Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

Friday 7 June 2024

Afternoon (Time: 1 hour 30 minutes)

Paper reference **9HI0/2F**

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'

Sources Booklet

Do not return this Booklet with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

P75764A

©2024 Pearson Education Ltd.
F:1/1/1/1/1/1/

P 7 5 7 6 4 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 letter written by Lord Reading, the Viceroy of India, to David Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, 4 May 1922. Here Reading is reflecting on Gandhi's actions since the start of the *satyagraha* in 1920.

I am sure you have been interested in following the developments of the non-cooperation movement, which ended two months ago in the arrest of Gandhi. He preaches, I believe with all sincerity, that non-violence is the most powerful weapon for ordinary people against the Government of India.

As Gandhi's influence increased, largely because Indians saw him as leading a saintly life, he gradually found himself to be the leader of a political party. He had made a bridge between Hindus and Muslims and was of great importance politically.

I have always thought that Gandhi became more the politician than the holy man and that these roles were not compatible. Although he showed considerable insight at times in his handling of the political situation, he never seemed to have a practical plan for government. This may be because he feared that it would cause divisions among his supporters. Some of his supporters were for complete independence, whilst others (who I believe to be the majority) wanted self-government under the British Empire. As time progressed, it became difficult to know where he was attempting to lead India.

Gandhi's more sensible followers began to wonder whether he would achieve anything beyond agitation and disturbance. As Gandhi's influence declined, so the more moderate and sensible people in India started to oppose him.

Source 2: From the autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru, *Toward Freedom*, published 1936. Here he is describing reactions to the ending of the 1920–22 *satyagraha*.

> The events at Chauri Chaura*, and its consequences, made us examine the implications of non-violence as a tactic. We believed that, if Gandhi's arguments for ending the campaign were correct, our opponents would always have the power to create circumstances that would necessarily result in our abandoning the struggle. Was this the fault of the non-violent method itself or of Gandhi's interpretation of it? After all, he was the author and originator of it, and who could be a better judge of what it was and what it was not? And without Gandhi, where was our movement?
>
> It may be that we made the right decision to suspend civil resistance in 1922, though the manner of doing it left much to be desired and brought about a certain demoralisation. It is possible, however, that this sudden ending of a great movement contributed to a tragic development in the country. The drift to sporadic and futile violence in the political struggle was stopped, but the suppressed violence had to find a way out. In the following years, this decision perhaps aggravated the communal trouble. It is just possible that if civil resistance had not been stopped and the movement had instead been crushed by Government, there would have been less communal bitterness.

*Chauri Chaura – an attack on a police station by supporters of Congress that led Gandhi to call off the 1920–22 *satyagraha*

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

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a letter written by Helen Suzman to her daughter, who was studying in France, 29 March 1960. This letter was reproduced in Suzman's autobiography (1993) with an additional comment. Suzman was an anti-apartheid MP and a founding member of the Progressive Party in 1959.

I have had eight meetings with all sorts of people to try to find out the truth of the ghastly happenings at Sharpeville. All the evidence points to needless and hysterical shootings by the police. I've got a sworn statement from one of the two white eye witnesses – the only two white people who were there, other than the police. He said that the crowd was good humoured. Even when the shooting started, he didn't quite believe it was really happening.

The government's reaction to Sharpeville has varied from defying the world to a sudden change of attitude, when it was announced that no more arrests would be made under the Pass Laws for the moment. Verwoerd is attending the Prime Ministers' Conference in London in May. He wouldn't want any more riots, so has called off the police for now.

There have been organised pass burnings, with Luthuli* taking the lead. The ANC is horrified at the success of the PAC campaign and is rushing around calling for a one-day strike. Yesterday was declared a day of mourning by the ANC; Johannesburg was like a dead city. Just how successful the pass-burning campaign will be, I don't know, but I imagine the government will have to modify the pass system.

Suzman's later additional comment:

I was incorrect. The Pass Laws were soon reinstated.

*Albert Luthuli – president of the ANC

Source 4: From an article written by Aggrey Klaaste, published in the *Sowetan* newspaper, 26 October 1988. Klaaste was a black South African journalist and editor.

I am 48 years old and have lived through 40 years of National Party rule. It has been a dreadful experience. I have lived through three historic turning points in the country's history, including Sharpeville. As a journalist, I have been somewhere near the centre of events.

After Sharpeville, a pattern was established that would be repeated in the coming years. After the first shock of the tragedy, we were provoked into uncontrollable anger, which was then ruthlessly suppressed by the State. The aftermath of the tragedy saw the banning of the ANC and PAC and the systematic destruction of almost all political dissent.

Day after bitter day, we opposed the government by writing and speaking of the evils of apartheid. Unwittingly, we were reinforcing the deep, but ineffective, anger in the hearts of black South Africans. I am not saying there was anything wrong in that. It was a natural reaction, but we were planting the seed for the next explosion.

Meanwhile, white communities were being told a different story. They were made to believe that everything was under control. The government and its media reinforced this view. Even those whites who had been close to the black struggle gave themselves a silent hug of comfort. The people were told repeatedly that the few radicals who had inflamed a gullible black population had been defeated.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements:

Source 1 from: *The Indian Nationalist Movement 1885-1947,* By Bishwa Nath Pandey © MacMillan, 1979

Source 2 from: https://archive.org/stream/towardfreedomthe000770mbp#page/n107/mode/2up/search/chauri

Source 3 from: *In No Uncertain Terms,* By Helen Suzman, © Mandarin, 1994

Source 4 from: *South African Despatches,* By J Crwys-Williams, © Ashanti Publishing, 1989