

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_2F_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 9HI02F, which deals with India, c 1914-48: the road to independence (2F.1) and South Africa, 1948-94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation' (2F.2). The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance.

Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. As noted in last year's report, there was again an increase in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting. Some of these responses were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There also continues to be some evidence of a number of candidates failing to use formal written English, e.g. the use of 'kids' in question 2, which dealt with children. This development is not welcome.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources. Such responses evaluated the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge that was on offer and through an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It continues to be the case that a number of candidates do not explicitly address the focus of the enquiry, but rather discuss issues arising from the sources in general terms. Indeed, this approach seems to have increased over the last few series of examinations. Another development this year appeared to be the response that lifted a succession of quotes from a source and then claimed that each quote demonstrated a particular point, without explaining how the quote and the point made were related. Section A questions require candidates to use the sources 'together'. Approaches as to how this is tackled do vary, but as long as it is present, there is no formulaic approach to how this should be done. Some candidates still continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. It is the use to which contextual knowledge is put that is important, not the quantity of it. There was some evidence this year, in both Sections A and B of the examination, of candidates going well beyond the chronological parameters of the question. On occasion, this could be made relevant; where this was the case, then it was credited. However, many candidates did not make explicit the relevance of material from outside the period of the question. There appeared to be more responses this year commenting on what was missing from the sources than has been the case for a number of years. This approach is only relevant if the author has intentionally omitted a detail.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Weaker answers often did not identify the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and wrote a response to a slightly different question. Whilst credit could be awarded for elements of this approach that were relevant, it often meant that parts of the response were not relevant. Weaker candidates also either engaged in a narrative approach that made links to the question in the conclusion or alternatively shaped their responses analytically but lacked

sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. It continues to be the case that there are a number of responses that only deal with one side of an argument; some of these can be a sophisticated analysis of that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to ensure that they take the most appropriate approach to answering a question. Candidates should always aim to show the links between the issues raised, not merely to present a list of factors.

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

Question 1

Most candidates understood what each source was arguing and were able to draw out some inferences about the political situation in 1942, with the most impressive being able to use the two sources together very effectively. A significant number of candidates were using contextual knowledge from outside the chronological parameters of the question to support their analysis. It was possible for such material, especially if it predated the source, to be made relevant, but only a small number of candidates were actually doing this. Most candidates did make reference to the provenance of the sources, but candidates do need to read the captions carefully and apply their contextual knowledge to the sources. A significant minority claimed that Attlee was prime minister in 1942, even though the caption clearly states that he was leader of the Labour party and a member of the wartime coalition government. This led to some problematic claims being made about him. There were, however, those candidates who picked up the reference to 'first-hand knowledge' and were able to link this to his membership of the Simon Commission. Weaker responses often made very limited use of the sources; as this question tests AO2 such responses cannot score highly.

Source 1 is written in February 1942 and Source 2 is written from July 1942 shortly after the 'Quit India' campaign was presented, when used together these sources become immensely valuable to a historian investigating the Political ~~situation~~ ^{situation} in India in 1942 as they are both contemporary sources and are written in 1942. The author of Source 1 is Clement Attlee a Senior member of the British Cabinet and would later become Prime Minister in the 1945 general election, this is useful when used with source 2 as source 2 is written by a Senior Member of the INC Rajagopalachari; this allows a historian to see differing perspectives of the political situation in India in 1942 from ~~as~~ senior members of key organisations central to the

divergent political situation. Source 1 is written as a response to the reactions of Vice Roy Linlithgow and the Secretary of State for India. Source 2 on the other hand was written to Gandhi who led the 'Quit India' Campaign warning him not to go through with it. This ~~is~~ is useful as both sources ~~are~~ have critical but formal tones which allows a historian to better understand the opinions concerning the transitions political situation in India in 1942. Therefore, Source 1 and 2 when used together give contrasting perspectives with similar tones and purposes that provide immense insight into the political situation in India in 1942.

Source 1 goes by criticising the Vice Roy and Secretary of State for ~~not~~ making policy that, "Merely reacts to

circumstances". From this we can infer that ~~this~~ a reason for the difficult political situation in India has come about from the Raj's law making, this is accurate as many 'concessions' made by the Raj in years up to 1947 have been in response to actions of the INC and Congress such as the Round Table Conferences by giving a response to Congress's Satyagraha in 1930 known as the 'Salt March'. Source 1 follows by writing that there must be a renewed effort to "ask the leaders of the Indian political parties to unite". This ~~statement~~ refers that another factor for the political instability in India is the contrasting views of the main political parties. This makes Source 1 and 2 useful to when used together as source 2 supports this argument, source 2

~~states~~ states, "We feel a
Hind - Muslim Settlement ~~is~~ is
essential." This clearly supports
Source 1 as the 2 major
powers in India during 1947
was the Hindu dominated Indian
National Congress and the
'Muslim League'. This clearly shows
that sources 1 and 2 ~~are~~ are
useful when investigating the
political situation in India 1947
as they both agree on reasons
and factors for the political
instability within 1947 India.

Source 2 opens by expressing
concern over the consequences of
the Quit India campaign.
The source writes that even if
Britain withdrew from India
unconditionally, we are
convinced that chaos would
follow. This is supported
historically as in 1947 following
Independence 1-2 Million people
died as a result of the chaos.

and riots of ~~the~~ Indian Independence. This is useful as a view expressed in Source 2 was shown to be true in later years. Source 2 then goes on to express concern over the potential invasion of Imperial Japan as a result of Indian Independence stating that, "Attempting to displace the British government would facilitate a Japanese invasion." This concern is echoed in Source 1 with these words that, "To do nothing is to lose India." ~~These~~ These sources when used together become useful as they share similar concerns that are a direct result of the political situation in India in 1942. ~~the~~ Therefore Source 2 when used ~~the~~ with Source 1 is useful to a historian investigating the political situation in India in 1942 as they both share ~~states~~ the same concerns about Indians threat

from Imperial Japan, overall
Sources 1 and 2 are extremely
useful.

In Conclusion, a historian would
be able to make immense use of
Sources 1 and 2 in investigating
the political situation in India
in 1947 as they ~~simultaneously~~
simultaneously give two
different perspectives but also agree
on several factors for the political
situation in India in 1947.
Sources 1 and 2 are written by
2 opposing figures 1 being a
senior minister of the British
Warren Cabinet and 2 is a
leading figure of the INC in
the period, this gives ~~insight~~ insight
into the opinions of the
political situation in India in 1947
from ~~two~~ two ^{opposing} sides.
Furthermore, Sources 1 and 2
create a consensus on the
factors and impacts of the
political situation in India in 1947.

It is when used with the sources
provenance creating immense value
for a historian investigating
the political situation in India
in 1942. Overall, sources to
create a large picture of the
factors contributing to the political
~~instability~~ instability in India and
the potential impacts of
the disorder and instability in
India in 1942.



This response is doing sufficient across the bullet points to achieve level 5. It clearly stands back from the sources and considers the issues that they raise in relation to the political situation in India in 1942. There are examples in this response of contextual knowledge that is not directly from the period of the question, but it can be credited because the candidate has made it relevant to the analysis being offered.



If contextual knowledge from outside the time frame of the question is being used it should be made relevant to the analysis.

Question 2

Most candidates clearly understood what each source argued and commented with varying degrees of precision as to how they worked together to represent differing positions on attitudes to black South African children. The most impressive answers were those that were able to identify that although Verwoerd appeared to be saying one thing, the reality of his attitude was something very different. Whilst most candidates were able to support their analysis with some contextual knowledge, it was disappointing to note that there were a number who either lacked sufficient knowledge or tried to shoehorn information about Soweto in the 1970s into an answer that was focused on the 1950s. Most candidates did make reference to the provenance of the sources, with most recognising the significance of Verwoerd. There was some unevenness in the approach to the two sources, with many candidates dealing more confidently and fully with Source 3 than with Source 4. Evaluation of the sources ranged from the stereotypical (typically that Source 4 was written much later and commenting on memory) to the assured and developed that went well beyond only using the information in the captions. A number of scripts were seen that abbreviated 'children' to 'kids' – this is not acceptable in academic writing.

After reading through and considering both sources, it's clear that they both hold opposing opinions regarding black South African education in the 1950s, thus exposing people's attitudes towards them.

For example, source 3 iterates a speech made by Verwoerd in the 1950s favouring the 'Bantu education Act'. The Bantu education Act was the beginning of segregation and Apartheid in youth education, stating that ~~separate~~ educational facilities for white and black children were to be separate and did not have to be equal. Throughout his speech Verwoerd ~~uses specific language~~ implies that they should pass the Bantu education Act because it's in the best interest of Black South Africans, seeming sympathetic and considerate on the surface, but however reveals his true attitude towards black education with his use of language and phrasing. For instance, in the source Verwoerd states 'Education must train and teach people in accordance with their position in life.' He also states that teaching Bantu children European subjects such as mathematics is useless because they 'cannot use it in practice'. The main two phrases used in these ~~quotations~~ quotations 'position in life' and stating

this education cannot be used 'in practice' implies that Verwoerd, and because this act was later passed, we can assume higher parliament and government hold the attitude that black South African children do not deserve a higher level of education because, due to their race and the growing level of Apartheid they will not achieve high on the career ladder and will be disappointed as ~~because of a~~ higher education will have ~~been lead to better~~ better ~~than~~ had high expectations, so thus, removing this education benefits these people as it will not raise their expectations. Verwoerd also exposes high Apartheid values in his speech with the phrase 'within his own sphere and in the service of his own people' implying a 'native' ~~not on~~ in the eyes of higher government can only develop in his 'own sphere' and within his own race, showing those Apartheid attitudes to education, another notable point is where Verwoerd states 'the native' using phrases ~~such~~ such as this dehumanises black South Africans further implying that higher powers in South Africa have the attitude that they are a lesser being, and as a lesser being only deserve a lesser education.

Source 4, on the other hand holds the opposite view. written by a black South African political activist and ANC member. This source ~~states that~~ ~~shows~~ shows the majority population's opposition to the Bantu education act. For example,

this is seen where she states in the source that Verwoerd 'wanted to deny them opportunities and keep them down' from this we can infer that the peoples reaction to the Bantu education Act was anger as they believe ~~they are~~ ~~not being~~ their children are not being lifted to their highest potential because Verwoerd is trying to 'keep them down' due to his ~~apar~~ beliefs in an Apartheid nation. It is further evident of this attitude as the source mentions ANC organised 'cultural clubs' from prior knowledge it is known that the ANC ~~is~~ was a driving force of Anti-apartheid movements and forces and thus, would not become involved unless an act blatantly implements Apartheid legislation, we also know that the ANC was peaceful activism, so although angry, the population still remained reasonable in response to Verwoerd's laws as the source states 'Boycotting' these new schools showing their attitude to black education.

However, the most important part of these sources is what ~~we can imply from them~~ a historian could imply from them together. For example from the initial evaluation of the sources individually we know they both had opposing views, however by using them together it is notable that: source 3 is from 1953 and was given in the form of a speech ~~to parliament~~ to parliament, so it shows the initial attitudes to education and as it

comes from Verwoerd shows the attitudes of higher government. While source 4, an autobiography is from 1986 so is able to give a well rounded view as they have seen the long term effects and as is from an activist and a parent shows a perspective from the other side of the spectrum and as we can assume resonates with the majority of the working class view. So together these sources show the two different sides of attitudes, giving a historian a wide perspective to consider. Together these sources also show the contradictions within them, for example, alone source 3 shows a considerate speech that, although has Apartheid intentions is reasonable, while in combination with source 4 shows the actual violent nature of it by arresting cultural club teachers and threatening children and parents and forcing them into the legislation via fearmongering showing a historian the reality of the Act and attitudes. Finally together, these sources clearly highlight Apartheid intentions by Verwoerd using petty Apartheid in segregation in schools to later help grand Apartheid across the nation and the two sources showing opposing opinions and attitudes towards education from the highest government to ANC activists, making them extremely useful to a historian as they give a range of insights from different times and extremes.



This level 5 response has been included to illustrate an answer that shows understanding of the conflict that is evident in Verwoerd's attitude between his words and his actions. It is weaker on Source 4 than on Source 3, but this does not prevent it being a level 5 response. Indeed, in the concluding section, there is excellent usage of the sources 'together' to test the weight the evidence will bear.

Question 3

This was slightly the more popular of the two questions in this section. There seemed to be a number of candidates who wished to begin this question significantly before its time frame, with a small number going all the way back to 1857. This impacted on some responses that failed to have enough time to develop material that could have earned credit at the expense of lengthy description that earned no credit. Some candidates focused on whether Britain maintained control, rather on why Britain maintained its hold on power; it is important that candidates understand the focus of the question before starting to answer it. Some weaker answers were organised chronologically with varying degrees of linkage to the question. Other weaker answers presented a list of reasons as to why Britain maintained power, and in the conclusion stated which of these reasons was deemed the most important, but with only limited substantiation. Better answers tended to be organised around a consideration of how concessions contributed to the British maintenance of control and assessing in the course of the answer whether this was more significant than any other factor, most commonly the use of repression and the weaknesses of the nationalist movement.

In the years 1917-35, the nationalist pursuit of independence gathered significant force. This put pressure on the British for independence, meaning they had to find a way to retain control. It could be argued that their concessions to nationalists allowed them to keep control, or ^{due to religious differences} ~~possibly~~ the weaknesses in the nationalist movement meant that there was no threat to British power. However, the most significant factor keeping British control was their use of repression. Judging this can be judged by how frequently it featured and to what extent it meant that the British maintained their power.

It is arguable that concessions were the main factor enabling the British to keep power in India. This can be first seen through the government of India Act passed. In 1919, the first government of India Act aimed to enlarge the provincial and legislative councils, giving India creating a dichotomy between India and the Raj. In turn, this enabled greater participation from Indians in government, contributing to there being less pressure on the British to introduce changes. Furthermore, the ~~Government of India Act~~ ^{Montagu-Chelmsford} ~~of 1919~~ ^{of 1919} further illustrates the use of concessions by Britain. Here, Britain

announced that the raj were looking for a solution to make India a dominion of the British empire, increasing the power of Indians in government, whilst also ensuring that the British were able to maintain power. This announcement suggested India again, giving greater self-determination. The government of India Act of 1935 can be seen to have extended the Union and Montagu declaration, granting the increased self government and dominion status to India. This unsettled the dependency system to be removed, increasing Indian participation. Additionally, the Indians were granted control over all aspects of Indian self government, apart from defence and foreign affairs. However, these acts can't be said to have maintained British power, as in reality, they meant that the British involvement in India decreased. Churchill was very vocal about this topic, claiming that if Indians were given too many concessions, it would result in the Raj collapsing, as echoed by the Indian League League. Furthermore, these concessions didn't actually slow the nationalist cause, as nationalists like Gandhi and Jinnah weren't in support of any British concessions. For example, Gandhi started his non-cooperation satyagraha shortly after the Gov. of India Act 1919, and after the Gov. of India Act 1935, both meetings and Linch were unsanctioned, as the nationalist idea of swaraj became more popular, whilst Congress were fixated on purna swaraj. Hence, the concessions were not the main reason for the British keeping power.

The most significant factor enabling the British to maintain

power over India was their use of repression. The use of repression was effectively used by the Raj to knock down any attempts of Indian revolution. This was apparent in Amritsar in 1919, when ~~in 1919~~ General Dyer sensed revolutionary action in Amritsar, with protests being arranged throughout March and April 1919. On the 13th April 1919, thousands of Hindus flocked to the Golden Temple in Jallianh Bagh to peacefully celebrate a Hindu festival. General Dyer however, who felt as if ~~the~~ a revolution would occur, instructed his troops, two thirds of which were Indian, to fire on the gathering, killing 400 and wounding 1500 more. This event, followed by martial law and the curfew order, demonstrated the hard approach the British were willing to take to confront and possibilities of revolution.

The Raj's response to Gandhi's non-cooperation campaign further illustrates the significance of repression for the British government.

After throughout 1930, during Gandhi's salt satyagraha, 60,000 people passed through Indian jails, with 29,000 there at the end of 1930. Protests were put down quickly, and it wasn't until by 1931, the campaign had ended with Gandhi in prison.

Alternatively, it is arguable that this wasn't the main factor keeping British control, as actually repression gathered more nationalist sentiment. For example, Gandhi who was initially supportive of the Raj, was apart, became disgusted with the British after Amritsar, encouraging his huge non-cooperation campaigns, which gathered millions of Indian Indians to fight against the Raj - Hindu and Muslim inclusive during the

first non-cooperation campaign as the khilafat movement
coincided it. However, the reaction of nationalists was often
not done very quickly. For example, despite the British
repression potentially sparking the first non-cooperation campaign, it
was British repression that caused that to end as well,
illustrating how British repression was a frequently recurring theme
to maintain the control of India.

Finally it may be argued that weaknesses in the non-cooperation
movements and the nationalist identity, caused largely from
Hindu-Muslim divisions, was the most significant factor
hindering enabling the British to keep control. Throughout
the 1920s, there was significant divisions between the
Hindus and Muslims which grew - largely due to both
the churches of Gandhi and Jinnah. Throughout the
khilafat movement, Jinnah had felt that Gandhi was
being opportunistic for supporting this Muslim campaign, for
which he pushed this narrative to the Muslim League,
encouraging separatism to be pursued. For example, Muslim
membership in Congress dropped from almost 10% in 1921 to
3.6% in 1923. Furthermore, divisions grew between Muslims
and Hindus, with Muslim ideas of Tawzeem and Talsil
promoting organisation and a return focus on religion, whilst
alternative groups like Arya Samaj, who were a Hindu group,
aimed to convert Muslims and promote their religion. These
key religious differences can be shown as a huge factor

enabling the British to keep control of India - as it was these divisions which prevented the second round Table Conference being a success - with Gandhi claiming to speak for Muslims, with Siraj and the League firmly disagreeing. This disagreement enabled the British to not have to concede at all to the nationalist case, enabling them to maintain power. However, this wasn't the most significant factor as in the time period, Hindu-Muslim difficulties weren't ongoing throughout the entire time. For example, there was huge numbers in the first non-cooperation movement, showing significant strength and hence illustrating how necessary British repression was to limit this. Additionally, ~~there~~ even though both religions were segregated, both parties ~~expressed~~ were not weak by any means for their own religion; the MNC had over 2 million members in 1922, with Gandhi being seen as a figurehead for change, attracting nationwide support. Therefore, weaknesses in the nationalist case weren't the most significant reason for the British keeping control in India.

To conclude, the most significant factor keeping British power was their use of repression. It occurred consistently throughout the time period, with vast numbers of political prisoners including Congress leaders like Gandhi and Nehru. It also meant that no power was given up by the British, as despite concessions giving some ~~power~~ ^{power} to the nationalist movement, they did involve reducing the royal power for these concessions. In actuality, the use of repression may have heightened the

British control in India, as can be seen in the Rowlatt Acts. Although religious tensions did prevent a cooperative push for independence in India, there was still enough strength within the leadership of both Congress and the Muslim League to put enough pressure on the raj. Hence, the raj's rigidity in loosening its grip of India illustrates that it was the repression was the main factor keeping British control.



This answer is a very secure level 5 response. It begins by looking at the evidence for the statement in the question, which it then challenges. It goes on to weigh this analysis against two other factors and reaches a measured conclusion.



It is important to think carefully about how to approach a question. It is a good idea to plan so that the analysis can be fully developed.

Question 4

This was slightly the less popular of the two questions in this section. Most candidates were able to look at some of the key events of the 1930s with which Gandhi was associated and, with varying degrees of success, to comment on whether these represented a limited or a more substantive contribution to advancing the cause of Indian independence. Weaker candidates often engaged in a description of events, e.g. of the salt *satyagraha*. Too many candidates, not necessarily always the weaker candidates, tended to confine their responses to the very early 1930s – mainly dealing only with the salt *satyagraha* and the Round Table Conferences. As the question was about the entire decade, this did limit the achievement that was possible. Better responses tended to frame the answer by firstly examining whether Gandhi's contribution was limited and then by weighing this against a relevant counter argument. The best answers did range across the 1930s as they analysed the role played by Gandhi and his contribution to advancing the cause of Indian independence in this decade. A number of candidates were unable

to spell Gandhi correctly.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Throughout the 1930s, it is evident that Gandhi only made a limited contribution to advancing ^{the} Indian Independence movement. It is his ~~the~~ unwillingness to work with other classes and religions in the 2nd Round Table conference (1931) and his unstable relationship with Bose caused a divide in the cause. However, it is equally vital to consider how Gandhi did make his contribution before reaching a justified conclusion.

In 1931, the British government announced the Second Round Table conference in August until November/December. After the Gandhi-Irwin pact, it was agreed that Gandhi was to attend the meeting as a representative of the Indian National Congress. However, his effectiveness in the conference is questioned. The presence of Dr Ambedkar (a representative for the untouchables) frustrated

Gandhi, for he had been trying to remove the negative stigma around untouchables being 'separate'. On top of this, Jinnah's ~~demands~~ and the Muslim League's demands for reserved seats allocated to minorities in central assemblies further intensified Gandhi's outrage. With both Jinnah and Dr Ambedkar considered, Gandhi was unwilling to reach rapprochement and progression towards a new constitution, as he believed that Congress was representative for all ~~to~~ minorities in India, causing him to be stubborn towards any ~~opportu-~~ ~~Atte~~ opportunity of ~~a~~ a peace deal - seen through his lack of contribution towards a new self governing constitution bill, restricting the advancement of the Indian Independence movement.

Not only this, but Gandhi heightened ~~the divide~~ in further sought to have limited contribution by ~~to~~ getting involved in the divide of Congress within the late 1930s. Gandhi made his dislike for Bose very known,

as he frequently pressured Bose to resign, despite this recommendation usually failing. This was until 1938, when Congress held their presidential election, and Bose won by 1580 votes to 1375, meaning Gandhi lost. In response to this, 12 members of Gandhi's sector of the Congress Working Committee resigned, after being encouraged to do so by Gandhi himself. This ultimately made the Congress somewhat dysfunctional, and intensified established pressure on Bose to give up his position, to which he did. Thus, Gandhi's personal dislike for Bose, ~~resulted in~~ who was more radical than himself, resulted in fragmenting the Indian Independence movement, as Bose's supporters in Congress left for the new Forward Bloc Party (established in 1939), and lost Gandhi some support.

However, it is difficult to assess whether Gandhi truly lacked contribution to the cause or the Indian Independence movement. For instance,

the Gandhi-Irwin pact in early 1931 had multiple benefits. Firstly, Gandhi was expected to attend the 2nd Round Table Conference - and despite his stubborn nature limiting progress made, Congress's attendance brought the meeting legitimacy, ~~as well~~ and it also laid foundations for the 3rd Round Table Conference in 1932, which made framework for the Government of India Act in 1935. Hence, Gandhi's presence may have been spiteful and bitter towards Indian Independence, him being there allowed the British government to build on his demands, regarding separate electorates and reserved seats, shown through the Communal Award (17th August, 1932). As well as this, the Gandhi-Irwin pact ~~at~~ also allowed the release of political prisoners, who had been arrested through the Salt Satyagraha - including Gandhi and Nehru himself. This enabled Congress and other parties (such as the Muslim League) to build on their membership and promote Indian Independence even more so than before.

On top of this, Gandhi had direct contribution to the Indian Independence movement after his assemblment of the Salt Satyagraha, or also referenced to as the Salt March. On the 12th March, 1930, Gandhi and 78 delegates marched about 240km to Dandi along the coast. Whilst on their march, they were expected to keep a diary, spin cotton and behave non-aggressively, publicising his non-violent ideas of protest. When they reached Dandi, there were a total of ~~75~~ 75,000 participants in the march, showing the solidarity between previously conflicting religions - specifically Muslims and Hindus. On his arrival, Gandhi picked up tax-free salt, encouraging others to do so. Despite himself and thousands of other participants getting arrested, the campaign remained non-violent, fulfilling Gandhi's aims of 'finding your truth' and proving the legitimacy to the cause of Indian Independence.

In conclusion, it is evident that Gandhi had a very limited contribution to Indian Independence. His fragmentation of Congress in 1938 made them lose membership, with many extremists ~~join~~ joining the Forward Bloc Party. As well as this, his spiteful attitudes and unwillingness to progress in the 2nd Round Table Conference meant that any advancement towards independence was prohibited, and ^{it} was ~~the~~ ultimately Gandhi responsible for this. However, the Gandhi-Irwin pact meant Congress were present in the Round Table Conference, earning Congress respectability. As well as this, the Salt Satyagraha created solidarity in India and heightened nationalism, thus making Gandhi's contribution to advancement more dominant.



Although at times, parts of this answer appear to be descriptive, it is clearly focused on the question and it weighs the arguments for supporting the premise of the question against the counter arguments. There is good coverage across the decade, showing an awareness of the demands of the question. There is sufficient analysis for this to achieve within level 5.



It is important to ensure, as is the case with this response, that there is coverage of the chronology demanded in the question.

Question 5

This was the less popular of the two questions in this section. It was pleasing to note that many of the candidates tackling this question were able to respect its chronological parameters. They appreciated that considering the impact of the Sharpeville massacre was relevant, even though the actual event was the year before the start date of this question. Weaker candidates often engaged in a more or less detailed description of the events at Sharpeville in 1960, but even these answers were generally able to move on and consider its impact as well. It was interesting to note that some candidates were even able to make use of the ending of the Treason Trial in 1961, before moving on to consider the Rivonia Trial. Most candidates were able to write about the extent of the threat that African nationalists posed to the government, drawing on evidence both internal and external to South Africa. In constructing their analysis, some candidates had only an insecure grasp of the state of the South African economy in the 1960s, deriving their comments from the state of the economy in the 1970s and 1980s. Some weaker answers focused on discussing threats in a general way, rather than focusing on the significance of the threat posed by African nationalists.

In the years 1961-68, the threat to ~~the~~ South Africa's (SA's) Government certainly became weaker and weaker. Although the African nationalists did gather great international support in this period and the state's reaction in the Rivonia Trial suggests Africans were a threat, it must be noted that apartheid actually saw its peak in this time period due to swift state intervention against the opposition and a thriving economy.

Firstly, there is an argument that the Rivonia Trial shows how threatening African ~~the~~ nationalists could be. When the Liliesleaf farm raid took place in 1963, it became clear that opposition forces were heavily active in sabotage - Mandela himself didn't question this at the trial in 1964. In fact, the defence strategy was not to deny sabotage, but to accept and justify it by placing apartheid itself under trial.

This shows the desperation of African nationalists and the motivation they had, Mandela even giving his famous "I am prepared to die" speech. At the raid at the farm secretly owned by the SACP (South African Communist Party), over 250 incriminating documents were found that showed Mandela's involvement as well as many weapons. This highlights how the ANC and MK's activities underground were thriving and could have threatened SA's security heavily. It also shows the failure of ~~the~~ the government in SA since its Unlawful Organisations Act that had banned the ANC and PAC after the Sharpenille ~~the~~ Massacre had not been effective, suggesting another point of weakness. However, the Rivonia Trial ended with Mandela ~~was~~ getting a life sentence and Lutuli in house arrest, where he started losing contact with colleagues. This shows that African nationalism had been stopped from challenging the government, so it didn't pose a ~~great~~ threat in 1961-68 after it was taken down in 1964.

others may also argue that African nationalism posed a threat to ~~the~~ SA's government because throughout the 60s, international support for it grew. ~~ea~~ For example, 1960 saw the creation of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM) in London. The AAM went on to organise many protests, boycotts and civil activity to challenge apartheid and support African nationalism through the 1960s. Although this did not have short-term consequences, it was significant for building the base to ending apartheid. Additionally, in 1963, the organisation of African Unity (OAU) was set up and the OAU itself then created a liberation fund to end apartheid. This shows how SA was getting more isolated due to international support for African nationalism growing. Even Verwoerd saw this as a challenge, which is why when he became PM in 1966, he tried to gain allies and had minimal success as Malawi ~~stade~~ started trade relations with SA. Furthermore, the ANC was slowly but surely reorganising and attracting

significant investment - ~~\$8800~~
\$860,000 from the USSR in 1963
and 1965 combined. This shows how
African nationalism was gaining support
and strength internationally, enabling it
to better challenge SA's government.
However, the effects of international
support for African nationalism was
not felt until the 70s because the
ANC could still not infiltrate SA to
start guerilla warfare. SA was
surrounded by friendly countries like
Rhodesia (a white supremacist state)
and Portuguese colonies of Angola and
Mozambique. Consequently, the
strengthening of African nationalism via
international support didn't have an
impact in 1961-68 - indeed, the MK
made no attacks in SA after 1963
until the later 1970s.

Finally, the economic prosperity of the ~~60s~~
1960s meant apartheid was strengthened so
African nationalism did not pose a threat.
Trade with Britain rose by 88%. In the
60s, 79% with the USA and 379%.

with Japan. This indicates prosperity grew immensely and many concluded it was a success of apartheid. Even black South Africans saw their incomes rise by 23% in the 60s. Additionally, gold became more valuable in this period, with its value rising by 85%. Gold was a main source of income for SA, so such growth in the economy meant even greater white support for apartheid, making African nationalism weaker. Year-on-year economic growth was at 6% in the 1960s, exemplifying the strength of the economy of SA and thus meaning the government had the resources to put pressure on African nationalists and end the threat posed by them. In fact, since SA's economic boom was tied to the economies of Britain and other such countries, they were also less willing to put pressure on SA and offer unconditional support for African nationalists. This is especially true because the 1960s were the height of the Cold War and SA was seen as a reliable ally against communism - not to mention SA's supply of uranium that was a byproduct of gold.

and was so essential for nuclear bombs.

Therefore, African nationalism was unable to pose a threat since apartheid was strengthened and international support for SA never actually diminished.

Overall, in 1961-68, the threat posed by African nationalism was minimal.

It was most threatening leading up to the Rivonia Trial, but the state suppressed opposition effectively in 1964. And

although ~~the~~ African nationalism did get immense support internationally, the effects of it were only felt in

the late 1970s once the countries

surrounding SA stopped shielding it

(Angola and Mozambique became independent in 1975). The importance of SA as an

economic and political ally also meant apartheid was actually strengthened - as was the state.



This is a secure level 5 response. There is a sustained analysis that is developed in relation to the focus of the question. It demonstrates a wide-ranging knowledge base on which it draws to develop this analysis.

Question 6

This was the most popular of the two questions in this section of the paper. The most impressive answers were seen from those who had carefully read the question and identified that it was asking whether opposition to apartheid was strengthened **throughout** the years 1968-83. This required candidates to consider whether the strengthening of opposition was sustained. Some candidates saw this question as being about the reasons for opposition to apartheid. Marks awarded for such responses varied depending on how far the candidate was able to link this to the actual question focus. Some candidates strayed beyond the chronological parameters of this question, most notably engaging in a description of the events at Sharpeville. Whilst the impact of Sharpeville resonated in the period of the question, this link was often not being made. A number of candidates described events in Soweto, often not moving much beyond this in terms of the contextual knowledge offered to address the question. Some answers were seen that only addressed the evidence that supported a strengthening of the opposition to apartheid. It is crucial that candidates consider both sides of an argument in order to be able to meet the demands of questions such as this.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

It is mostly accurate to say that opposition to Apartheid was strengthened during this time. This was primarily through the Soweto uprising and black consciousness, though the widening anti apartheid movement also saw the ANC restrengthened and more active international response. Whether opposition in these ways was strengthened I think depends upon the ability of factors to challenge and influence government policy, which for the most part found increasing success during this period.

The 1970s saw a large scale assertion of the black consciousness movement in South African society. This was led by charismatic figures such as Steve Biko, using slogans like "black is beautiful" and therefore encouraging greater pride in black identity and culture, such as mbaqanga music popular in the townships. This caused a fundamental shift so that many no longer accepted the only place prepared for them in South Africa by Apartheid and so were driven to protest. This was instrumental in the 1976 Soweto uprising when 20 were ^{brutally} killed by police when protesting about inferior education.

The long term consequences of this were immense as there had been over 80 protests across South Africa by October. Protest and unrest continued at this level until the end of apartheid. The government extended repression and in the face of this, thousands slipped away to join the ANC in exile. The strength of this new movement in radicalising a new generation of activists showed a new powerful resolve able to challenge the government en masse, found in the popular support of the UDF in the 1980s. The ramifications were equally found in the government's policy in attempting to reform Apartheid in the 80s, for example, Botha doubled the black education budget and tried to give Africans more of a stake in society to quell the growing violence. Because of this very direct and long term impact in both ways, opposition to Apartheid can certainly be considered to be strengthened at this time in terms of Soweto and Black Consciousness.

At the same time, the ANC in exile also experienced a strengthening. This was led by Tambo who developed his strategy of making South Africa ungovernable through guerrilla warfare. Tambo launched a charm offensive, gathering support from communist countries especially which were estimated to provide 85% of the ANC's income in the 1980s. Much of this strengthening was due

in no small part to Soweto, which supplied the ANC with thousands of Cadres and promoted sympathy for the armed struggle due to the severity of the township's suppression. By 1985, Tambo had given evidence to a British House of Commons committee justifying the armed struggle, and this eventually led to sanctions. In this way, the ANC resurgence can be seen to be challenging Apartheid, especially as MK activity led to massive defence expenditure which drained the South African economy. However, there were limitations to this as often due to friendly neighbours like white controlled Rhodesia, MK was not able to mount attacks. Morale in the camps was low as MK had not conducted a campaign since the Hunkie incursion in 1967 and expelled 8 dissidents in 1975. Tambo provided a unifying figure which kept the organisation intact, but the ANC's influence would come later in the era and was more limited in effecting policy at this time, especially in comparison to black Consciousness and Soweto which the ANC's support was often dependant on.

Another way that opposition to Apartheid was strengthened was in the global anti apartheid movement. This had its roots in events like Sharpeville in the 1960s and during the 1970 SA rugby tour in Britain, widespread protest led to several games being abandoned. People were encouraged to boycott South African fruit

and there were large protests outside Barclays banks which had close ties to South Africa. Furthermore, this opposition intensified during this period as the UN arms embargo became mandatory after Soweto and protests on university campuses in the UK & US pressured companies such as Polaroid, which withdrew completely in 1977. This was encouraged by ambassadors like Tambo, who drummed up support for sanctions, although the main cause can be seen as the horrors revealed to the world by events like Soweto as people could no longer feel culpable in such brutality by the government. This opposition was key as it meant the SA economy was largely unable to ~~recover~~ recover from the 1973 oil crisis and 1975 drop in price of gold due to these sanctions. This was important also in Botha's reforms as a prime motivation was a need to look more conciliatory in the eyes of the world in order to rescue the economy. However, South Africa had long retreated into 'Laager mentality' and politicians were determined not to be moved by the actions of other countries. The real impact of Sanctions ~~was~~ did not really take place until the 1980s, when they saw a more general and inevitable ~~was~~ decline in the economy. The decisions to ~~oppose~~ impose sanctions were often also as a reaction to events in South Africa, crucially Soweto, or demanded by figures like Tambo or Joe Slovo. Though Anti-apartheid sentiment

certainly increased during this period and was starting to have a real impact, this was not as important as the shifts within South Africa itself.

Overall, due to the the growth in opposition on several levels but primarily in Black Consciousness and increasing Assertion like Soweto, which would continue until 1994, the opposition can be seen to restrengthened, seen in the growing impact on Government evident by the time of Botha's reforms. Greatly effected and closely linked to these shifts were the ANC in exile and the response of the international community, which although faced limitations and were more significant in the later period, also contributed to this overall restrengthening of opposition.



This is an impressive level 5 answer that engages in a sustained analysis that draws on contextual knowledge but also considers varying types of impact in relation to the focus of the question. Occasional errors, e.g. the number killed at Soweto, do not detract from the quality of this response. It has also, at several points, managed to address issues 'throughout'.



The question should be carefully read so that all of its demands are understood and addressed.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully and ensure that they explicitly address the focus of the enquiry rather than merely discussing the issues raised by the sources in general terms
- Candidates should read the caption carefully to ensure that it has been fully understood and should then go on to make full use of it as part of their evaluation of the sources
- Candidates should go beyond the stereotypical when commenting on the provenance of sources
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Candidates should ensure that the material used is relevant to the demands of the question.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range and often went outside the chronological parameters of the question without indicating why this might be relevant to this particular question
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely presenting a list of factors
- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both sides of an argument where the question requires this.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

