



Examiners' Report

June 2024

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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_2F_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with GCE A Level paper 2F, which deals with India, c 1914-48: the road to independence (2F.1) and South Africa, 1948-94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation' (2F.2). The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question 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. There continues to be an increase this year in the number of scripts that were seen that posed problems for examiners with a lack of legibility of handwriting, some of which were almost entirely indecipherable. Examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There did seem this summer to be evidence of a greater number of candidates using the language of the mark scheme in their responses. However, many of these responses were not doing what they claimed to be doing and it was felt that generally this was not a very helpful approach. There was also some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, eg the use of gov instead of government. This is not a development that is welcomed.

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 disappointing to have to note 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. This question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and most candidates are now able to deal with this reasonably well. Approaches to how it is approached do vary, but that is perfectly acceptable, as long as it is present. 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. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the sources adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up little or, on occasion, no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. These were not always weaker candidates; some answers were seen that were strong in bullet points 1 and 3 of the mark scheme but had very little that could be credited for bullet point 2. The impact of this was to hold down the marks that were achievable in this question.

In section B, it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second-order concept that was being targeted by the question. Weaker candidates 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 have a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were 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. Candidates continue to need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

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

Question 1

Candidates were able to respond well to the sources with some impressive answers seen by examiners where candidates were clearly achieving in the top levels for all the bullet points. Contextual knowledge was generally used effectively to explain and support inferences and, at the higher levels, to illuminate and discuss the content of the sources. However, some responses contained errors of chronological understanding of events and others produced responses that did not fully engage with the sources, spending much of the answer in providing a chronological narrative of events. Whilst most candidates did make reference to the provenance of the sources, it was generally felt by examiners that much of this was being done in rather a superficial way and based on generalised points, rather than exploring the relevance of these points for these particular sources. Where candidates did engage in such exploration, responses were generally achieving at the higher levels.

In this essay it is going to give weight to the source that is more useful in investigating the effectiveness of the methods of non-violence advocated by Gandhi in the 1920-22 Satyagraha. ^{The} This use of the two sources will be to show the similarities or differences in views also on how effective the methods of non-violence advocated by Gandhi in the 1920-22 Satyagraha as well as this

It can be argued that source 1 is the most useful source in giving weight to how it can investigate the effectiveness of the methods of non-violence advocated by Gandhi in the 1920-22 Satyagraha because it shows clearly the level of support Gandhi was able to acquire for the Satyagraha campaign of non-cooperation due to him being a political leader trying to bring Indians from all communities in India together to achieve more Indian representation in India. This is supported by in source 1 it says 'Gandhi's influence increased largely because Indians saw him as leading a political party, where he bridged the gap between Hindus and Muslims. As a result of this, it clearly shows the level of support and loyalty gained by Gandhi ^{by} the Indian people, to disrupt British control in the country.

This is shown with Indian people in their thousands following Gandhi's leadership and orders to boycott elections and also to boycott their jobs in law run by the British Government also. This therefore shows that with this being a letter ^{source} written by Lord Reading ^{the viceroy} to the British Prime Minister David Lloyd George in the 4th May 1922, showing their increased concern at the peak of the Non-Cooperation Movement, about the leadership skills of Gandhi to build up a large proportion of support of the Indian people against the British Raj. Therefore, the purpose of this source is to show that through Gandhi's teachings of non-violence, from the British perspective they could really see Gandhi and ^{and encourage} the Indian people to join the Non-Cooperation Movement. ^{this is due to the fact that} ~~it is~~ ^{the} believed that Indian people should not be second class citizens anymore and must stand up to the British Raj and pursue an India where the large majority of the country is influenced by the Indian people not the British Raj. Making it clear that through this ^{use of} source it is very useful in showing how the use of non-violence by the Indian people against the British rule was more accepted and meant more people wanted to join the Movement.

However, it can be argued that source 2 is the most useful in giving weight to the investigation of the effectiveness of the methods of non-violence advocated by Gandhi in the 1920-22 Satyagraha because it ~~states~~^{shows} that Gandhi's original plan of a non-violent protest was not followed by all the Indian people. With extremists such as Bose believing the way to render the British as the controlling entity in India will not be solved by violence, ~~especially~~^{this view} was followed by ~~Muslims~~^{some} and Hindus who due to their religious differences did not stick to the non-violence approach of the non-cooperation movement. This is supported by in source 2 it says the events of Chauri Chaura and its consequences. This therefore links to the historical violent action taken by Hindus and Muslims, where a police station was set on fire and many Muslims and Hindus were injured/killed in the riots of the Chauri Chaura event in the non-cooperation movement. As a result of this, it shows that through the source being published from an autobiography of Nehru in 1936, it gives a clear indication from the ^{needs} leading names in the nationalist movement concerns with Gandhi's strategy in being able to ensure the idea to all of the Indian people that the use of non-violence is ^{the} only way to win back control or representation in India.

This is supported by in the source 2 it says "Was this the fault of the non-violent method itself or Gandhi's interpretation of it? This clearly shows that the lack of conviction by Gandhi to choose to go down the path of non-violence was highlighted by Nehru with the divisions and violence brought about in the non-cooperation movement, which meant it was a failure. Therefore, this shall be set by source 2 being set in 1936, through the autobiography of Nehru, it clearly shows the ability of time to reflect on the mistakes made in the non-cooperation movement, especially on how the use of non-violence methods was not a strict approach for all Indians to follow, making the ~~satyagrah~~ ^{Satyagrah} campaign overall not effective in showing non-violent methods. As a result of this, source 2 can be argued to be most useful in giving weight to the question, as through Nehru's Indian Point of View it gives a balanced and fair assessment on how the promising ideals by Gandhi's enforce non-violent protests was not followed, due to underestimating the ^{pure} willingness of the Indian to strike violently against the British to achieve more self representation in India.

Therefore, it can be argued that you can use both source 1 and source 2 together to investigate the effectiveness of non-violent methods in the satyagraha campaign 1920-22 because with both source 1 and source 2 they both highlight the questioning of Gandhi's effectiveness to end the period of non-cooperation established unconditionally in all his supporters of non-violence being the only way of protest to achieve successful change in Indian representation in British Government. This is supported by in source 1 it says from the British point of view "As Gandhi's arguments declined, so more moderate and sensible people in India started to oppose him" and in source 2 it says "Was this the fault of the non-violent method itself or Gandhi's interpretation of it?" Although, it can be argued that source 1 and 2 are in comparison different to each other in their views to investigate the effectiveness of non-violent methods in the satyagraha campaign because source 1 highlights how Gandhi through his non-violence methods was able to gather large support for the non-cooperation movement, whereas in source 2 it says that Gandhi found it harder to gather a large majority of support in the ^{non-cooperation} campaign to follow non-violent methods as protest.

This is supported by in source 1 it says 'Gandhi's influence increased it largely ^{as he was respected} ~~because~~ ^{for his} pressing of the ~~powerful~~ total non-violence. Although in source 2 it says 'the events of Chauri Chaura as a consequence made us examine the implications of non-violence as a tactic'.

In conclusion it can be argued that source 2 gives the most weight in evaluating the effectiveness of the satyagraha campaign in 1920-22 because it gives a balanced view from the Indian point of view of Nehru. It has had time to reflect of the failure of the movement and the clear mistakes in Gandhi's leadership in not enforcing to a larger proportion of the Indian people that non-violence should be the only form of protest against British rule to spark civil negotiations with the British over more Indian representation. As a result of this, through Nehru's view it shows clearly that through Gandhi's lack of effectiveness to enforce non-violence in the non-cooperation campaign was the key reason why it was not a driving force for independence but instead failed as well as this.



This response demonstrates clearly that the candidate is interrogating the sources in light of the enquiry that has been posed by the question. There are reasoned inferences that are well supported by contextual knowledge that is used to further illuminate what can be learned from the content of the source. In this way, the answer is operating at level 5 in all three bullet points.

Question 2

Candidates seemed, in general, quite confident with the sources and were able to elicit their value, making reasoned inferences and using contextual knowledge to support their points. Weaker candidates tended to make more generic comments around both the causes and the events at Sharpeville, whereas stronger candidates focused on the precise enquiry of the question, the consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre. Most candidates were able to successfully interrogate, in most cases, why the provenance was useful to the enquiry regarding the different experiences of the authors and the time of writing. Some of the candidates operating at the higher levels were able to make the link between Klaaste's comments on 'white communities' and what Suzman was saying. Contextual knowledge was often used well, expanding upon points raised in the sources but also, in some achieving at the higher levels, to challenge what the sources were suggesting.

The Sharpeville Massacre of 1960 had many consequences on South Africa as a country and on its people. Some of these consequences include the suppression of political opposition, which both sources mention, as well as stricter National Party rule and greater distance amongst Black South Africans against apartheid and the National Party. Both of the sources effectively address these consequences, however the first is primarily focused on immediate reactions compared to the second reflecting on longer consequences and equally has different details. Overall, however it should be considered that these two sources for a historian would be highly valuable as informing of the consequences of the Sharpeville Massacre, addressing mainly both short and long term respectively.

Both sources would be highly useful to a historian studying the impacts of the massacre due to how they clearly address how political opposition was suppressed afterwards. In Suzman's letter, she notes that "the ANC is horrified at the success of the PAC's campaign" effectively showing that one of the consequences of the Massacre was increased division in the fight against apartheid. The author additionally has no reason to falsify this as it is a direct, private letter to her daughter informing of the events, meaning that it is more trustworthy for a historian to use. This idea is correct due to the knowledge that Black South Africans were struck by

apartheid policies, meaning that division in the fight against apartheid across the National Party's struggle to increase as their opposition is not unified - ultimately suppressing the power and ability to evoke change. This point is reinforced with Suman Sanyal's "He wouldn't want any more riots, so he has called the police to now" indicating that the anti-apartheid movements would not be able to resist again and need the same media recognition worldwide, with this idea being reinforced by Suman's date of writing as she is clearly then experiencing it first hand, making it more useful to a historian. Same & Jane Aggrey Klaaste also explores how the events of Sharpeville led to the emergence of political suppression. Klaaste merely advocates this through the idea that the "aftermath of tragedy saw the banning of the ANC and PAC" clearly showing how Apartheid policies were suppressing black anti-apartheid movements. Klaaste also notes that this banning was "systematic destruction of almost all political dissent" an idea reinforced by the fact that African art grew in the 1960s and 1970s whilst the ANC was banned until 1990, 2 years after the one was produced - adding to the strength of the above as she had experienced my term conceived politically and seen how this banning or suppression led to longer black African struggle. Overall, it is evident that both sources will be inherently useful to a historian studying the impact of the Sharpeville Memorial through the manner by which it addresses the banning and suppression of the political opposition. It should also be considered same & is more useful due to the long term political

consequences that the author experienced and if they're able to reflect upon.

Both sources are also adept in noting how the Sharpeville Massacre was responsible for an increased strictness of National Party rule and apartheid policies. Source 3 best depicts this by Sizer's later additional comment "The Pass Laws were soon reinstated", suggesting that National Party rule did not change and actually became more harmful or suffering to Africans, with Sizer saying "I imagine the government will have to modify the pass system" prior. This claim may be Sizer's personal feelings during KwaZulu Natal, being an advocate for anti-apartheid and member of the Progressive Party, with optimism and hope for change potentially blinding her and not allowing her to see that the National Party will react harshly to the Massacre - this being a historian's use in that sense to potentially be rechecked. This idea also correlates with the banning of the ANC and exile of key members such as Oliver Tambo, in order to keep National Party strength and apartheid policies alive. This idea is also reinforced with Sizer suggesting "the government... has never fully defused the world" indicating a suppression of the truth in order to keep apartheid and prevent international boycotts or bans, such as the banning of South Africa from the Olympics in 1964 and FIFA in 1965, ultimately indicating South Africa's leaders policies were not going to change or become any lighter. This idea is also explored by KwaZulu. This increased strictness and support of apartheid had to be controlled by Afrikaner people voting for the

National Party, this means that "white committees were told a different story" in order to protect the National Party and retain votes to retain power. Klaus suggests that "the media reinforced this view" an idea highly significant with the emergence of media at the time and as a use of propaganda to ensure National Party rule remained. This relates to a historian's bias in the source and its usefulness as it directly explains how the other side of the event had consequences too, but was that only helped the National Party, allowing them to retain power until 1994. The source also mentions that "even whites ~~others~~ ... due to the belief they gave themselves a sense of relief", suggesting the National Party was changing views and increasing their grip on South Africa. Overall, both sources are highly useful in addressing how important the emergence of Sharpeville were in allowing the National Party to increase their grip on power and strength of apartheid policies.

Finally, both sources are useful in addressing the nature of that reaction as a result of the events in Sharpeville. Source 3 suggests that "Dhenshi was like a dead city" explaining how the black reaction felt deflated after the police unnecessarily open fire on them, killing 69 people. The source also informs of the "original press findings" headed by 1961 Nobel Peace Prize Winner Leites, suggesting that the ~~of~~ resentment towards the apartheid policy makes and sends a clear message that the anti-apartheid movement lies not on. The source therefore has added usefulness, showing the immediate response only days after the

events. The same is further useful to a historian by Sover's
noting "I have had eight meetings", citing the scene as it
clearly shows she is well informed and knowledgeable, allowing a
historian to trust her words and intended that it comes from
my viewpoint compiled together. Sover 4 also is highly important
in recognizing that reactions and reactions after the events.
Sover 4 shows that the events ^{were} reinforcing the deep, but ineffective
crisis in the hands of the South African. Sover built up a case
that they were just unable to effectively release, prevent the
case from progressing. This idea is highlighted by Klauke being
personally experienced the struggle as she is able to rely on personal
feelings, although it must be avoided that her personal beliefs
and potential emotions may cause her to be slightly biased in
her views. Finally, Klauke suggests that "we were playing a
game for the next explosion" indicating that the consequences of
Sharpeville ~~were~~ as the South African would cause more damage
as directly offset in long run due to this act. This is increased in
credibility by the writing of the 'Southern newspaper' - having a direct
outlet of the South African, although implying that they should not
let this case overrule them and maintain the struggle peacefully.

In conclusion, both sources are highly useful in providing a historian
with clear evidence of the varied impacts of the Massacre in
1960. Both sources as they were successfully to understand the
National Party reaction, the South African reaction but most importantly
how the political landscape changed as a result - which is due effectively by

by both but more effectively, it should be argued, by some
& as it directly addresses the issue.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate clearly interrogates the sources, drawing on what is in them and evaluating them in terms of the weight that they will bear. Contextual knowledge is used to both illuminate and to contribute to reaching a judgment. These attributes are evidence of a strong level 5 in all three bullet points.

Question 3

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. Some impressive answers were seen where candidates demonstrated a detailed understanding around the extent to which constitutional change in India attracted British support at differing levels, including the British public, individuals such as Churchill, the political parties and government. Weaker responses often had a weaker understanding of the focus of the question. Some of the weaker responses dealt with support for change amongst Indians and some frequently tried to develop an analysis that was based on evidence that fell outside the chronological parameters of the question. Neither of these approaches could achieve much credit.

Between the years 1928 - 1935 there was a pressure for a constitutional change in India which attracted considerable support in Britain to a very certain extent. Arguably the British showed willingness to discuss these ~~part~~ changes through a series of conferences to ensure the outcome is fair and realistic, which were known as the Round table conferences, although each conference failed. ~~the~~ Arguably Britain showed more support to India's constitutional change because the leading political party in Britain was New Labour, who was friendlier with Congress leader and Gandhi.

During 1928 - 1935, the Indians were pushing for constitutional change. ~~to~~ Lord Irwin, the viceroy, took orders from Britain to declare a plan which reiterates the Montague declaration of 1917, for separate electorates and a dominion status within India. However, Arguably, the British are ~~showing a sense of~~ willing to compromise which conveys a ~~small~~ segment of their support. Although ~~not many Indians agreed~~, he also established a conference to take place between British political leaders and Indian political leaders. Lord Irwin

§ Illustrated his willingness to compromise with Gandhi, ~~at~~ through his Irwin-Gandhi pact, which highlights the support the British had for ~~India's~~ Indian struggles and goals. The ~~pact~~ pact was for Gandhi to attend the second round table conference as a representative; it also discussed bringing in 11 provinces and discussing ~~an~~ ~~over~~ Indian governments for each. The pact ~~was~~ highlighted considerable support from Britain for India's constitutional changes, and portrayed their willingness to discuss and compromise with India at a London conference. Therefore arguably, Britain ~~had some~~ ~~su~~ showed moral support for India's wants with the idea for a conference.

Argua' However, on the other hand the British support for an Indian constitution was limited due to the mass failings of each Round table conference. The first conference ¹⁹³⁰ consisted of 16 ~~de~~ British delegates and 46 Indian delegates, yet nobody was there to represent Congress, the ^{main} results of the conference was for India ~~to~~ to be run as a type of dominion. ~~And~~ From this it is clear that the British were un willing to give India what they wanted, and ~~left~~ dominated the conferences to give India half-way compromises. Which further indicates the lack of support the British had for the pressure of India's constitutional change.

The second round table conference in 1931 was also a ~~large~~ failure as nothing was agreed.

The two failures of the conference provide evidence that Britain had a lack of support for the Indian constitutional changes as it was causing a lot of separation and complications ~~the~~ between Indian leaders.

The second conference consisted of Gandhi, Congress, Aga Khan etc. yet India was divided because Congress only represented ~~the~~ Congress, Hindus and partly the untouchables, which angered the Muslim League - causing divisions in India. The disorganisation and ~~the~~ conflict between Indian political leaders, ~~become~~ ~~made~~ ~~Britain~~ as well as the failure of the conferences lead Britain to have less support in their constitutional changes and want for a self-government or a dominion status as they felt they were not ~~yet~~ yet ready to handle the pressure of it, leading to a lack of support.

~~The third and final conference~~

~~It is evident to suggest that Britain had a lack of support for the pressure for constitutional changes in India during 1928-35 to a~~

It is however, evident to suggest Britain had considerable support for India's constitutional change due to their ~~renewal~~ introduction of the Government of India Act

1935, which suggested a self government in the provinces, and for India to have more freedom in choosing the viceroy appointed to India, but they did not have complete freedom with this act as Britain still maintained the control of domestic affairs and foreign affairs. Although the support given from Britain to establish this act illustrates India's step in the right direction for independence. Although, the act seemed to be at a state of change, when as it was a struggle on who would get the power to appoint a viceroy govern the provinces, and who would choose. Although, conservatives still remain maintained their right to choose the viceroy as well, so it was chosen by some Indians and some of the British. Overall, Britain did show considerable support with the government of India act 1935, to an extent, as India's demands were met with governed provinces and separate electorates, but Britain still held the power with domestic and foreign affairs. Overall, Britain did show considerable support to constitutional change in India with the government of India act 1935.

In conclusion, after weighing out each argument it is clear to see that ~~unfortunately~~ despite Britain's support with the Irwin-Gandhi pact and their

Intentions to compromise with Indira's demands through a conference in London, and their approval of the government of India act, ultimately their support to constitutional change was limited, as each of the round table conferences failed, and Britain were still very sceptical about giving India their demands and changes to separate electorates and governed provinces a dominion status as they still felt they couldn't be trusted with the power of running India, as the leaders were divided. Therefore in summary it is clear to see the pressure for constitutional change in India attracted some support in Britain to a fairly certain extent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response shows an understanding of the material that is relevant to the question posed. It uses the material as the basis for its attempts to engage in analysis and although this is not fully developed, nonetheless there are sustained links made to the focus of the question and criteria are established. This response is clearly achieving level 4 in all of the bullet points.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Aim to sustain and develop the analysis throughout the course of the answer.

Question 4

This was the more popular question in this section of the paper. Most candidates were able to demonstrate some knowledge about the role of Mountbatten in the events surrounding the partition of India. Candidates did take differing approaches to answering this question with some having a narrower focus on Mountbatten and others looking at a wider range of factors; both approaches were legitimate. It was more common to see the latter approach, where some impressive answers were seen that were able to offer a range of factors that may have contributed to the problems associated with partition and weighed these against the role of Mountbatten and against each other. Weaker answers were characterised by losing the focus of the question and moving into an explanation of the reasons for independence, having a weak chronological knowledge base and consequently arguing inaccurately from this, and insufficient focus on the role of Mountbatten.

By 1947, the partition of India and Pakistan had been agreed upon and the partition had occurred by the end of 1947. However with the partition came a huge number of issues, such as conflict over the terms of the partition, issues over the boundary between India and Pakistan and huge levels of violence in India, leading upto and during the partition which led to a huge number of deaths as the result of the partition. In this essay I will argue that the issues with the ~~part~~ partition on the whole were a result of the rushed nature of partition and the lack of British government ^{of India} intervention to stop the ~~part~~ violence and fighting occurring during the partition, therefore I would agree that it was Mountbatten who was primarily responsible for the issues with the partition as the ~~head of~~ Viceroy and head of the British raj in India. He ~~was~~ also rushed the planning for the partition and fuelled tensions between hindus and muslims.

One issue with the partition in 1947 was the issue surrounding the actual plan for partition and how partition would be implemented.

~~Mr~~ Mountbatten had been appointed as he was charismatic, left wing and charming and the British government hoped he would be able to break the deadlock between Congress and the Muslim League over how partition would be implemented in 1947. A major issue was that Congress wanted a united India and were strongly opposed to the partition of ~~Bengal~~ Pakistan, but Jinnah and the Muslim League ~~were~~ would refuse to pass any proposal that didn't include the creation of a strong independent state of Pakistan. Mountbatten's first plan, the Balkan Plan proposed leaving it up to the 11 provinces to decide if they wanted independence was instantly rejected. Mountbatten had been reluctant to become viceroy and had only agreed if there was a timeframe for British withdrawal ~~from~~ India (1948) as the situation in India worsened with huge violence.

~~and~~ Therefore ~~he~~ he quickly constructed another plan for partition, the

Mountbatten Plan, which provided for two separate states of Pakistan and India and this was quickly passed in 1947. This plan was very rushed due to the strict time frame of when the British had to leave and its rushed nature was a considerable ~~problem that caused~~ issue, as there was not sufficient time to ^{properly} ~~provide~~ explain the partition.

Therefore the issues with the terms of partition can be seen as Mountbatten's fault as he wanted a speedy transferral of power, leading him to rushing the plan for partition.

A second issue with partition was the issue over how India and Pakistan would be divided. The Boundary Commission was appointed to set the boundary line between India and Pakistan. It was headed by Sir Cyril Radcliffe a British legal expert who was chosen specifically as he had no previous experience of India (had never ~~even~~ visited) and therefore he would be impartial. ~~As domestic~~ However this meant he had no understanding over provincial issues, and the matter

* The Boundary Commission was also only given 5 weeks to complete its work by Mountbatten, ^{meaning} it was very rushed was worsened by the fact Mountbatten supplied him with out of date maps and censuses.* This caused considerable issues with the partition as towns and villages were split down the middle and the border was inconsistent, and muddled. Another issue with the Boundary Commission was Mountbatten pressured for Hindu and congress concessions as he was close friends with Nehru, for example Mountbatten persuaded Radcliffe to move the town of Ferozpur from Pakistan to India, and this led to Jinnah and The Muslim League being angered and fuelled the violence as a result. Therefore the ~~rushed~~ haphazard and biased nature of the 'Radcliffe boundary line' separating India and Pakistan was due to Mountbatten in many ways.

Another arguably the largest issue with partition was the ~~issues~~ huge level of violence that occurred due to it. During the summer of 1947

Hindus and Muslims were terrified they would wake up on the wrong side of the border so many packed up and moved to ~~the~~ safer territories. Around 10 million made this journey and there were huge killings and massacres of Hindus by Muslims and vice versa, over 1 million had died only in 1947 as a result of partition. The British military did nothing to intervene, Mountbatten had only appointed an inadequate 50,000 troops along the border and he instructed them to only act to protect European lives. Therefore Mountbatten did nothing to stop the killing and the British military completely withdrew by 1948. Another issue was following the partition there was a considerable refugee crisis in both India and Pakistan, many of whom were traumatised from the violence of their journeys.

The British Raj and Mountbatten's decision to allow the violence was arguably the largest problem therefore I do agree it was his responsibility

as he allowed the violence to occur.

Therefore overall, I do agree that Mountbatten was largely responsible for the problems with partition in 1947 as he was the head of the British government and responsible for the implementation of partition. His plan was rushed and he rushed, poorly informed and ~~was biased~~ unfairly pressured the Boundary Commission resulting in an inadequate boundary that ~~was~~ worsened the violence and he did nothing to stop the killing that occurred as people desperately moved to be on the right side of the India / Pakistan divide, by ~~it~~ failing to mobilise and British troops or forces to deal with the fighting, causing huge violence and the deaths of around 1 mil by end of 1947.



This answer accesses level 5, although some of its qualities are more firmly rooted in level 4. It identifies a range of key issues, which at times are described rather than fully explored, and also tend to largely support the proposition in the question rather than presenting a counter argument. It establishes valid criteria for its argument and the judgement reached in the conclusion has been supported through the course of the response.



Ensure that your answer presents both sides of the argument – evidence to support it and evidence to counter it. These do not have to be balanced, but both do need to be clearly present.

Question 5

This was the more popular answer in this section of the paper. Candidates clearly had a secure knowledge base on which to draw in answering this question. Weaker responses tended to get bogged down in description, often going back in time to relate a brief history of the Boers in South Africa, but even such narrative answers were able to make links to the focus of the question. Many candidates looked at a range of factors in addition to the stated factor, most usually the impact of the Second World War, the weaknesses of the United Party and the Westminster-style elections. Weaker candidates tended to treat these discretely, often asserting that one was more important than another, with no developed analysis to support the assertion. Stronger answers were able to successfully weigh the relative importance of each of the factors.

Afrikaner nationalism was the primary reason for the National Party (NP) victory in 1948, as it fostered a sense of collective identity, and enabled Malan to capitalise on other factors - notably the political and economic discourse of the Second World War, and the Westminster system.

The rise in Afrikaner nationalism was the primary reason for the NP victory as it created a sense of collective identity: beginning with the founding of the Broederbond in 1918, and accelerating with the 1929 Depression, the idea that Afrikaners should exclusively aid other Afrikaners effectively gave the NP a captive voter base, especially in rural areas, already giving the party a significant advantage. Through this, the rhetoric of the party unified the Afrikaners against other groups, including the English -

the Afrikaner centenary events, such as the 1938 laying of the Voortrekker Monument, were steeped in ideas of oppression by colonial Britain. Indeed, ~~England~~

English farms owned the majority of mines in South Africa. This rhetoric was doubly effective in that it unified the population while harming So the United Party, as Smuts was a ~~good~~ famous Anglophile and a friend of Churchill, hence he was branded a traitor. The extent of separation was such that, with 1/4 of Afrikaners in poverty in 1930, separate financial institutions were set up to help them. These, such as Sarlam insurance and Volkskas Bank, further cemented the idea of separation, even within the white community. The English lacked any such ethnic cohesion, thus ~~it~~ inherently weakening the UP's electoral position. In this way, the growing political nationalism and economic separation of the Afrikaners inspired radicalism, pushing most Boers towards the NP. This was furthered by the Dutch Reformed Church. This idea of collective hardship was also made the electorate especially receptive

to slights in other areas.

The Second World War was also hugely significant as it inflamed racial divisions, both along colour lines and between Britons and Afrikaners. With 250,000 South Africans serving, the labour shortages were made up by 25% black men, hence meaning that in practicality, the Natives in Urban Areas Act 1923 had been negated. This exacerbated Afrikaner fears of replacement, especially as African labour increased house prices and depressed wages in Cape Town. Moreover, as SA had become independent in 1934, it made the free choice to go to war - this led to Hertzog ending his coalition with the Smuts, as well as the nationalist paramilitaries the OB and NSR being set up. This further inflamed division between white groups, especially as the authorities regarded the NSR as terrorists, with leader Riekert sent to death in 1942. This ended hopes of cultural cross-coordination between white groups, as even moderate Afrikaners began to prioritise ethnic interests -

in 1948, Hertzog lent his support to Malan, pushing the NP over the line. In this way, WW2 was hugely important in inflaming tensions, and cementing the divisions in South African society. Despite this, Afrikaner nationalism remains more significant as WW2 only inflamed existing divisions: their pre-existence was necessary in order for WW2 to have the effect it had, as anti-British terror groups were wholly based on Afrikaner nationalism, hence WW2 only exacerbated existing perceptions of the villainy of Smuts.

Political factors were also hugely significant in securing the National Party victory, as many urban whites remained undecided. Smuts made some noticeable mistakes, notably that his campaign was small scale and lacking energy, possibly due to exhaustion from his war service. This failed to attract young whites, and his support of the 1947 Fagan report convinced many whites' fears about the 'Swart Gevaar'. Judge Fagan's recommendation of removal of restrictions on Afrikaners in

urban areas, and increased government help for black healthcare, that conformed to the fears of the white community - that Smuts would replace them with Afrikaners. It is in this racial fear that the NP secured its victory: an almost all-white electorate would almost always favour more racist policies. This was especially true in the rural areas, which the Westminster system weighted ~ 15% more heavily, due to smaller constituencies. Therefore while the VP won 50% of raw votes vs the NP's 40%, the NP won the parliamentary majority. In this it can be seen how political technicalities pushed radical Afrikaners into the mainstream, while Smuts's mistakes scared many moderate whites into also supporting the NP, which was a decisive factor in their victory. Despite this, the Westminster system only benefited the NP because farmers were particularly nationalist in nature, hence their prior radicalisation in Afrikaner nationalism remains most important. Similarly, Smuts's mistakes were only profound as they fed into existing NP rhetoric. The political factors as however more significant than WW2.

as they affected far more whites across the political spectrum, while the reaction to WW2 was more intense, but localised among the radicals.

In conclusion, Afrikaner nationalism was the primary reason for the NP victory in the 1948 election. This was because it created a collective identity and the shared history of oppression, which set up both British & and black South Africans as the 'enemy'. While both were significant, the effects of WW2 and political issues were only prescriptive as they fed into an existing narrative of racial fear and hatred. The Westminster system especially should nonetheless be appreciated for its role in making NP votes count for more, but this is again dependent on the nationalist inclinations of the rural population.

In this way, while all 3 factors combined effectively with one another to produce widespread support for apartheid, Afrikaner nationalism was the spark that began the make the impact of other events especially profound.



This is a secure level 5 response. There is sustained analysis throughout this response with a secure focus on the question. The response makes clear links between the various factors, arriving at a substantiated judgement in the conclusion.

Question 6

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates responded to this question in one of two ways, both of which were legitimate approaches. The focus could be entirely on Mandela and the ways in which he was and was not significant, or candidates could look beyond Mandela at other factors that were significant. Weaker answers often provided potted biographies of Mandela with only limited links being made to the question. However, some very impressive responses were seen where candidates focused entirely on the question, engaging in sustained analysis that enabled them to reach well-supported conclusions in relation to the question.

I believe ~~it was~~ significant that the release of Nelson Mandela from prison was significant in enabling a political settlement to be reached in South Africa in 1989-94, but there are more significant factors such as international pressure ^{external factors} of legislations and economy. Mandela once free ~~was~~ started negotiating with De Klerk CODESA which eventually did lead to an ~~election~~ of have a positive impact of enabling a political settlement to be reached, but international pressure from other countries did do things like sort out the problems ~~to~~ such as the disagreements after CODESA, leading to the ANC party being elected, ~~if~~ legislations made it easier for pressure to be applied on the South African Government economically.

A factor more significant than the release

of Nelson Mandela from Prison was international pressure & external factors. Once De Klerk entered office & the ~~South~~ National party's reputation was very poor, and led to De Klerk being willing to make an agreement with the ~~the~~ Black South Africans & to comply. This can be seen as he ~~announced the~~ entered he stated negotiating Codesa with Mandela, even though both Mandela & De Klerk had opposite views. ~~That~~ This shows that ~~the~~ international pressure plays large part in his deal as the National party's main goal, since 1948, has been to keep them in power, and white supremacy, so for De Klerk to be willing to ~~talk~~ negotiate demands with Mandela shows that they are under international pressure. One example of this is when the Economic sanctions placed on South Africa, this was attempted to be overturned by Reagan due to anti-communist & conservative beliefs aligning, but due to Congress ~~not~~ overruling his decision, economic sanctions were placed on South Africa. Another way external factors, and how after both CODESA negotiations failed between Mandela & De Klerk

White Nationalists stepped in, leading to an election where ANC won 50% of the vote leading to a political settlement to be reached in 1993.

Even though other factors are more significant, Nelson Mandela ~~and still~~ getting released from Prison did help enable to reach a political settlement.

This is because Mr. Once Mandela was released it meant that morale would increase for Black South Africans as a key figure in the Anti-Apartheid movement has been released after many years, giving hope & more support towards the Anti-Apartheid movement. Also, linking to external factors, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ Mandela was well known in the world, even having Wembley Stadium in the UK celebrate his 70th birthday, showing that the news of Mandela's release would've travelled around the world due to his imprisonment being well known, creating more international support. Once Mandela was free he started giving speeches, raised morale & finally started negotiating CODESA with De Klerk, which was

Similar to the freedom charter it would be a step even closer towards signalling the end of Apartheid. The reason why Mandela is not the most significant factor in a political settlement being reached ~~in 1989-94~~ in 1989-94 because Mandela did not actually reach an agreement with De Klerk over CODESA as they had multiple disagreements, such as Mandela wanting it to not be equal, but ruled by Black South Africans, leading to CODESA 1 & 2 negotiations failing, and had to wait for international intervention for the ANC to be the favoured party ~~enabling~~ enable a political settlement being reached.

Another significant factor ~~on~~ enabling a political settlement to be reached in 1989-94 is economic & legislative. De Klerk was troubled with the legislation ~~to~~ been overturned by Bona before him, such as unbanning trade unions & the ANC & PAC which created it much easier for Black South Africans to protest - ~~to support the~~ this is because they could go on strike which would economically damage South Africa as Black South Africans

women in jobs such as mining & farming, which is used for exports which are a & agriculture which are big economic factors for South Africa, applying even more pressure on the National party to be pressured into negotiations with Mandela, which eventually led to enabling a political settlement to be reached as the National party ~~could~~ had too much opposition.

In Conclusion I do agree that the Release of Mandela from prison & was significant in enabling a political settlement to be reached, but not enough to say the most significant. This is because even though his release from prison signalled the end of Apartheid, raising morale & support, and also regarding CODESA, without international ^{pressure} & external factors, CODESA wouldn't have been as impactful, leading to the ANC being elected, ending apartheid & ~~reaching~~ enabling a political settlement to be reached, as the United Nations forced non control after negotiations of CODESA failed, applied pressure for

codersa to be negotiated in the first place
it with the help of the legislation & economy
problems for the National party, led to
the enabling of a political settlement to be
reached.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response has taken the Mandela v other factors approach to the question. It links some of the other factors it identifies to the role, as a result of the release, of Mandela. It deals clearly with the stated factor and does not dismiss it. This is a level 5 response.

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 aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption carefully and make full use of it when evaluating the sources
- Contextual knowledge should be used to illuminate and discuss what is in the source, rather than provide an answer to the enquiry. Long descriptions of linked events are unlikely to gain much, if any, credit
- Candidates should ensure that their responses address the demands of all three bullet points that are assessed in this section of the paper.

Section B

- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth, precision and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely 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>

