

# **Examiners' Report** **June 2022**

**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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_2F\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid set of exams on A Level paper 9HI02F, which deals with India, c 1914-48: the road to independence ( 9HI0 2F.1) and South Africa, 1948-94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation' ( 9HI0 2F.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts – cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was very little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. A minority of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting; examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

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. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together', but it is not a requirement to use them 'together' throughout the response. There was some evidence of some candidates attempting to do this. Depending on the sources, it was not always possible to do this convincingly, and some candidates engaged in some superficial argument and analysis as a result. Some candidates used 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, it was clear that, despite Advance Information, some candidates had insufficient contextual knowledge to deal effectively with the sources.

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 shaped their responses analytically but lacked sufficient substance and accurate contextual knowledge to support the arguments that they were making. 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 need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates note in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

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



## Question 1

Almost all candidates understood the principal messages of both Sources. Most candidates appreciated that Finlay's views were not representative of all British views, although a significant minority did think that he represented the views of the country, even though there was evidence in both Sources that this was not the case. In the stronger responses, candidates had developed reasoned inferences with confidence and were able to develop and support these whilst commenting on the provenance of the Source. Such answers fully appreciated the variety of views expressed in the Sources – Finlay supporting Dyer's actions and the more mixed reports of the Majority and Minority of the Hunter Committee, as reported in a New Zealand newspaper. Many candidates wanted to demonstrate their often exceptionally strong knowledge of events at Amritsar. This did mean that some of them failed to directly engage with the Sources in a sustained way as the answer focused on narrative. It also meant that for some candidates, the focus of the response was not always explicitly addressed to the terms of the question – attitudes to the actions of General Dyer at Amritsar. Several weaker answers often engaged in a narrative into which brief quotes from the Sources were dropped, often without fully understanding the thrust of the Source.

Sources 1 and 2 are highly useful in portraying the conflicting attitudes towards General Dyer after his role in the Amritsar Massacre. Source 1 <sup>and tone</sup> shows an almost celebratory ~~attitude~~ towards Dyer, showing the House of Lords' positive attitude whilst this is wholeheartedly undercut in Source 2. Rather, Source 2 emphasises the inhumanity and barbarism of his actions, exploring both an Indian and British viewpoint from an international source. Thus, only together can the contrasting and directly opposing attitudes towards Dyer be understood.

~~Taken from a speech made by Viscount Finlay in the House of Lords, the source is useful in displaying the admirable attitudes towards Dyer given that they were ~~as~~ highly praising towards him. Given that the House of Lords praised Dyer's actions in Amritsar, Source 1 is very useful in displaying the British viewpoint that commended Dyer given that it is a speech taken by Viscount Finlay.~~

in the House of Lords. Furthermore, taken from July 1920, after the publication of the Hunter Commission it perhaps falls on a unified a coherent perception. Indeed, as expected, the Source highly celebrates Dyer particularly in preventing a weakening of the Empire whilst justifying the force used and in doing so indicating his actions. Finlay begins 'I strongly feel that an injustice has been done to a very distinguished and deserving officer'. Drawing on Dyer's expertise the source portrays Dyer as a heroic British official who acted 'honourably and performed his duty'. Whilst O'Dwyer feared a planned uprising Dyer arguably went beyond his remit. Furthermore, portraying an unjustly punished leader is arguably misleading: Dyer was only gently reprimanded in the Hunter Commission and received a hero's welcome on his return to England, with the Morning Post raising £26,000 for him. - Though he was forced to resign he received no criminal punishment. Nonetheless, this positive attitude succeeds in vindicating Dyer of responsibility whilst stating 'women in India do not attend meetings and there were no children', undermining



his repressive measures and commending him. Furthermore Finlay seeks to portray the severity of the situation which is challenged and arguably corrected in Source 2. He states Dyer had 'found an enormous gathering of men, many of them criminals of the worst type'. Again, justifying his actions, Finlay not only indicates Dyer but also displays an attitude of admiration towards him. In actual fact, the gathering at the Dalimwala Bagh garden was due to a Sikh religious festival which saw around 10,000 to 20,000 unarmed men attend. Thus, the historian must approach this portrayal of a volatile situation with caution. The final sentence encapsulates the entire outlook of the source: 'if General Dyer had hesitated, all would have been lost'. Indeed, the general celebratory tone that justifies and commends Dyer's actions portrays him with a hero-like quality and an undeniably positive attitude. Overall, the source, albeit it distorting on the events of Amritsar, is highly useful in portraying ~~the~~ <sup>angle</sup> one side of British opinion that praised Dyer.

Where Source 1 celebrates and respects Dyer's actions

Source 2 falls ~~on~~ the opposing side. Taken whilst the Hunter Commission was being carried out the source falls at an intense moment on the Amritsar timeline and is valuable in showing the divided opinions on Dyer. Furthermore, published in New Zealand ~~the source~~ a Dominion within the British Empire arguably places it on a moral ground that forces sympathy towards India, given that ~~it~~ India was still under the Raj's ultimate control (Indeed, this sympathetic tone is reflected in the source). Discussing the Hunter Commission the source asserts that 'it covers up the truth regarding the Government of the Punjab and martial law'. As mentioned, the Commission only gently censured Dyer, despite his responsibility in killing 379 people <sup>and</sup> injuring 1,500 with 1,650 rounds of ammunition which only stopped after ammunition ran out. Where Source 1 refuses to address <sup>his</sup> the act of barbarism, Source 2 challenges Dyer's treatment and portrays him in a negative light. ~~Indeed, the actions at the Jallianwala Bagh as 'open to criticism' & displaying the criticisms of Dyer under the Hunter Commission~~ the article asserts 'they defend the use of martial



law both for preventing the rebellion and for punishment'. As showcased in source 1, the article is useful in portraying the inadequate and 'weak' findings of the commission. Discussing general Indian opinion it asserts they 'declare that the conduct of General Dyer was inhuman' and 'they reject the Majority's theory that the riots amounted to rebellion'. This is useful in highlighting Indian opinion which resented Dyer ~~as a person~~ whilst also reminding the historian of the riots that were triggered by the Rowlatt Act as the motivator for Amritsar. ~~The~~ Furthermore, in Congress' separate enquiry on the Massacre they concluded it was 'a calculated piece of inhumanity' publishing graphic images. Therefore, the ~~text~~ <sup>source</sup> is sourceful in portraying the Indian opinion that highly condemned Dyer and his actions in Amritsar. In addition, the source usefully goes on to discuss the other side of British opinion that that of Source 1. Drawing on Montagu's opinions it discusses his opinions of Dyer's actions as a 'complete violation' and ~~is~~ who 'criticises Dyer's inhumanity in neglecting the wounded'. This reminds the historian

that the House of Commons had passed a motion in direct contrast to that of the House of Lords, condemning Dyer's actions, albeit gently. Therefore, source 2 is highly useful in displaying the negative and condemning attitudes towards Dyer.

Ultimately, only together can the starkly conflicting attitudes towards Dyer in 1857 be concluded. Although source 1 is misleading in portraying the actual events of the Massacre it is highly useful in demonstrating the praising attitudes from the House of Lords. Adopting a highly celebratory tone that commends Dyer whilst justifying his actions, the source portrays the positive attitudes towards him. It is only alongside source 2 that the complete British response be understood; only together, can the historian confirm that British opinion remained divided with some praising Dyer and others condemning him. ~~Source 2~~ is also. Furthermore, perhaps the tone of source 1 which commends and congratulates Dyer confirms and adds context to the

'in-human and un-British' Indian opinion  
on his actions and the British response to  
them.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is an impressive level 5 response. The candidate has developed and supported inferences that are linked to contextual knowledge to develop the analysis even further.



## Question 2

The focus of this question was the significance of the Soweto Uprising. A minority of candidates did not deal with this focus but discussed a range of issues linked to events at Soweto. Some of these responses did imply significance, but this was not universal. Most candidates were able to engage with the provenance of Source 3 effectively. However, a significant minority of candidates did not read the caption of Source 4 with sufficient care. It does not state that the source was a newspaper article, rather that the author was employed by a newspaper at the time of the Soweto Uprising. A minority of candidates concentrated the bulk of their answer on discussing the weight that the Sources would bear in terms of their provenance, some of them doing this to a very high standard. In such answers, it was often the case that little reference was made to the content of the sources. Where there was reference to the content of the Sources in such answers, often it was a brief summary of content rather than an interrogation of it in reference to the terms of the question.

A historian could make greater use of Source 3 when investigating the significance of the Soweto uprising than Source 4, as it ~~explain~~ conveys the repercussions of the slaughter which had a ripple effect for change. Whereas Source 4, ~~few~~ is limited in explaining the uprising's significance as it solely focuses on the events at the demonstration. Together however, they demonstrate the significance of the uprising to have exposed the faults in the Apartheid system.

In Source 3, a his  
~~later~~ Source 3 is of high utility when investigating the significance of the Soweto uprising as it expressed the level of condemnation the Apartheid regime had received as a result of the Soweto uprising.

In For example, by stating that "black unity [is a] victory", Mandela is alluding to the success of Black Consciousness which inspired pride and celebration of being a black African <sup>which had been as a result</sup> ~~as it was a catalyst for~~ ~~vital~~ ~~greater opposition to the discrimination deeply~~ ~~rooted in South Africa, as seen through the Soweto~~ ~~uprising~~ which had rejuvenated grass-root resistance.

Furthermore, Mandela addresses the backlash the Apartheid government had received, "both within and beyond [South Africa] borders", which is a direct address to the "UN [and the] Anti-Apartheid Movement [AAM]" which had condemned South Africa massively, manifesting itself in the UN resolutions 1st stating that violence will continue unless Apartheid ends, and pro mass protests outside the South African Embassy. It is here, the Source provides its highest value, as it not only through its angered tone ~~expose the~~ mirror the global resentment towards the horrific activities within South Africa, depicted mostly through the police forces, but it shows how the Soweto uprising 1972 had laid the foundation for further international sanctions. By the Source, being from the figurehead of opposition, Mandela, the Source's utility is heightened massively as its first hand account provides authenticity in its attitudes towards the happenings in Soweto whilst providing insight to the general reaction of the uprising domestically within South Africa. Furthermore, by being written in 1977, a year after Soweto, the Source would automatically be more centred and influenced by the feelings of anger as was at the time of great conflict. Yet, by the Source failing to omit, the raft of repressive measures after Soweto, such as the granting of greater control



to the police, the Source ignores how the uprising whilst giving new heights to opposition to Apartheid, had strengthened repression & ~~giving~~ making South Africa have ~~at the~~ the trappings of a police state.

Although, the Source claim include this it does still maintain its high usefulness in investigating the significance of Soweto as unlike Source 1, which focuses on the internal repercussions, Source 3 provides great insight to both the internal and external effects of the Soweto where it had created a "Solid wall of resistance", especially as it helped the ANC to recognise their opposition by providing Cadres to set a new generation of fighters and infiltration routes through Zambia and Mozambique due to their ~~own~~ sympathy for ~~ethnic~~ ~~minority~~ opposition groups after seeing the police and government ~~repercussions~~ activity in Soweto.

Source 4, however which is later in provenance as published in 1990 where tensions were relaxing as Nelson Mandela won a noble peace prize after being released during publication. As this means that Sparks would have a ~~under~~ weaker understanding of the immediate significance. Yet, one may argue that it offers a wider ~~span~~ acknowledgement of Soweto's significance as it is able to assert its importance and as a catalyst for ~~greater~~ the actions of the government and opposition after

uprising due to more archives available. Because of this, it becomes transparent perhaps that Soweto was the significant as it exposed the faults in the Apartheid System meaning it was the beginning of the end for the discriminatory government. By it being a newspaper however, and not a message like Source 3, the provence is again weakened as would have been censored to a degree if it took sides. So the Source is fairly neutral in taking sides, and instead directs focus on the administration, creating a very impersonal tone. The Source, is of moderate value, as it does highlight, how "Soweto was ablaze" which led to 176 dead, which is highly accurate as even though 20 died at the uprising, it was responsible for the death of 1000 afterwards due to the mass protests that took control of South Africa, as seen in the Source where it states that "violence had spread to 160 different communities", as there was in fact 80 protests internally in South Africa after the uprising. The Source, furthermore demonstrates the need for transformation, alluding to a slight shift in government attitudes, "Commercial development and no separate homelands", as it shows how Soweto paved a path for unity and acceptance of all races, as shown through Trask becoming the first Independent homeland in 1979 and greater rights opportunity. Therefore,



Source 4 is of moderate utility when investigating the significance of opposition as it shows the hope for ~~france~~ Constitutional reform within South Africa, but ~~the~~ Source 3 is of higher utility as it provides a wider explanation of the ~~ten~~ effects of Soweto, such as the global outcry and the strengthening of opposition ~~was~~ influenced by the ~~a~~ <sup>small</sup> picture of Hector Pieterson that had begun the mobilisation of the government.

Both Sources together are of high use to a historian investigating the significance of Apartheid as it shows a continuity in opinion and effect such as the need to end Apartheid <sup>as from different times</sup>. By this, a historian is provided with unrefutable evidence that Soweto uprising <sup>is</sup> was a turning point in South Africa, in every way. Alongside this, through both Sources ~~providing~~ explaining the different ~~stage~~ impacts, Source 3 on opposition and Source 4 at African Standard of living which allowed to greater investment into healthcare to reduce the number of slums which was 70% of the dwellings, a historian of a wider perspective ~~of the~~ on the importance of <sup>the</sup> Soweto uprising <sup>in forming</sup> for the South Africa we see today.

In conclusion, Source 3 is of more use to a historian

than Source 4, as not only does it have a higher utility as a first person account at one time of great violence, it ~~is~~ provides a more in-depth account of how and why Sauer's was of great significance more so than Source 4. Although Source 4, is of moderate utility, it more so strengthens Source 3 by conveying the <sup>now possible chance</sup> need to end Apartheid and reform South Africa, with Sauer in both Sources being the catalyst for change.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 response. It deals with Source 3 more effectively than it deals with Source 4 in both drawing out inferences and dealing with its value. Indeed, it seems to change its mind about the value of Source 4 in the course of the answer.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Read the caption of a source carefully to ensure that you have understood it.

### Question 3

This was slightly the more popular question in Section B for 9HI02F.1. Candidates clearly understood the demands of this question and almost all candidates compared the significance of the salt *satyagraha* to that of at least one other civil disobedience campaign. In fact, most candidates realised that the chronological range of the question required references to the 1920-22 *satyagraha* and the Quit India campaign. Most candidates handled the 1920-22 *satyagraha* and the salt *satyagraha* more effectively than the *Quit India* campaign. Stronger answers were able to focus effectively on the impact of the various campaigns and compare their relative significance. Weaker responses tended to be more narrative in their approach, describing what happened in each campaign, but even where this approach was taken, candidates often drew some analytical points out in the conclusion.



Many civil disobedience campaigns took place in the years 1920-42 within India to try and pressure change and challenge the British. I'll be discussing why I believe the Salt Satyagraha (1930) to be the most impactful whilst also discussing how other campaigns such as Gandhi's non-cooperation campaign (1920-1922) and the Quit India campaign also had some impact.

It could be somewhat argued that Gandhi's non-cooperation campaign was the most impactful civil disobedience campaign in the years 1920-42. This is because this was the first real attempt at this strategy and can be said to be somewhat successful, evident with Congress membership increasing from a base of 100,000 to 2 million by the end of 1921. This civil disobedience campaign involved boycotting taxes, withholding taxes and not buying imports. The plan for this was to make the Raj ungovernable and force the British out of India. Initially this would've been seen as a great way of challenging the British as this <sup>movement</sup> ~~factor~~ didn't involve violence, hence the British really couldn't counter the Indians and

arrest them as they weren't technically doing anything wrong. This would've led to great success and have a massive impact as this would've made British rule in India extremely hard with the Indians simply not complying to what the British expected, and that would in theory allow the goal of forcing the British out to be possibly met. However, people misunderstood the morality of this movement and hence completely ruined what could've possibly been a successful and impactful campaign. Attacks and violence broke out and from that point on there was no chance of the campaign being successful as it ended with a police station being attacked and 22 police officers dying, leading to imprisonment for Gandhi which would halt progress. Though it could be viewed as a success as it increased membership and was only a first attempt.

The Salt Satyagraha on the other hand was masterfully carried out and could be argued to be the most impactful civil disobedience campaign. This is because this was an issue that affected all Indians <sup>(Salt tax)</sup> and needed hence allow for mass support and outrage. The campaign was also carried out in a smarter way than the



previous non-cooperation campaign. This is evident as here allowed nationalist demands to be heard nationwide in Britain. This was evident as Congress now authorised provinces to carry out their own protests. This was of massive significance as the movement wouldn't ~~not~~ now only be concentrated in one area which would make it harder for the British to deal with. This was evident with nationwide protests which now occurred in India. This would've had a huge ~~imp~~ bearing on the impactfulness of the satyagraha as people were now able to act against the British and that too, to a large extent as protests were nationwide. This would've allowed Congress to put forward their nationalist demands and express their feeling towards the British in a successful manner. However, like the non-cooperation campaign in 1920-22 it ended in arrest and this time to a massive scale, 60,000 people were incarcerated including Gandhi and Congress members. This would've again limited the impactfulness of this satyagraha as further actions couldn't be taken to capitalise on the success of the campaign. Although we can still agree that success stemmed from Congress gaining attention to their demands.

It could be fairly agreed that the Quit India campaign (1942) was the most impactful form of civil disobedience. This is because it was carried out during WW2 and was a cause of growing tensions with the British. This ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> mean that the British would not struggle to retain control in India as Congress were now ready for a harder approach which was fuelled by the Cripps mission where the INC saw proposals from Britain in order for cooperation in the war as too conservative. This ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> fuelled anger even more as the British expected Indians to help with war again after they weren't given their full reward for their contribution to WW1. This increased anger ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> been deadly for Britain as they were ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> focused on their own war effort which meant the Indians could take advantage and out-do the British in India. Though this again ~~seemed~~ <sup>seemed</sup> seemed a good idea like Gandhi's first non-cooperation campaign it didn't go to plan. This is because Congress members were arrested before they could carry out the campaign due to ~~harder~~ <sup>harder</sup> approaches by the British. This meant that Gandhi left the people to carry



out the campaign which ultimately was successful as it brought detention, death and despair and the military stayed loyal to the British. Hence leading to very little if not any change.

To conclude, I believe the Salt Satyagraha to be the most impactful civil disobedience campaign in the years 1920-42. This is because this campaign was one that was carried out diligently and was well thought out. It was more strategic than the other campaigns that were either done out of instinct/anger (quit India) or weren't followed correctly (non-cooperation campaign) which ultimately allowed for Congress to achieve their aims of being heard and gaining nationwide support during the Salt Satyagraha. And though the other campaigns were based on good ideas and could've worked if handled correctly, too many variables went wrong during these campaigns, e.g. violence in non-cooperation campaign and imprisonment before quit India, which meant they ~~were~~ weren't as impactful as they really could've been.



This is a sound level 4 response. It considers each of the three civil disobedience campaigns in turn, drawing out some of the ways in which their impact is significant and/or limited. It pulls together the relative significance of each in the conclusion



Try to compare relative significance throughout the essay, don't just leave it until the conclusion.

## Question 4

This was slightly the less popular question in Section B for 9HI02F.1. Candidates answered it from a variety of standpoints, some agreeing with the proposition in the question and some challenging it. The effects of Gandhi at the Second Round Table Conference were analysed in different ways, with many responses tending toward an analytical rather than a narrative approach. Most responses were able to offer specific details and examples to support their argument. However, there was a minority of responses that struggled to go beyond the role of Gandhi in any meaningful way, that confused the events of the three Round Table Conferences and whose grasp on the British political context at the time of the Second Round Table Conference was limited.

## 1) Gandhi poor politics

- Gandhi did tours of UK. Tried at conferences
- Insisted at being sole rep. out of his depth.
- Couldn't understand political issues.
- Stubbornness - No reserved seats for Muslims, Untouchables. Haggled over no. of seats.
- Found Gandhi hard to work with.

## 2) British politics. ✓ less clear role.

- No MacDonald at 2nd RILC. Busy bc of Lloyd George Crisis.
- British public were anti RILC. Wanted to keep hold of India. Jewel of Empire. Churchill India Defence League.
- Newspapers ~~criticised~~ <sup>warned</sup> against storing <sup>arms</sup> keeping India, bc of British interest in India.

## 3) Muslim Hindu Muslim tensions existing deep of Post WW1 League.

- British didn't trust Gandhi, esp as he saw Gandhi support for ~~Radical~~ <sup>Radical</sup> movement against Gov.
- Gandhi couldn't understand depths of H-M <sup>Mus</sup> Govt. So ~~made~~ <sup>made</sup> reserved seats debate made tensions worse.
- Muslim Muslims feared a Hindu Raj. ~~Wanted~~ <sup>Wanted</sup> more seats for more elections.
- British leaving Congress after rejected his ideas in 1928.



It is very accurate to say that Gandhi's poor political skills were the ~~principle~~ <sup>main</sup> reason for the failure of the Second Round Table Conference in 1931, as Gandhi was seen as more of a hindrance than help due to his stubbornness at certain issues, making him difficult to work with, which I will further discuss in this essay. Other reasons for the failure of the Second Round Table Conference include the British political landscape during this time and existing Hindu-Muslim tensions, all contributing to the failure.

The first reason why Gandhi's political skills were the main reason for the failure is because he did not give them his full energy. On his arrival to the UK, Gandhi toured the country to meet with <sup>new groups of</sup> workers at factories <sup>such as in</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>consequence</sup> looked up to him. He gave himself a very busy schedule, meaning that he had little energy for the Conference. He was often pictured being asleep at the conferences, ~~as~~ as well as people stating he often seemed bored. By not being able to give his full energy, it made it more difficult for any progress to be made. Another reason is because Gandhi insisted on being the sole representative for Congress. This was agreed to in the Irwin Gandhi Pact. Gandhi being the sole representative of the party, who was identified as being the key component to the success of the Round Table Conferences at the 1st Round Table Conference as 'whatever concessions were made meant nothing without Congress' approval, meant his views were going to be listened to strongly, and every effort would be made to adhere to his wishes. ~~As~~ This ~~meant~~ <sup>meant</sup> his strong stances on the issue of reserved seats for minorities resulted in the Conference remaining stagnant. Gandhi was not a politician

well versed in politics, so it is accurate to say he was out of his depth. Another reason why Gandhi's political skills were the main reason for the failure of the Round Table Conference was because he was stubborn. Gandhi was not easy to work with, with his advisors calling him "The Holy Fox". He was also spent a lot of the conference haggling over the number of reserved seats for Muslims, which did not please Jinnah, as well as absolutely refusing seats for Untouchables, for his spiritual reason stating how Untouchables were Hindus. This disregard for the Untouchables wishes not only caused the failure of the RTC but also lost him support from the Dalits. Gandhi's stubbornness at a time where the British were open and willing to come to an agreement meant the opportunities had not been fully utilised, so this makes Gandhi's poor political skills the <sup>main</sup> reason for the failure of the Second Round Table Conference.

Another reason for the failure of the second round table conference was the British political landscape. ~~But this was~~ The second round Table Conference did not have the PM MacDonald present, due to the struggling economy of the 1930s because of the Great Depression. This meant Labour PM MacDonald was more preoccupied with the Gold Standard Crisis was a more pressing matter, so took priority over the topic of India's Status. Without the PM there, it made it harder to ~~come~~ to agreements at the Conference. Another way the British political landscape was a cause for failure was the conservative reaction to the Conference. There was little support for



the RTC, from conservatives. They did not want to lose the 'Jewel of the empire', as they had heavily invested in India. This is shown by Churchill setting up the India Defence League in efforts to keep hold of India by getting public support. Another way the British landscape was ~~impacted~~ as cause of failure was the fact there was not a lot of public support. Newspapers printed reports about keeping India. Furthermore, ~~the great Conservative-Labour~~ public felt that there were more important matters, such as the effects of the declining economy and the Depression. Furthermore, the weak coalition government between Conservatives and Labour, 2 groups <sup>who</sup> ~~with~~ <sup>wanted</sup> very different outcomes made it more difficult to come to agreements.

The last reason for the failure of the 2nd RTC was the existing Hindu-Muslim tensions. Jinnah distrusted Gandhi. This was because he felt as if Gandhi's support for the Hindu-Muslim movement was a power grab. Jinnah felt as though Gandhi could not understand the depths of Hindu-Muslim grievances, and this was proven by Gandhi's resistance to <sup>the loss of</sup> ~~Muslims losing~~ <sup>reserved</sup> seats, making the tensions between them worse. Jinnah and Gandhi's history was also a reason for the failure. Jinnah was against the 1920-22 Satyagraha that Gandhi wanted and carried out, as he rightly predicted it would lead to Hindu-Muslim violence. Congress also ~~and~~ refused his 1928 proposal calling for a weak ~~dominant~~ government.

which resulted in Jinnah leaving Congress and going to England to study law. Congress also refused his 14 points program. These reasons show Congress and the League had a troubled partnership, making the second RTC doomed for failure as these two big forces could not agree. Gandhi did not understand what Muslims & gave high numbers of reserved seats. He did not see the League's views or see that they were fearful of being under a Hindu dominated Council due to years of communal violence. This makes the existing tensions between Hindus and Muslims a big reason for the failure of the second RTC.

In conclusion, the main reason for the failure of the second round table conference was Gandhi's poor political skills. He was stubborn and unwilling to work with the British or the other minorities at a time where he could have made great strides in independence as the British were treating Indians as equals, hence the nature of the Round table aspect of the conference, he worsened Hindu Muslim tensions as he could not apprehend the depths of misgivings. The British political landscape meant there was not as much support for the conference, however it was not the biggest reason as they could have come to further concessions if they did at the 1st RTC if Gandhi had been easier to work with and not so out of his depth.



This is a level 4/5 response. The candidate analyses the role of Gandhi in the failure of the Second Round Table Conference and then considers two other possible factors that might have also played a role. It clearly reaches a judgement in the conclusion.

## Question 5

This was the more popular question in Section B for 9HI02F.2. Some candidates treated this as a question on the weaknesses of the anti-apartheid movement. Although some of the material that this raised was relevant to the question set, it needed to be directed explicitly at this question. Some candidates confused the Treason Trial with the Rivonia trial. Most candidates also discussed Sharpeville, although this often involved considerable description of the events, with only limited consideration of the extent to which it posed a challenge to the anti-apartheid movement. For candidates who only used Sharpeville as the other factor, the chronological coverage of the question was limited, as it was missing the years 1948-56 – more than half the chronology. A wide range of differing other factors was seen in answers to this question. Stronger answers were able to focus effectively on the challenges posed by the Treason Trial relative to other challenges. Weaker responses tended to be more narrative in their approach, describing several challenges, but even where this approach was taken, candidates often drew some analytical points out in the conclusion.



When analysing the challenges faced by the anti-apartheid movements in the years 1948-1961, it is clear to suggest that the Treason Trial was significant, but was not the only factor that enforced challenge. Anti-apartheid movements also faced challenges such as the Unlawful Organisations Act, resulting from the Sharpeville Massacre, as well as the movements into homelands.

The Treason Trial 1956-1961, occurred from the creation of the Freedom Charter where all groups came together to create a document ~~and~~ of what they believed they desire. The Treason Trial was ~~a~~ significant as all key leaders of organisations were arrested and trialled for plotting against the government. This was significant as each party was left without a leader potentially causing disenfranchisement of groups leading to less pressure being applied on the National Party to prevent apartheid. However, what made the Treason Trial less significant than other factors was that all leaders were found not guilty therefore, allowing groups to continue making their situation being less challenging. Although the duration of the trial was long it allowed groups to use the Freedom Charter as their main demonstration especially the ANC. As groups continued to progress throughout the trial it led the Treason Trial to being a less significant

factor to challenging the anti-apartheid movement as it helped ~~for~~ to raise more awareness to apartheid.

~~Howe~~ Another factor considered to be significant to challenging the anti-apartheid movement was the Unlawful Organisations Act which was implemented by the government after the Sharpeville Massacre in 1960. This would be significant when challenging the movement as it cause organisations such as the ANC and PAC to be banned causing them to work underground. This applied challenge as many groups were unable to display any form of action against the apartheid government meaning they required time to make new tactics and strategies in order to raise awareness of anti-apartheid. It was also challenging as it made any movements created by organisations punishable by law meaning potential numbers and influence would decrease if they were not careful. However, the act led to splits within groups such as the ANC making the beliefs and desires of the groups less unified meaning being anti-apartheid was being represented and demonstrated differently throughout. The Unlawful Organisations Act devalues the significance of the Treason Trial as this could be considered to be more significant.

Overall, when analysing both factors presented it is clear to see that as the years progress, the significance of the Treason Trial when challenging anti-apartheid movement



decreased due to the increasing number of implementations made by the apartheid government in order to reduce the impact of anti-apartheid movements. This is also due to no mass consequences faced from the Treason Trial when comparing to the implementation of the Unlawful Organisations Act therefore, the accuracy of the statement can only be agreed to a certain extent to the significance of the Treason Trial.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a level 3 response. It understands the focus of the question. However, it lacks range insofar as it looks only at the stated factor and one other factor at the end of the chronology. It also tends to assert its conclusions rather than analyse them. It may be that the candidate runs out of time as the introduction mentions a factor that is not discussed in the response.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Ensure you organise your time effectively. Ensure that you have chronological spread across the timeframe of the question.

## Question 6

This was the less popular question in Section B for 9HI02F.2. There was some impressive contextual knowledge pertaining to the economy in this period, although it was not always entirely effectively linked to the strengthening of apartheid. The best answers did make that link and considered the impact of the economic recovery against the impact of other factors. Weaker answers tended to describe the economic recovery and other factors, some of which were outside the chronological parameters of the question.

I partly agree with the statement 'it was principally the economic recovery that strengthened apartheid in the years 1961-1968.' This is because although economic recovery contributed to the strengthening of the apartheid regime, other factors such as government repression and legislation can be viewed to be majorly influential.

~~The aspect of economic recovery should be viewed as an important factor towards the strengthening of apartheid, however it is not just it is only partly accurate to claim that economic recovery was the principle factor towards the strengthening of apartheid. During the 1960's, South Africa experienced a large economic boom that strengthened apartheid both domestically.~~

On the one hand, the aspect of economic recovery should be viewed as an important factor towards the strengthening of apartheid, this can be conveyed through its domestic influence on the apartheid regime. Through the 1960's, South Africa experienced a large economic boom, with foreign trade and income rising by a substantial rate, this provided citizens of South Africa with great prosperity. Due to the economic recovery, more jobs were created, seeing white employment rise by 50% alongside a



rise in white income of over 50%. This prosperity not only benefitted white South Africans, as it also contributed to the strengthening of the apartheid regime. Though the substantial rise in Afrikaner quality of life, the National Party began to dominate nationwide elections, as votes in favour of the party rose by at least 8% in the short term. This increase in power made the National Party government increasingly confident in their apartheid regime and that they had the full backing of the white population regarding their implementation of apartheid laws. Furthermore, the economic recovery also participated in the suppression of protests against apartheid. This is because in homelands such as Transkei in 1963, job opportunities and employment increased, with consumers becoming less political, this overall saw the suppression of anti-apartheid protests. Overall it can be inferred that through the domestic impact on white prosperity increasing the National Party's electoral power and general power. It ~~can~~ should be argued that the economic recovery was an important factor that strengthened apartheid in the years 1961-68. However, it can only be partly argued that economic recovery was the principle factor as despite white prosperity through rising living standards, white radical groups such as the ARM and NLC carried out various bombings on vulnerable infrastructure out of frustration towards the National Party's apartheid regime. These bombings were carried out through 1963-1964 and showcase that despite economic prosperity, not all white South Africans were content and supportive of the apartheid regime.

Furthermore, the aspect of economic recovery should be viewed as an important factor towards the strengthening of apartheid, this can be conveyed through the impact it had on international relations. Throughout the 1960s, alongside domestically improving the quality of life for South Africa's white Afrikaners, the economic recovery caused South Africa to emerge as a trading hub for various foreign countries, during this period overall foreign trade increased by 15% due to South Africa's possession of valuable minerals and resources. Trade with the UK increased by approximately 70%, and trade with the US increased by approximately 88%. Because of the strong trade relations South Africa developed with foreign countries, the National Government were able to implement apartheid legislation without the threat of sanctions, thus strengthening apartheid. This can be conveyed through hesitant international reactions towards the Sharpeville massacre as despite calls to impose sanctions from people across the world, foreign governments such as the UN council only condemned South Africa's apartheid regime out of fear it could harm their trade relations. Western countries were specifically hesitant as they did not want to lose South Africa as an ally amidst the development of the cold war. The limited action taken by foreign governments once more made the National Party government more confident in strengthening their apartheid regime, as they used some foreign income to buy and develop military weapons alongside the development of the Bureau of State Security, this one role aimed at intensifying maintaining racial segregation and the apartheid together with apartheid legislation.

It can therefore be overallly conveyed that the impact on foreign relations and the limited sanctions imposed on the apartheid government as a result of their oppressive laws ~~shows~~ implies that economic recovery should be seen as an important factor towards the strengthening of apartheid. However it should not be seen as principally responsible as despite lack of action from foreign governments, citizens from foreign countries such as Brit the UK boycotted South African goods such as fruits, Oliver Tambo, an individual who was exiled as a result of the 1956 treason trial also travelled globally to attend gatherings such as the UN council meeting in New York to spread anti-apartheid propaganda. This proved to damage apartheid in the long term.

On the other hand, I partly agree with the view that economic recovery was principally responsible for the strengthening of apartheid in the years 1961-1968, this is because there are other factors that should be viewed as equally, if not more important. One of those factors being government repression. During the 1960's the National Party government used government repression to substantially silence anti-apartheid protests, something that the economic recovery couldn't do. For example, as a result of the 1960 Sharpeville massacre, the National Party implemented legislation such as the 1962 Sabotage Act, this legislation defined sabotage more broadly and imposed detainment for at least those convicted of sabotage. Under the Sabotage Act, leading anti-apartheid organisation leaders such as Robert Sobukwe who



formed the Pan African Congress (PAC) were punished and detained, Robustwe specifically was detained under the 'Sabotage clause' which sent him to Robben Island, this ensured he would have no influence on opposing apartheid. The National Party also introduced legislation such as the Terrorism Act in 1967, this once more was a form of government repression aimed at intensifying suppressing anti-apartheid protests. Together, the sabotage and ~~Terrorism~~ Terrorism acts heavily suppressed opposition to apartheid though detaining influential individuals and radicalising opponents such as the Liberal Party. This legislation strengthened apartheid greatly as although economic recovery assured National Party power in elections, it failed to compress anti-apartheid protests on the large scale that government repression achieved, therefore conveying government repression as a crucial factor towards the strengthening of apartheid. However, although government repression mostly succeeded in repressing opposition, it was not totally effective as militant groups such as MK and ARM consistently carried out bombings and violent acts against government officials and infrastructure. These groups are examples of existing militant opposition that repressive legislation failed to eradicate totally.

In conclusion, I partly agree with the view that economic recovery is principally responsible for strengthening apartheid as factors such as government repression proved more important in sustaining apartheid rule and suppressing anti-apartheid protests, unlike economic recovery.



This answer accesses level 5. The candidate is aware of the importance of the economic recovery to the strengthening of apartheid. Links are made between the economic recovery and other factors in the course of the answer.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A

- Candidates should aim to draw out reasoned and developed inferences that go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources
- Candidates should read the caption carefully so that they can 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 any credit
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer but are certainly not required to do this all the way through the answer.

### Section B

- Candidates should not assume that every question will require a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses generally lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.



## **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>

