



## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE History (9HI0/2F)  
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'

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Summer 2019

Publications Code 9HI0\_2F\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Section A

Target: A02: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the source material by selecting and summarising information and making undeveloped inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid inferences.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria but with limited justification.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may be weakly substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/ or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

Target: A01: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
3	8–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
4	13–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
5	17–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</b></p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the nature of British government in India in the years 1918–20.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The source is an official document produced for the British government and is therefore likely to reflect its views</li> <li>The authors of the source are Montagu (the Secretary of State for India) and Chelmsford (the Viceroy) and both are very well-informed about British government in India because of their positions</li> <li>The ideas and recommendations encapsulated in the report would be the basis of legislation the following year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of British government in India in the years 1918–20: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It suggests that the British government knows what is best for the interests of both Britain and India</li> <li>It provides evidence of the desire of the British government to increase <b>the participation of Indians in the Legislative Assembly ('enlarged and made more representative')</b></li> <li>It points to the need for the extension of rights and powers to Indians to be undertaken gradually and suggests that the success of this should be under constant scrutiny.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The decision by Britain to move towards greater self-government for India was partly the result of the loyalty shown by India in the First World War</li> <li>Edwin Montagu had shown his commitment to a gradual move to self-government through the Montagu Declaration 1917</li> <li>Before the writing of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, Montagu travelled widely in India listening to a range of opinions</li> <li>The 1919 Government of India Act set up a system of dyarchy.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Source 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The source is a letter from a leading Indian nationalist to the Viceroy and <b>as such might be expected to be a frank expression of Gandhi's views</b></li> <li>The source considers how Indians perceive the nature of British government in India</li> <li>The tone of the letter demonstrates that Gandhi is very angry about recent events in the Punjab.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of British government in India in the years 1918–20: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It claims that the Viceroy was not taking the events that had happened at</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Amritsar sufficiently seriously</b> ('treated this official crime casually')</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that British government was not acceptable to Gandhi</li> <li>• It argues that the events at Amritsar were disproportionate to the provocation that caused them</li> <li>• It claims that the British government had no genuine concern for the Indian people ('hopelessly indifferent').</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rioting had begun in Punjab as a result of the arrests of those who were leading opposition to the implementation of the Rowlatt Acts</li> <li>• The Hunter Committee censured Dyer, thus forcing his resignation, and <b>reprimanded O'Dwyer</b></li> <li>• The House of Commons upheld the censure of Dyer, but the House of Lords voted against censuring him.</li> </ul> <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source 1 presents a British perspective whereas Source 2 presents an Indian perspective</li> <li>• Source 1 deals with British government through legislative policy whereas Source 2 deals with it through a specific incident</li> <li>• Source 1 takes a positive view of British government in India whereas Source 2 takes a negative view</li> <li>• Source 1 suggests that British government in India brings benefits to Indians, whereas Source 2 suggests it maintains itself through indifference and cruelty.</li> </ul>

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited <b>according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme</b>. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to shed light on the use of international sanctions as a means of achieving change in South Africa in the 1980s.</p> <p>Source 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The speech was made in the British parliament and is therefore evidence of how a British politician viewed the possibility of the use of sanctions</li> <li>Ten Minute Rule Bills do not necessarily reflect the view point of the British government</li> <li>The proposal of a Ten Minute Rule Bill demonstrates that there were some politicians in Britain who wished to implement sanctions</li> <li>The tone of the piece makes it clear that Carlisle opposed sanctions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the use of international sanctions as a means of achieving change in South Africa in the 1980s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It states that all South Africans will suffer as a result of sanctions</li> <li>It suggests that the author feels there would be more progress made by building on reforms rather than implementing sanctions</li> <li>It provides evidence of the view that the economic impact of sanctions is likely to be significant through the references to unemployment statistics</li> <li>It claims that the use of sanctions was counterproductive as its impact was likely to be an escalation of violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The British Conservative party did not support a policy of implementing economic sanctions, preferring to work through negotiation</li> <li>There were some leading liberal South African politicians who did not support the imposition of economic sanctions because they believed that they would be harmful to poor blacks, e.g. Helen Suzman</li> <li>The impact of major banks pulling out of South Africa in the mid-1980s triggered a financial crisis.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Source 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author of the source is a leading anti-apartheid campaigner whose opinion carries weight</li> <li>As a general press statement, it was intended to reach a wide audience, both at home and abroad</li> <li>The tone of the source makes it clear that the purpose of the press statement was to galvanise an international audience to support sanctions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the use of international sanctions as a means of achieving change in South Africa in the 1980s: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>It provides evidence of Tutu's view on the importance of sanctions in</b></li> </ul> </li> </ol>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>bringing about change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It suggests that the international community was prepared to use political <b>and diplomatic sanctions ('rejected economic sanctions')</b></li> <li>• It suggests that the impact of economic sanctions would be no worse than the treatment facing black Africans from the security forces</li> <li>• It expresses a strong desire for sanctions to be applied, whatever the costs.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International pressure for economic sanctions intensified in the 1980s</li> <li>• The <b>US Congress overrode Reagan's veto to implement economic sanctions</b> in October 1986</li> <li>• The incidence of violence rose rapidly in the mid-1980s, partly as a result of State Security Council policy.</li> </ul> <p>Sources 3 and 4</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources agree that the leaders of Western powers were opposed to implementing economic sanctions</li> <li>• Source 3 argues against the use of economic sanctions, whereas Source 4 fully embraces their use as a means of bringing about change</li> <li>• Source 3 states that even Tutu has questioned the validity of sanctions, whereas Source 4, which is Tutu, is calling for the implementation of sanctions.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
3	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the main reason for political hostility between Hindus and Muslims, in the years 1920–40, was differences between Gandhi and Jinnah.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that supports the statement that the main reason for political hostility between Hindus and Muslims, in the years 1920–40, was differences between Gandhi and Jinnah should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gandhi and Jinnah disagreed over the approach to be taken in the <b>Khilafat movement, although many Muslim leaders supported Gandhi's stance on this</b></li> <li>• Gandhi and Jinnah disagreed over the deployment of a mass movement; Jinnah distrusted the masses and preferred to deal with educated Indians</li> <li>• Gandhi and Jinnah came to the Second Round Table Conference with different positions, especially over the issue of separate electorates, an ongoing cause of political hostility</li> <li>• Attempts at League/Congress agreement in these years were largely <b>unsuccessful, e.g. in 1938 Jinnah's insistence that the Muslim League should be regarded as the sole party of India's Muslims by Congress</b></li> <li>• Jinnah laid out what he believed Muslims should achieve in the 1940 Lahore Resolution; Gandhi spoke out strongly against this, leading to protests.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence countering the statement that the main reason for political hostility between Hindus and Muslims, in the years 1920–40, was differences between Gandhi and Jinnah should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hindus and Muslims pursued different sets of religious beliefs and values and these underpinned political hostility</li> <li>• Religious groups that emphasised a sense of separateness developed in this period, e.g. <i>Tanzeem</i> and <i>Tabligh</i> movements (Muslim) and <i>Arya Samaj</i> (Hindu)</li> <li>• The British policy of strict neutrality towards the religions encouraged all religions to believe that they could act as they wanted with no regard to the sensibilities of other groups</li> <li>• <b>The impact of the neutrality policy was exacerbated by the use of 'divide and rule' tactics by the Raj</b>, which helped to foster political hostility between Hindus and Muslims</li> <li>• The inability of Jinnah and Nehru to reach agreement in 1939–40 also played a contributing role in the continuing political hostility between Hindus and Muslims.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to <b>candidates' deployment of material</b> in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate is it to say that the Second World War hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Second World War hindered rather than helped the advance of India towards independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Linlithgow's declaration of war on behalf of India demonstrated that India</b> was still firmly under British control</li> <li>• The differing responses to the war of Congress and the Muslim League reinforced the divisions between them and the difficulties that this posed in advancing the cause of independence</li> <li>• Britain was more concerned with the threat of attack in the region by the Japanese than with moving towards independence</li> <li>• Divisions within Congress in responding to the war were created by, e.g. the Quit India campaign</li> <li>• British policy in the 20th century had been to make a series of concessions to India, which were moving towards independence and were interrupted by the outbreak of war.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Second World War helped rather than hindered the advance of India towards independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>India's contribution to the war effort in manpower</b> made it difficult to <b>resist India's</b> claims to independence</li> <li>• Britain came under pressure from some of its allies, e.g. USA, to make far greater concessions than had been made hitherto</li> <li>• The wartime debts incurred by the British as a consequence of the Second World War meant that it was reluctant to remain in the subcontinent</li> <li>• The effects of the war on Britain required significant expenditure on rebuilding Britain, which conflicted with the costs that remaining in India would entail.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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

Question	Indicative content
5	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the system of apartheid was never seriously challenged by the ANC in the years 1948–68.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the system of apartheid was never seriously challenged by the ANC in the years 1948–68 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The implementation of apartheid legislation in the 1940s and 1950s and the strengthening of separate development in the 1960s demonstrate the failure to challenge the system</li> <li>• The threat from the ANC was diminished by divisions over how to achieve an ending to apartheid, e.g. the split with PAC, and over the methods to be used, e.g. whether to engage in violence after 1960</li> <li>• Many leading members of the ANC were imprisoned and isolated on Robben Island, especially following the Rivonia Trial, e.g. Mandela and Sisulu, so that they could not communicate with other members of the ANC</li> <li>• Leading members of the ANC were in exile from 1960, e.g. Tambo, so that there was no real leadership within the country to organise a challenge to the system of apartheid</li> <li>• The state of emergency declared in 1960, followed by the banning of the ANC shortly afterwards, limited its ability to organise opposition to the system of apartheid</li> <li>• Effective use of police powers by the National Party across the period limited the ability for opposition to flourish and challenge the system of apartheid</li> <li>• The increased economic prosperity of the 1960s reduced opposition to apartheid and hence support for the ANC.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the system of apartheid was seriously challenged by the ANC in the years 1948–68 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ANC was responsible for developing a mass movement that protested the system and engaged in a range of protests, e.g. the Defiance Campaign, that posed a serious challenge to the system</li> <li>• The ANC worked with other anti-apartheid organisations in South Africa in the 1950s to effectively protest the system and gather support, e.g. the campaign against the Pass Laws, the Freedom Charter</li> <li>• The ANC exploited the repression they faced in the 1960s under apartheid to garner international support, e.g. Tambo addressed the UN, which contributed to a serious challenge to the system.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
6	<p><b>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material</b> in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that the main obstacle to a new political settlement, in the years 1991–94, was opposition from white South Africans.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that it is accurate to say that the main obstacle to a new political settlement, in the years 1991–94, was opposition from white South Africans should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The National Party's</b> reluctance for change is shown by its desire at the CODESA talks to maintain a constitutional veto in the hands of whites that would result in power sharing rather than majority government by the ANC</li> <li>• Mandela did not trust de Klerk, e.g. opening speeches at CODESA and accusations of violence by the police in order to divide black opinion and justify maintaining Nationalist Party control</li> <li>• Right-wing extremists, such as the AWB, engaged in terrorist attacks, bombing public buildings, random shootings of blacks and assassinations, e.g. Chris Hani</li> <li>• Right-wing extremists seemed to have much support for their views within the army and police, e.g. the ease with which the AWB occupied a Johannesburg building in 1993</li> <li>• The Conservative Party maintained a commitment to apartheid policies and opposed CODESA; by 1991, it was the main opposition party to the National Party, indicating the position of many white South Africans.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that it is not accurate to say that the main obstacle to a new political settlement, in the years 1991–94, was opposition from white South Africans and/or other factors were more of an obstacle should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The result of the 1992 whites-only referendum was 69 per cent support for continuing with reform, suggesting whites did not oppose a new political settlement</li> <li>• In spite of the violence and political divisions, the political parties worked out an agreement that was reasonably fair to all parties</li> <li>• Neither Mandela nor Buthelezi kept to the agreement made in 1991 to prevent violence in the black communities of Natal and tension and violence between the two groups escalated</li> <li>• Violence by young supporters of the ANC in urban areas, possibly encouraged by Winnie Mandela.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>