Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE

Friday 6 June 2025

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 ▶

P76441A

©2025 Pearson Education Ltd.
Y:1/1/1/1/1/

P 7 6 4 4 1 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 Clement Attlee, 'Memorandum on the Indian Situation, 2 February 1942'. Attlee was the leader of the Labour party and a member of Britain's wartime coalition government. The Memorandum was a response to opinions about India expressed by the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy.

I cannot accept the conclusion that nothing can or should be done about India at the present time. This seems to me to result from a dangerous ignoring of the present wartime situation. The Secretary of State thinks that we may survive the immediate situation by doing nothing, but what of subsequent problems? A policy that merely reacts to circumstances is not statesmanship. The increasingly large contribution in blood and tears and sweat made by Indians to the war effort will not be forgotten.

Having some first-hand knowledge of the constitutional problem of India, I am aware of its complexities. These complexities are made harder, not easier, by the war. They are made more, not less, urgent by the approach of war closer to the borders of India.

I consider that now is the time for an act of statesmanship. To do nothing is to lose India. A renewed effort must be made to get the leaders of the Indian political parties to unite. It is quite obvious that the Viceroy is not the man to do this. Lord Linlithgow thinks only in terms of making minor concessions, while maintaining the existing situation.

Source 2: From a letter written by Chakravarti Rajagopalachari to Gandhi, 21 July 1942. Rajagopalachari was a leading member of Congress who was opposed to the 'Quit India' movement. The letter was signed by three other members of Congress.

We have carefully read the Quit India Resolution passed by the Congress Party Working Committee on 14 July, which is to be placed before a full meeting of Congress next month. We feel it is our duty to give you our considered views on this matter.

We do not disagree with you about India's demand for complete freedom from foreign domination. However, the idea of the withdrawal of the current British Government, to be replaced by an Indian Government, is altogether impossible at this time. Even if the British could be persuaded to withdraw unconditionally, we are convinced that chaos would follow.

We feel that a Hindu-Muslim settlement is essential before a demand for withdrawal can reasonably be made, even though achieving such a settlement may be difficult. The major political organisations, namely the Congress Party and Muslim League, should develop a joint plan for a provisional Government that can take power and preserve the continuity of the State.

The serious international situation in which India is directly involved makes certain that it will be Japan that would gain immediately by the Quit India movement. If the movement could possibly displace the British Government by installing an Indian Government capable of resisting Japanese aggression, it might be worthwhile taking the risk. But, as this result is not even remotely probable, it will only produce more intense and large-scale repression and suffering. Attempting to displace the British Government would facilitate a Japanese invasion and occupation.

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

Sources for use with Question 2.

Source 3: From a speech made by Hendrik Verwoerd in the South African Parliament, 17 September 1953. Verwoerd was the Minister of Native Affairs and was speaking in favour of the passing of the Bantu Education Act.

When we consider European and Native education, there are certain fundamental educational principles that are common to both. However, when you come to the actual teaching, there are definitely differences. What's the use of subjecting a Native child to a curriculum that is traditionally European? What is the use of teaching Bantu children mathematics when they cannot use it in practice? That is quite absurd.

Education must train and teach people in accordance with their position in life. Some Natives have to be trained to be able to serve their people in the higher professions. However, there is a much greater number of Natives who have to find a future in other forms of work.

If the Native is being taught to expect that he will live his adult life under a policy of equal rights, he is making a big mistake. We are in favour of the Native's development within his own sphere and in the service of his own people. The Native should be introduced to that idea early on. Should the South African Government spend money creating an ever-increasing number of dissatisfied persons, or should we look for a way of improving racial relations by giving these people the chance of suitable development?

Source 4: From Frances Baard's autobiography, *My Spirit Is Not Banned*, published 1986. Baard was a black South African political activist and member of the ANC Women's League in the 1950s. Here she is recalling her involvement with the campaign to oppose the 1953 Bantu Education Act.

We didn't want this bad Bantu Education Act for our children. Our children would only go to school for three hours a day, two shifts of children every day, so that more children could get a little bit of learning without the government having to spend more money. Verwoerd didn't want our children to get a proper education; with this education system, he wanted to deny them opportunities and keep them down. Before 1953, the education was a bit better, Christian missionaries mostly ran the schools, but now all the schools were going to be run by the government.

In December 1954, at the ANC conference, we rejected this new education plan and started to organise a boycott of government schools. But we couldn't leave the children like that, out of school and learning nothing. So, every morning the children were taken by bus to ANC-organised 'cultural clubs'. We weren't allowed to call them schools because it was illegal to have a school that wasn't registered with the government.

When the government saw that all the children were going to these clubs, they started sending the police to arrest the teachers and to intimidate the children and their parents. Some people were afraid and started to send their children back to the government schools. But some of the children didn't go back to those schools for a long time. Some of the 'cultural clubs' stayed open until 1960.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Acknowledgements:

Source 1 from: *The Indian Nationalist Movement 1885–1947*, B. N. Pandey © Macmillan, 1979

Source 2 from: *Indian Politics 1936–42*, R Coupland, © Oxford University Press, 1942

Source 3 from: *Apartheid*, Edgar H Brookes, © Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968

Source 4 from: https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/bantu-education-boycott