilment of a ~~the~~ fully democratic South Africa. Both address the conflict between the African National Congress ^(ANC) and the Inkatha Freedom Party as being a large fuel of turbulence which would mean that even if elections were carried out, the participation of ~~the~~^{all} people would be unlikely because of intimidation or fear or spite.

Source three focuses more on the actual negotiations, meaning it will differ from source four's question of practicality of the results of the negotiations, therefore allowing a historian to view a rough timeline of exactly what progressed in the early 1990s in terms of ground problems, not just politics. Source three, however, implies that the blame for such tensions lay with the ANC (and thus Nelson Mandela by default), with President de Klerk reportedly saying that the 'mounting toll of township deaths should be blamed in large part on the ANC.' This shows that from a presidential, and official standpoint that the obstacles to negotiations lay with the 'radicals determined to overthrow white rule by force.' This means that the National Party sees itself as being threatened by Africans as they gain momentum in this ~~new~~ 'luxury' newfound recognition for the right of equality. The ^{implies} tone of source three when recounting de Klerk's ~~implies~~

that because de Klerk was ready to accept 'an assembly elected by South Africans of all races', the fault of stalled negotiations was ~~not~~ the fault of overambitious and zealous Africans, not as Mandela viewed (which is omitted from this article) ~~as~~ as the National Party dragging its heels and trying to preserve a mild mimicry of apartheid. Source three demonstrates that the restless and violent dispositions (likely believed by many Africans to be inherent due to the decades of protests and violence, as recent as Alexandria) of Africans manifested in a sense of black supremacy, meaning de Klerk almost victimised himself and sees himself as an innocent helper being taken ~~ungratefully~~ ^{ungratefully} ungratefully for granted.

Source four, however, finds a scapegoat elsewhere, and whilst it is not addressing the terrorism during negotiations that source three speaks of, it does look at the after-effect and analyse whether source three is true in its allocation of blame. This, in source four, is confirmed by the acknowledged of the 4364 deaths in 1993 due to political violence or terrorism, which is succeeded by a focus on the conflict of the ANC and Inkatha. This means a historian is able to identify that the civil unrest depicted in source three ~~is~~ was so severe as de Klerk implied to international news that it remained two years later. How-

even, source four critiques the security forces and thus the government and their acts of violence ~~source~~ which are missing from source three. From the beginning, the tone of source four lists the prospects of illegal executions, deliberate killings, torture or arbitrary detention! This allows source four to tell the reader that South Africa is in fact like a dictatorship, and that the 'prospects for a free and fair election' are in fact illusory, meaning that it seems South Africa ultimately wishes to remain a one-party state (the National Party). This critique is supported throughout with 'violence', 'jean' and 'death squads'; lexis that rings true and deep with everybody around the world due to the turbulent nature of the 20th century with the ~~let~~ world and Cold War and revolutions, all fighting against the image Amnesty International then painted South Africa. This means that South Africa's problems in transition come from its militaristic state and the ~~is~~ duty of de Klerk to control security forces to first promote democracy.

Both source three and source four are useful in understanding first the issues of fair negotiations and then the implementation of democracy. Source four, however, is more useful as it exposes a problem source

three hides because of de Klerk's need for international support and thus careful selection of what news was to go to ~~international~~ foreign media outlets. ^{such as the New York Times} Amnesty International does not have political motives, but instead focuses on human rights meaning that source four is a tool for a historian to utilise to validate source three; source four may utilise language to influence a negative image, however, the objectivity of its need to help the practical fulfilment of democracy and identity to foreign countries. The issues that may hinder it simply enforce the fact it recognises the real problem is the inability of the state to make democracy work on the ground. Because both look at the ground it makes them both useful as they focus on legitimate problems for the governmental transition (people make a democracy); source four has no agenda for support or preventing a marred reputation meaning it should be used as a signpost in conjunction with source three to find the extent of civil and government violence, and thus the one that is overall, across the period, the true hindrance.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 answer. It draws out inferences from both sources, developing them and interrogating them using contextual knowledge. There is a weighing of the content and the purpose of the sources for the enquiry. The answer is aware of the differing audiences and their values. The sources are used in combination.

Question 3

This was the more popular choice in this section. The focus of the question was whether the position of Congress was strengthened in this period. The best answers clearly focused on this and had supporting evidence to prove and disprove the statement. Candidates in the higher levels tended to automatically link factors through using one to introduce another or even discussing their relative importance in strengthening or weakening Congress within the same paragraph. Many candidates equated Congress with Gandhi and although there is clearly a link to be made, an exclusive focus on Gandhi made it difficult for candidates to access the higher levels, as they were lacking in range in their responses. Indeed, some weaker candidates presented answers that were descriptive of Gandhi's various campaigns, including the 1920-22 one. It was not uncommon for candidates to stray beyond the chronological parameters of the question.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**
Question 5 **Question 6**

Congress in the years 1922 to 1932 saw a varied amount of power, that being consolidated and being lost, may it be via the disruption caused during the Civil disobedience movement or the international support it gained during the Salt March. However it is clear that by the end of 1932 Congress had strengthened but to a limited extent. Through the ~~Failure~~ ^{Failure} of British policy and declarations such as the Simon Commission and Irwin declaration, Congress was able to strengthen through the responses to it such as the Civil disobedience movement as well as the Salt March of 1930. It thus showed how Congress became a mass movement with the support of previous groups of society that hadn't supported them before such as the poor, young and industrial workers. However, Gandhi's stubbornness as well as spontaneously led decisions, such as the Round Table Conference to fail.

At the start of the 20's, Congress was at a low with the ending of the non-cooperation campaign due to violence breaking out as the movement wasn't understood properly. (This disorganisation was also to affect them in the future.) The Ray took this opportunity to begin to work on their aims for India to consolidate power in the future, however no specific time given, with the introduction to the Simon Commission in 1924. However, though this was created to benefit Indians, it actually acted as a way that Congress could strengthen themselves. Firstly, not one Indian was on the Simon Commission declaring whatever it said solely to benefit the British. This thus enraged the Indian people and pushed them towards the Nationalist movement that Congress was primarily leading. This shows how therefore as a result to British arrogance (Congress) strengthened as they gained more support for their movement. As well as this, the public rioted and protested in the masses, especially in Bengal and the Punjab further strengthening Congress position. Following on from this, the Indian political groups were also enraged with an opinion that favoured every party. ^{Thus} ~~then~~ the Nehru Report was created. This was made up of all the national organisations that boycotted it previously but they all formed into a sub-committee, headed by Jawaharlal Nehru, who drew up a report constituting their demands. (These demands were then used by Congress in 29). This therefore shows how all the national organisations formed one sub-committee to further enhance the position of Congress against Britain.

To further show how Congress's position strengthened, ~~the~~ Gandhi re-escalated his non-cooperation campaign to protest the salt tax with a Salt March. This event was significant as it not only gained international support but also national. By 1930, taxes had risen on food grains by 69% and on international goods by 120%. The salt tax further hurt Indians as it was their own salt that was being taxed by the British ^{to foot} the British economy, which was declining. From this Gandhi decided to take 78 satyagrahis to the coast, 200 km away to protest this unnecessary tax. On the way, support ~~totally~~ increased with over 75,000 joining him. ~~Not~~ Not only this, across the country 4 million protested as well. Though they were breaking the law, it was in such a harmless way that Britain did not consider it a threat to international support besides. This was seen with news crews and journalists who documented the march ~~very~~ carefully. As a result of their close documentation, when the British attacked a peaceful demonstration in the Dandi Salt works in 1930, the British rule in India was deemed unconstitutional by the Americas and so ~~British~~ ^{Congress} benefited from a terrible disaster. The events at the Dandi Salt works and during the March show how much support Congress had gained as a result further strengthening their position. However, as Gandhi had disobeyed the law, he was imprisoned, weakening ~~the~~ Congress.

This weakness in Congress could be seen also as it was divided during the 20s. There were those who were middle class and moderate and then there were those who were ~~set~~ Radical New Leaders such as Bose and Nehru. Gandhi did not support them and stated that they are socialist members yet he took their demands of Poona Swamy into his movement, showing Gandhi's inconsistency. Not only this, the Round Table Conference also proved a mess in the years 30-32 as Gandhi did not agree with what the 1st RTC stated. MacDonald agreed to have the RTC in 1930, that being that all Indian representatives were present. They decided on a plan for dominion ^{status} ~~status~~ for the future, ~~to~~ which is what Gandhi wanted originally ~~was~~ however, neither he or Congress were present at the 1st RTC. As a result, in 1931 at the 2nd RTC, he demanded Poona Swamy instead leading to the collapse of the conference which therefore ~~weakened~~ weakened the position of Congress.

Therefore it can be said that through the failure of the Simon Commission, ~~Congress~~ ~~ab~~ and the success of the Salt March, that Congress had strengthened their position as they had had international support as well as wide national support that went from 100,000 in 1920 to 2 million by 1930. The support also came from groups that previously hadn't supported them. However, Gandhi's indecisiveness ~~and~~ reflected poorly on Congress and meant that it caused the collapse of the 2nd RTC and that it also divided Congress, weakening their position overall, Congress had strengthened their position, but to a limited extent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response ranges fully across the period considering ways in which Congress was both strengthened and weakened, and showing an awareness that there could be different circumstances at different points. The arguments made are supported by sufficient knowledge to fully meet the demands of the question. This answer is Level 5.

Question 4

This was the less popular choice in this section. The majority of candidates clearly understood the focus and were able to produce responses that responded fully to the demands of the question. It is important that candidates acknowledge the parameters of the chronological demands of the question. A minority of candidates interpreted division as being to do with the partition of 1947 and answered the question as if to explain why this was deemed necessary. Whilst such answers did often contain some relevant analysis that could be rewarded, much of what was written was beyond the scope of this question. Other weaker answers tended toward listing information which was not directed to the conceptual demands of the question.

Chosen question number: Question 3 Question 4
 Question 5 Question 6

Between 1935 and 1942 India moved closer to independence but did not achieve this for five more years. A significant obstacle to independence was divisions within India, both between the INC and the Muslim League and inside Congress, which made a united push for independence impossible. Other significant factors include the remaining strength of the Raj such as the ability to put down Quit India and nationalist preoccupation with the results of the 1937 election. Overall, however, it isn't accurate to say divisions in India were the most significant obstacle since independence was achieved even while these splits remained.

Between 1935 & 1942 the nationalist movement in India was riven by divisions that made it less effective. The major division was between the mainly Hindu INC and the Muslim League. These divisions had existed since the failure of the United Movement but worsened in this period. The parties fought the election of 1937 fiercely with the Congress landslide victory alienating the League further. Then as the INC ministries began to adopt chauvinist Hindu policies, such as curbs on religious freedom for Muslims, the divisions within India between the religions worsened. This division was an obstacle to independence because

it meant the two most important nationalist parties couldn't work together to pressure the British. After the declaration of war in 1939 Congress walked out of its 8 provincial ministries, putting pressure on the British, but due to these divisions the League remained supportive of the Raj and Jinnah called a Muslim day of deliverance on the 22nd of December 1939 which weakened any nationalist push for independence. Another sign of the obstacle the divisions caused was the Quit India campaign where the INC and most Hindus vigorously campaigned for independence but the League and most Muslims backed the Raj lessening pressure for independence.

Another division within India was between the moderates and radicals within Congress. This too hampered the effectiveness of the INC in demanding independence. These tensions came to a head in the INC's presidential election where radical Bose narrowly defeated Gandhi's moderate candidate. The election of the violent extremist was beyond the pale for Gandhi & Bose was forced out to form his new extremist party, the Forward Bloc. This split made Congress preoccupied with internal divisions and less able to challenge the British for independence with a united front. Therefore all these divisions weakened the nationalist movement and provided a significant obstacle to independence.

Another significant obstacle to independence in this period was the strength of the Raj. Throughout this period the British remained strong enough to combat the nationalist threat and with this the case made independence all but impossible to achieve. One way the Raj showed its strength was in the 1935 Government of India Act. Although the Act was a concession to nationalism it showed the continuing strength of the Raj by reserving responsibility for defence and foreign affairs with the British. These were the most important powers and that the British kept them shows they still had strength. The strength of the Raj was also shown by Viceroy Linlithgow's declaration of war without consulting the nationalists.

This ^{fact} shows that the Viceroy thought the Raj was still strong enough to make unilateral decisions and that the nationalist movement was not powerful enough to bring down the Raj over it, which it was not. A British strength was also shown with the repression of the Quit India movement. Brutal repression was used to stop the campaign, ~~and~~ INC leaders were thrown in prison and the party was declared illegal and shut down. Additionally the army remained loyal to the Raj showing that even in the face of a concerted nationalist campaign the Raj maintained military dominance over India in 1942. Thus British military and political strength, combined with the desire to maintain the Raj, provided a significant obstacle to independence as it made the nationalists unable to force independence.

Another significant obstacle to independence in this period was nationalist preoccupation with the results of the 1937 elections. The INC scored a massive victory, winning more than 200 out of 1500 seats (and more than 900 were reserved for minorities) which enabled them to form provincial ministries in 8 of the 11 provinces. This victory preoccupied them as they had to now run these provinces. The INC had never governed before and the transition from protest movement to alternative government for the India took much of their energy and resources. ~~The~~ Due to the Government of India Act the provinces had responsibility for all domestic issues such as irrigation or

education, which made the job of running the provinces even more difficult and time-consuming. This preoccupation was a significant obstacle to independence since it precluded the IML from running any major campaigns in the pre-war years and then when the IML left these ministries in 1939 they were shut out from power entirely.

The Muslim League was also preoccupied the results of the 1937 election. They suffered a humiliating defeat winning only 22% of the Muslim vote (less than the IML) and losing even the Muslim-majority North-West Frontier Province to the Hindu-dominated Congress. This defeat forced the League to rebuild which diverted energy from campaigning for independence. The party had to expand its support

to up to 2 million by 1942, oppose the Congress ministries when they, for example, appointed friends and families of the leaders to top jobs, and they had to differentiate themselves from Congress for Muslim voters. They did this by endorsing independent Muslim states in the 1940 Lahore declaration.

Therefore due to the results of the 1937 election the League had to retreat from pressuring the British (as demonstrated by their continued support after the declaration of war) and divert their energies inward. The elections, then, proved a major obstacle for independence since they diverted the energies of both major nationalist parties from campaigning for independence and they widened the splits within the movement.

Overall it is not accurate to say divisions in India were the most significant obstacle. Although the splits made the nationalists less effective the results of the 1937 election also contributed to the weakness of the challenges for independence in this period. Moreover independence was later achieved while the splits, especially between Muslims & Hindus, still existed. It is therefore more accurate to say that the strength of the Raj was the most significant obstacle since when this strength lapsed at the end of the war and the British determination to hold onto India vanished independence was finally achieved.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a thorough response to this question. The candidate has considered and discussed the stated factor in the question before moving on to a counterargument that considers other factors. Within each paragraph there is a clear discussion of the issue and the response reaches clearly substantiated judgements. The use of 'another significant factor' might encourage simply a listing, but in this particular answer that is not the case. This is a Level 5 response.

Question 5

This was slightly the more popular choice in this section. Some very impressive answers were seen in response to this question, which, for example, weighed up the violence used in rural areas as opposed to urban areas, in reaching developed judgements pertaining to the question. Most responses began with the stated factor and discussed various repressions in the 1960s and how this prompted a move to violence, but not all continued with the counter argument. There was evidence of some candidates misunderstanding the conceptual focus and discussing what caused government repression rather than what caused the move to violence. Some candidates also failed to recognise the full use of 'repression' and sometimes included laws, or stated violence as a separate factor. It was not uncommon for candidates to stray beyond the chronological parameters of the question. A number of weaker answers focused mainly on Sharpeville to the exclusion of many other relevant points.

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Following the 69 deaths of the 1960 Sharpeville massacre by the South African police, violence increased in South Africa. This was primarily due to the ~~repression~~ repression by the government such as increased police powers and the 1967 180 day detention Act but could also be attributed to the failings of previous anti-apartheid protests such as the Defiance Campaign in 1952 and the Freedom Charter in 1955.

After Sharpeville, the National Party imposed stricter punishment for political crimes under the Criminal Amendment Act and also banned the ANC and PAC. This forced an underground movement for both groups which included more militant members and therefore, increasing violence. The ANC militant armed wing, MK, began working underground with aims to overthrow the government. This included "Operation Mayibuye" run through Lulusleaf Farm where young militant members plotted acts of sabotage to government buildings. Although the campaign proved to be a failure in 1964, where 9 members were arrested, ~~and~~ ~~changed~~ it demonstrates the new violence these break off groups were prepared to involve themselves in as a

result of government repression.

However, the increased violence could also be as a result of the failings of previous resistance. For example, the Defiance Campaign in 1952 and the Freedom Charter in 1955-56 proved a huge failure in the struggle of Apartheid. Peaceful protest was clearly not enough to compromise the National Party and aims such as the risking arrest, with over 14,000 arrests in Port Elizabeth and East London alone, were not in any way successful. Similarly, the Freedom Charter and Treason Trial were also an example to the Congress Alliance that peaceful protest is not enough to end the struggle. ~~Treason~~ Acts of Treason then became ~~more~~ under more repressive laws introduced by the National Party, such as the 90 day detention act, increased to 180 days in 1967. Therefore, not only did non-violent campaigns prove to be a huge failure, they also increased government repression which can be directly linked to the need to increase violence due to the reaction to the National Party government; agreeing with the statement.

Another ~~minor~~ less significant reason for anti-apartheid movements to increase violence could be to attract an international response. Up until 1960, the international condemnation of the National Party was limited, with only recognition from the United Nations but no direct action. The National Party also received some ~~g~~ western

sympathy by comparing Treason traitors ~~within~~ and
Revonia traitors with "terrorism" and "communism,"
both an imminent threat to western culture and
therefore, sympathised with the National Party. However,
with an increase of international media in the 1960's,
some anti-apartheid movements may have used violence
as a way to spread concern within South Africa
and globally; evident in later ~~war~~ events such as the
Hector Peterson images after the 1976 Soweto Uprising.
Having said this, increased international response
would only be a ~~supplement~~ secondary factor for the
reason for more violence.

It must be argued that the increase in violence
~~from~~ ^{from} 1960-1968 ~~was~~ used by anti-apartheid movements
was primarily due to their reaction to increased
government repression, therefore, agreeing with the
proposition statement.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 response. There is an attempt to address the conceptual focus of the question, but not all of the arguments presented are entirely convincing and the argument lacks secure development, as is evidenced by the conclusion. There is some valid supporting contextual knowledge, but the material lacks range.

Question 6

This was slightly the less popular choice in this section. Candidates need to be aware of the range of second order concepts that can be assessed. In this question candidates were expected to consider significance, but a significant minority of candidates merely presented potted biographies of some leading individuals with no sense of their significance and no sense of the chronology of the question. The key individuals who were considered by most candidates were Biko, Tambo and Mandela. Other individuals were discussed in some responses, e.g. Suzman, Slovo and Hani. The most successful answers used the second part of the response to either challenge the ways in which these individuals were significant and/or to consider other factors that were significant in challenging Apartheid. These included a range of factors, e.g. youth movements, National Party reforms and international pressures including boycotts. Some impressive answers were seen which were able to weave a nuanced argument throughout their essay considering the link between individuals and groups – and what should be considered more significant, the person or the people.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

Question 5 **Question 6**

It is true to say that individuals were of great significance in challenging apartheid, i.e. opposing the National Party (NP) government's policies between 1968 and 83; individuals are largely who we refer to when we review the anti-apartheid movement today, as such stand-alone influential figures made the movement more accessible internationally, for example Nelson Mandela, and provided reasons for protest within the country, as Steve Biko did. However, we must not disclude from our analysis of opposition forces the work of group organisations, such as the UDF, nor mass mobilisation of people such as students or the growing opposition in the international community. Overall, I believe that leading individuals largely paved the way for change, which thereby allowed further challenging of apartheid throughout this period.

Firstly, we must look at the impact of individuals, the most famous of which being Mandela. The 'Free Nelson Mandela' campaign of the AAM (Anti-Apartheid Movement) was launched as a way to gain & galvanise international support for the movement. It was recognised that stories of individuals had great power over the general public - this was proved by the popularisation of Mandela's story to such an extent that a song, named Free Nelson Mandela, was released and for his 70th birthday a concert was held in Wembley stadium and was broadcast live to millions worldwide. This surge in popularity & making Mandela a household name quickly spread awareness of the movement, thereby allowing the international community to further challenge the NP. However, Mandela's actual significance may be contested due to the fact that at this time he remained imprisoned, and so was unable to directly influence the NP himself.

We must also look to individuals such as Oliver Tambo, who gained the ANC great international legitimacy and headed the movement while in exile throughout this period. He tirelessly travelled the globe, creating connections with the AAM in Britain, gaining significant funding from the USSR and even speaking to the UN, which resulted in the passing of a resolution calling for the release of all political prisoners in SA. It is the role of Tambo at this time, unmatched by any other organisation or individual, which greatly strengthened the movement.

ability to challenge apartheid due to its international backing. We must additionally look at the influence of Biko, who as a student helped found the South African Students Organisation (SASO) and led the black consciousness movement. Not only did this influence and mobilise a whole new generation of anti-apartheid protest, but his death at the hands of police in 1977 and the exposure of government cover up by his friend and reporter Donald Woods sparked mass outrage internationally and was a cause for greater protest within SA. It is therefore widely demonstrated that individuals played a key role in challenging the NP, as they galvanised support and increased recognition of and protest against the treatment of African people. However, we must balance these facts with the role played by other factors in order to gain a balanced view as to ~~what~~ what challenged apartheid rule during this period.

As aforementioned, the role of students under black consciousness was the key opposition force which challenged apartheid at this time; it cannot be underestimated that the mass mobilisation of students under individuals such as Biko and also through events such as the Soweto uprising was a great challenge with which the NP struggled. Soweto bore witness to thousands of school students protesting the compulsory introduction of

Afrikaners in various school subjects in 1976. As police opened fire on students, the death toll reached 176 on that one day and the world watched as students burned buildings and vehicles which represented the apartheid state. This was the beginning of a new 'style' of protests, where youths mobilised under black consciousness would violently retaliate against state authority. Though this ^{was} ~~an~~ ^{insurgency} was certainly one of the major challenges for the NP at the time, such protest was brought about due to the work of individuals such as Biko.

In addition we must look at international influences such as economic and sporting boycotts - the 'Stop The Seventy Tow' protests following the D'Oliviera crisis in the ~~the~~ 60's saw the beginning of increasing isolation for SA in sport; an aspect of life which was very poisoned for Afrikaners & which brought home the implications of apartheid to increasing numbers of people. In 1977 the ~~the~~ Commonwealth countries signed the Gleneagles agreement, discouraging all from playing with SA. ~~That~~ This coupled with huge economic disinvestment undoubtedly was a challenge for the NP, yet they were able to open new trade relations to avoid serious implications, eg. with Japan.

Finally, just as the work of individuals was significant so was that of group organisations. It was organisations such as the UDF who organised opposition on the ground in SA, giving an ideological centre, and international movements such as the AAM who raised the profile of Mandela through their campaign SATIS.

Overall, I feel that individuals bore great significance in challenging apartheid throughout their period, yet it is also necessary to recognise those aspects which acted in conjunction with, or as a result of them.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Although this answer looks at the individuals separately, it is aware of the need to comment on the significance of these individuals and whilst most of the answer sees them as being significant, there is also an attempt to suggest ways in which they were not. Most of the counterargument identifies alternate factors as being significant and this is a legitimate approach to take. There is linked argument throughout the response, although it is disappointing that there appears to have been insufficient time left for a developed conclusion. Despite this, the strengths of this answer enable it to be awarded Level 5.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure you leave sufficient time to write a clear conclusion that sums up the judgements that you have arrived at.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the sources, not merely paraphrase the content of the sources
- Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the sources
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/ purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/ or purpose of the writer
- Candidates should use the sources together at some point in the answer.

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
- 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.

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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

