Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

History

Advanced
Paper 2: Depth study
Option 2F.1: India, c1914–48: the road to independence
Option 2F.2: South Africa, 1948–94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation'

Friday 16 June 2017 – Morning
Sources Booklet

Paper Reference
9HI0/2F

Do not return this booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P50509A

©2017 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1/1/1

P 5 0 5 0 9 A

Pearson

Sources for use with Section A.

Answer the question in Section A on the option for which you have been prepared.

Option 2F.1: India, c1914–48: the road to independence

Sources for use with Question 1.

Source 1: From a speech made by Madan Mohan Malaviya at a regional meeting of Congress at Lucknow, 10 August 1917. Malaviya was a leading member of Congress and its President in 1909 and in 1918.

At the outbreak of the war, His Majesty sent a gracious message to the princes and people of India that he had entered upon the war in defence of the cause of justice and liberty. The princes and people of India loyally responded to His Majesty's appeal to stand up to fight for what was right and for the Empire. In view of the splendid rally of India to the cause of the Empire, the first thing this deserved was that all distinctions between the Indian and European fellow-subjects of His Majesty should once and for all be removed. It is a matter for deep regret that these distinctions remain as they were before the war broke out. I have been repeatedly told that the matter is under consideration. I regret that the consideration has been so prolonged. The matter is one of simple justice.

As regards constitutional reforms, the Congress and the Muslim League have recommended that His Majesty should issue a proclamation announcing that it is the aim and intention of British policy to confer self-government on India at an early date. I cannot understand why the Government does not make such a pronouncement as there is no serious difference of opinion between ourselves and the British about self-government being the goal of British policy in India.

Source 2: From a statement made by Edwin Montagu, Secretary of State for India, to the House of Commons, 6 August 1918.

I should like to say a word or two about the Indian war effort. It is well known that Indian troops have played their part, and are playing by far the larger part in Mesopotamia and Palestine*, and, at the beginning of the War, played a very large part in France.

I claim it with confidence, that the principles of reform which we have recommended throughout are not principles which arise now, but are the logical, inevitable outcome of over 100 years of British rule of India. The developments have led inevitably to the conditions which have arisen today, when those people whom we taught and trained have come to us and said, 'You have taught us the value of self-government; set us on the road to obtain it.' I do not say that that demand for self-government was not quickened by the War. The statements of our own ideals, the hatred of the German ideal, the share of India in this war of liberty have all added their impulse to this development. They have made an irresistible appeal to the Government of India for some further steps in the development of self-government.

*Mesopotamia and Palestine – regions in the Middle East where campaigns were fought during the First World War

Option 2F.2: South Africa, 1948–94: from apartheid state to 'rainbow nation'

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From *The New York Times* newspaper, 3 July 1992. Here it is reporting on the breakdown of CODESA talks, 26 May 1992.

In a letter to Nelson Mandela, Mr. de Klerk said the Government would accept a new constitution ratified by 70 per cent of an assembly elected by South Africans of all races. Mr. Mandela was prepared to agree this figure in May, but may find it difficult now, with his allies apparently set on a course of confrontation. Further complicating things, Mr. de Klerk's concession was buried near the end of an angry 31-page letter that accused Mr. Mandela of favouring radicals determined to overthrow white rule by force. The ANC withdrew from the deadlocked negotiations because of what it said was the Government's guilt in aiding supporters of Inkatha* in carrying out a massacre in Boipatong township. Mr. de Klerk said the mounting toll of township deaths should be blamed in large part on the ANC for having failed to prevent the civil wars that have cost thousands of black lives. Much of the angry language appeared to be directed toward the international audience whose favour both sides have fought to win.

*Inkatha – Inkatha Freedom Party, a South African political organisation that promoted Zulu nationalism

Source 4: From a statement made by Amnesty International to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 4 February 1994. Amnesty International is an international organisation that promotes human rights. In the 1960s, Amnesty International did not regard Nelson Mandela as a prisoner of conscience because of his links to violence.

The hopes for the new South Africa will never be achieved if those who seek to participate in the 1994 elections become victims of illegal executions, deliberate killings, torture or arbitrary detention*. The present government bears the greatest burden of responsibility for this through its control of the security forces.

In some areas, violence and fear – whether the fear of violent attack or the fear of arbitrary detention and torture – are casting deep shadows over the prospects for a free and fair election. In 1993, according to the South African-based Human Rights Commission, at least 4,364 people died in incidents of political violence and through acts of terrorism. Nearly 90 per cent of these deaths occurred in Natal and in the townships on the East Rand near Johannesburg, where the political conflict between supporters of the African National Congress and the Inkatha Freedom Party is most intense. Amongst last year's victims were political leaders at national, regional and local level, trade unionists, and peacemakers, who were targeted for assassination by their political opponents, or by members of the security forces.

In many of these situations, the role of the security forces has been highly questionable. It has ranged from the direct involvement of the police in 'death squad' killings and participation in Inkatha Freedom Party attacks on African National Congress supporters and trade unionists in Northern Natal, through South African Police Internal Stability Unit involvement in arbitrary detentions, torture and murders.

*arbitrary detention – imprisoned without just cause

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.