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1. **SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS**

1.1 The following Learning Outcomes and Assessment Standards will be assessed in this question paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOMES</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE ABILITY OF THE LEARNER TO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 1 (Historical enquiry)</td>
<td>1. Formulate questions to analyse concepts for investigation within the context of what is being studied. <em>(Not for examination purpose).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Access a variety of relevant sources of information in order to carry out an investigation. <em>(Not for examination purpose).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Interpret and evaluate information and data from sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Engage with sources of information evaluating the usefulness of the sources for the task, including stereotypes, subjectivity and gaps in the evidence available to the learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 2 (Historical concepts)</td>
<td>1. Analyse historical concepts as social constructs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Examine and explain the dynamics of changing power relations within the societies studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Compare and contrast interpretations and perspectives of events, people's actions and changes in order to draw independent conclusions about the actions or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcome 3 (Knowledge construction and communication)</td>
<td>1. Identify when an interpretation of statistics may be controversial and engage critically with the conclusions presented by the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence to support the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sustain and defend a coherent and balanced argument with evidence provided and independently accessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Communicate knowledge and understanding in a variety of ways including discussion (written and oral) debate, creating a piece of historical writing using a variety of genres, research assignments, graphics, oral presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 The following levels of questions were used to assess source-based questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 1 (L1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extract relevant information and data from the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organise information logically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain historical concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 2 (L2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Categorise appropriate or relevant source of information provided to answer the questions raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyse the information and data gathered from a variety of sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate the sources of information provided to assess the appropriateness of the sources for the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 3 (L3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret and evaluate information and data from the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engage with sources of information evaluating the usefulness of the sources for the task taking into account stereotypes, subjectivity and gaps in the evidence available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyse historical concepts as social constructs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Examine and explain the dynamics of changing power relations within the aspects of societies studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compare and contrast interpretations and perspectives of peoples’ actions or events and changes to draw independent conclusions about the actions or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify when an interpretation of statistics may be controversial and engage critically with the conclusions presented by the data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 The following table indicates how to assess source-based questions.

- In the marking of source-based questions credit needs to be given to any other valid and relevant viewpoints, arguments, evidence or examples.
- In the allocation of marks emphasis should be placed on how the requirements of the question have been addressed.
- In the marking guideline the requirements of the question (skills that need to be addressed) as well as the level of the question are indicated in italics.
2. EXTENDED WRITING

2.1 The extended writing questions focus on one of the following levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS OF QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss or describe according to a given line of argument set out in the extended writing question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan and construct an argument based on evidence, using the evidence to reach a conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence to support the argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustain and defend a coherent and balanced argument with evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write clearly and coherently in constructing the argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Marking of extended writing

- MARKERS MUST BE AWARE THAT THE CONTENT OF THE ANSWER WILL BE GUIDED BY THE TEXTBOOKS IN USE AT THE PARTICULAR CENTRE.
- CANDIDATES MAY HAVE ANY OTHER RELEVANT INTRODUCTION AND/OR CONCLUSION THAN THOSE INCLUDED IN A SPECIFIC EXTENDED WRITING MARKING GUIDELINE FOR A SPECIFIC ESSAY.
- WHEN ASSESSING OPEN-ENDED SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS, LEARNERS SHOULD BE CREDITED FOR ANY OTHER RELEVANT ANSWERS.

Global assessment of extended writing

The extended writing will be assessed holistically (globally). This approach requires the educator to score the overall product as a whole, without scoring the component parts separately. This approach encourages the learner to offer an individual opinion by using of selected factual evidence to support an argument. The learner will not be required to simply regurgitate ‘facts’ in order to achieve a high mark. This approach discourages learners from preparing ‘model’ answers and reproducing them without taking into account the specific requirements of the question. Holistic extended writing marking credits learners' opinions supported by evidence. Holistic assessment, unlike content based marking, does not penalise language inadequacies as the emphasis is on the following:

- The construction of argument
- The appropriate selection of factual evidence to support such argument and
- The learner's interpretation of the question
Assessment procedures of extended writing

1. Keep the synopsis in mind when assessing extended writing.

2. During the first reading of the extended writing ticks need to be awarded for a relevant introduction (indicated by a bullet in marking guideline/memorandum) each of the main points/aspects that is properly contextualised (also indicated by bullets in the marking guideline/memorandum) and a relevant conclusion (indicated by a bullet in marking guideline/memorandum) e.g. in an answer where there are 5 main points there will be 7 ticks.

3. The following additional symbols can also be used:
   - Introduction, main aspects and conclusion not properly contextualised
   - Wrong statement
   - Irrelevant statement
   - Repetition
   - Analysis
   - Interpretation

4. The matrix

   4.1 Use of analytical matrix in the marking of extended writing (refer to page 6)

   In the marking of extended writing with reference to page 6 the given criteria shown in the matrix should be used. In assessing the extended writing note should be taken of both the content and presentation. At the point of intersection of the content and presentation based on the seven competency levels, a mark should be awarded.

   4.1.1 The first reading of extended writing will be to determine to what extent the main aspects have been covered and to determine the content level (on the matrix).

   | C | LEVEL 4 |
   | P | LEVEL 5 |

   4.1.2 The second reading of extended writing will relate to the level (on the matrix) of presentation.

   | C | LEVEL 4 |
   | P | LEVEL 5 |

   4.1.3 Allocate an overall mark with the use of the matrix.

   | C | LEVEL 4 18-19 |
   | P | LEVEL 5 |

Copyright reserved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>LEVEL 7</th>
<th>LEVEL 6</th>
<th>LEVEL 5</th>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 7</td>
<td>Question has been fully answered. Content selection fully relevant to line of argument.</td>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 6</td>
<td>Question has been answered. Content selection relevant to a line of argument.</td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 5</td>
<td>Question answered to a great extent. Content adequately covered and relevant.</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td>Question recognisable in answer. Some omissions/irrelevant content selection.</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>Content selection does not always relate. Omissions in coverage.</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>Sparse content. Question inadequately addressed.</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>Question not answered. Inadequate content. Totally irrelevant.</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL</td>
<td>If the candidate has demonstrated all or most of the skills listed in a particular level, she/he will be awarded a mark relevant to the category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 100%</td>
<td>Consistently focuses on topic – demonstrates a logical and coherent progress towards a conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 30</td>
<td>Clearly comprehends the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Excellent]</td>
<td>Uses all or most of the sources and own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selects relevant sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes selectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups sources (not essential but should not merely list sources)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a setting of sources in background understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If appropriate, deals fully with counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refers appropriately to relevancy, bias, accuracy, limitation of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expresses him/herself clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concludes essay with clear focus on topic – takes a stand (i.e. reaches an independent conclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Meritorious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 79%</td>
<td>Makes a good effort to focus consistently on the topic but, at times, argument loses some focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 23</td>
<td>Clearly comprehends the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Very Good]</td>
<td>Uses all or most of the sources and own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selects relevant sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes selectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good use of relevant evidence from the sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good attempt to consider counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good attempt to refer to relevancy, bias, accuracy, limitation of source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concludes essay with clear focus on topic – takes a stand (i.e. reaches an independent conclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69%</td>
<td>Makes an effort to focus on the topic but argument has lapses in focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20</td>
<td>Comprehends most of the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Good]</td>
<td>Uses most of the sources and own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selects relevant sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression good but with lapses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps, lacking some depth of overall-focus, or does not make reference to one or more relevant sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If appropriate, makes an attempt to consider counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rather superficial or no attempt to refer to relevancy, bias, accuracy, limitation of source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes an attempt to take a stand (focuses on limitations, etc.) in reaching an independent conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59%</td>
<td>Makes some effort to focus on the topic but argument has many lapses in focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 17</td>
<td>Moderate comprehension of most of the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Satisfactory]</td>
<td>Moderate use of relevant evidence from the sources and own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate attempt to consider counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate attempt to refer to relevancy, bias, accuracy, limitation of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression is satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes an attempt to take a stand but there are serious inconsistencies with making links with the rest of the essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essay might have a tendency to list sources and ‘tag’ on focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49%</td>
<td>Little attempt to focus on the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 14</td>
<td>Little comprehension of the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fair]</td>
<td>Struggles to select relevant information from the sources and own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No quotes – or generally irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes little effort to consider counter-arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly characterised by listing of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No attempt to refer to relevancy, bias, accuracy of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes a poor attempt to take a stand. (i.e. battles to reach an independent conclusion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39%</td>
<td>Unable to focus on the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 – 11</td>
<td>Unable to identify relevant sources and limited use of own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Weak]</td>
<td>No quotes – or generally irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes no effort to consider counter-argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essay characterised by listing of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No attempt to refer to relevancy, bias, accuracy of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expression very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes a very poor attempt to take a stand – if at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Not Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 29%</td>
<td>No attempt to focus on the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 8</td>
<td>Uses no sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Poor]</td>
<td>Does not use own knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies directly from the sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answer extremely poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 1: HOW DID THE FALL OF COMMUNISM IN THE USSR INFLUENCE POLITICAL CHANGES IN SOUTH AFRICA IN THE 1990s?

1.1
1.1.1 [Extraction of information from Source 1A–L1–LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
- Glasnost/allowing political transparency/open to criticism
- Perestroika/economic restructuring (2 x 1) (2)

1.1.2 [Explanation of historical concepts from Source 1A – L1 – LO2 (AS1)]
- A state of international tension and hostility between the Soviet Union and the United States of America/ideological war
- A war that relied on propaganda and the threat of nuclear warfare rather than fighting
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.1.3 [Extraction of information from Source 1A–L1–LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
- Eastern European countries split from the Soviet Union
- Demolished of the Berlin Wall
- Eastern European countries prepared for democracy
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 1) (2)

1.2
1.2.1 [Interpretation of evidence from the cartoon in Source 1B – L2 –LO1 (AS3 and 4), LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2)]
- Soviet Union had disintegrated as shown by the disintegrated hammer and sickle
- Gorbachev is powerless to stop this disintegration as seen through his body language
- The Eastern bloc countries splitting from the Soviet Union as implied by the disintegrated hammer and sickle
- The introduction of new reforms led to the fall of communism
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.2.2 [Interpret and evaluate Source 1B – L2 - LO1(AS3)]

A mere statement of 'unhappy' or 'happy' for an answer would not suffice for full marks as candidates need to substantiate their answer

- The US could have been happy because it signalled the end of Communism
- The struggle for world domination between US and USSR came to an end with the USA in a dominant position
- The US claimed a moral victory as communism in the USSR was defeated
- The US was happy because it opened the possibility for new trade and political relations with Eastern Bloc countries
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
1.3 [Comparing how the written and the visual sources support each other L3 – LO2 (AS3)]
- Both Sources (1A and 1B) refer to the disintegration of the Soviet Union
- Both Sources (1A and 1B) refer to the end of communism in the USSR and Eastern Bloc countries
- Any other relevant response

1.4.1 [Interpret and evaluate Source 1C - L2 - LO1(AS3)]

Candidates can refer that the fall of the Berlin Wall influenced both the ANC and National Party to seek for a political solution

(a) ANC
- The ANC was forced to abandon its armed struggle because of a lack of funding
- The training of ANC personnel in the Soviet Bloc countries came to an end
- The ANC realised that the political landscape in South Africa had changed
- The ANC realised that change was inevitable in South Africa
- That negotiations with the NP was inevitable
- Any other relevant response

(b) National Party
- The NP could no longer claim that it acted as a 'bulwark (acted in defence) against communism'
- They could not claim that South Africa countered 'Soviet expansionism'
- The NP realised that the political landscape had changed
- That political change in South Africa was inevitable
- That a new political dispensation in South Africa was inevitable
- Negotiations with the liberation movements was inevitable
- It lost support from the western powers
- Any other relevant answer

1.4.2 [Interpret and evaluate Source 1C - L3 - LO1(AS3)]
- Blacks wanted their full political and economic rights/white minorities had a problem of giving power to black majority
- Any other relevant response

1.5
1.5.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 1D – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2)]
- To have an inclusive peacefull political settlement in South Africa
- To end white minority rule while protecting white interests
- To establish a democratic constitution
- To promote economic and political equality amongst all South Africans
- To control the process of negotiations
- Any other relevant response
1.5.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 1D – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2)]

(a) The majority of black South Africans:
- They would have been happy because it signalled the end of apartheid rule
- Discrimination/dehumanisation of the majority of South Africans would come to an end
- Would now enjoy full political and economic rights/freedom
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

(b) Conservative white South Africans
- Unhappy because according to them De Klerk did not have a mandate to transform the political landscape of South Africa
- Not prepared to relinquish their economic privileges and social positions
- White superiority was under threat
- Opposed the reforms of De Klerk
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.5.3 [Explain the usefulness of Source 1D - L3 – LO1 (AS4)]
When answering this question on usefulness, candidates need to show that the source is relevant to the investigation and reliable by interrogating the provenance (origin) and level of bias

- The source showed that FW De Klerk's speech was a watershed moment in the history of South Africa
- Speech would lead to the irreversible transformation of the political landscape of South Africa
- Apartheid was coming to an end
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.5.4 [Interpretation and evaluation of evidence from Source 1D – L3 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2)]
Candidates could either choose AGREE or DISAGREE with Esterhuyse's view and support their response with relevant evidence.

AGREE
- Members of the ANC national executive committee had different responses to De Klerk's speech
- Walter Sisulu was shocked by the opposing views within the ranks of the ANC about De Klerk's speech
- They received no prior notice about De Klerk's intentions
- They were surprised by the speed at which De Klerk announced changes
- The ‘doves’ like Thabo Mbeki was encouraged
- The ‘hawks’ like Chris Hani was suspicious
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
DISAGREE

- The ANC was involved in secret talks with the NP prior to 1990
- The ANC expected some success after the struggle for freedom
- Some political prisoners were already released
- Any other relevant response

(any 1 x 2) (2)
1.6 [Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence from all sources – L3 – LO1 (AS3); LO2 (AS2 and 3); LO3 (AS2)]

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

Candidates should make reference to how Gorbachev's policies had an effect on BOTH the NP and the ANC in order to reach Level 3:

**Effects of Gorbachev's policies on the National Party**
- Gorbachev's policy of glasnost and perestroika paved the way for the NP to reform
- There was pressure on the NP from the western powers to work towards a peaceful settlement in South Africa
- After the fall of the Berlin Wall the apartheid government could not claim it acted as a 'bulwark against communism'
- South Africa's claim that they countered 'Soviet expansionism' became irrelevant
- Apartheid government had to find a peaceful and workable solution for South Africa
- Any other relevant response

**Effects of Gorbachev's policies on the African National Congress**
- The ANC could no longer depend on the USSR for funding
- Training of ANC members in the Soviet Union came to an end
- It became difficult for the ANC to function as a movement in exile
- There was pressure from major powers on the ANC to work towards a peaceful settlement in South Africa
- The ANC indicated that it was in favour of a negotiated settlement
- The armed struggle will only be used as a last resort and began to seek recognition from western countries
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>• Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of the effects of Gorbachev's policies on both the National Party government and the African National Congress • Uses evidence partially to write on the topic or cannot write on topic</th>
<th>Marks: 0–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. shows an understanding of the effects of Gorbachev's policies on both the National Party government and the African National Congress • Uses evidence in a very basic manner</td>
<td>Marks: 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>• Uses relevant evidence e.g. demonstrates a thorough understanding of the effects of Gorbachev's policies on both the National Party government and the African National Congress • Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic</td>
<td>Marks: 6–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7 EXTENDED WRITING

1.7.1 [Plan and construct an argument based on evidence using analytical and interpretative skills - L1 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 in addition 4)]

SYNOPSIS

Candidates should explain how the fall of communism influenced South Africa to embark on political changes in the 1990s.

MAIN ASPECTS

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates should explain how the fall of communism influenced the political future of South Africa and how it paved the way for negotiations.

ELABORATION

- Gorbachev’s reforms: Glasnost and Perestroika and its role in ending communism
- The democratisation of the Soviet Bloc countries and fall of the Berlin Wall
- The impact of the political transformation in Soviet Bloc countries on the apartheid government and the ANC
- De Klerk used the fall of communism as an opportunity to initiate reforms
- His willingness to open talks was welcomed by the ANC in terms of its longstanding principles
- The ANC had to abandon the armed struggle to begin the process of negotiations
- Opened the way for negotiations with the ANC leading to the release of political prisoners and unbanning of political parties
- USSR’s economic stagnation influenced political changes in South Africa between the NP and ANC
- The USA’s abandonment of support for the NP – affected South Africa’s political future
- Any other relevant response

- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion

(30)

Use the matrix on page 6 in this document to assess this extended writing
1.7.2 [Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence from the sources and own knowledge to support the argument - L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates must show how political changes in the Soviet Union had a profound effect on the reform process in South Africa. They need to indicate how the collapse of the Soviet Union left the National Party and the ANC with no alternative to negotiate on the political future of South Africa.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- **Introduction:** Candidates should indicate why the collapse of communism was/was not the most important factor that led to the demise of apartheid.

**ELABORATION**

- The collapse of the Soviet Union contributed to the emergence of democracy movements including South Africa
- South Africa was no longer significant in Cold War politics
- The policy of Glasnost/Perestroika paved the way for the ANC and NP to reform (Disappearance of Marxist-Leninist states and fall of the Berlin Wall affected both the ANC and National Party; Gorbachev favoured a negotiated settlement)
- De Klerk was aware of the implications of the political changes in Eastern Europe (He realised that communism was a spent force in world affairs; This made de Klerk open for negotiations; de Klerk's government saw the ANC's loss of support as an opportune time to dictate change)
- Improving relations between the USA and USSR meant that the NP could no longer use the Cold War to win support of the west; South Africa's status as an anti-communist champion lost its appeal)
- The ANC could no longer depend on the USSR for funding/ It became difficult for the ANC to function as an exile movement
- There was pressure from major powers for both the National Party and ANC to work towards a peaceful settlement in South Africa (The ANC indicated that it was in favour of a negotiated settlement (The armed struggle will only be used as a last resort and began to seek recognition from western countries)
- The ANC and the NP had to find a peaceful solution
- The apartheid government took the opportunity to negotiate with the ANC because there was no longer a threat from the Soviet Union
- Both the NP and the ANC took cognisance of internal factors (economic stagnation, unrest, financial crisis, States of Emergency, etc.) to save the country's future
- Any other relevant response

- **Conclusion:** Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion.

Use the matrix on page 7 in this document to assess this extended writing [75]
QUESTION 2: WHAT IMPACT DID THE FALL OF COMMUNISM HAVE ON ANGOLA IN RE-IMAGINING ITSELF AFTER THE 1990s?

2.1
2.1.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1 – LO1 (AS3)]
- United States of America
- Soviet Union

2.1.2 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1 – LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
- More than four hundred thousand war victims died due to the collapse of food security and health services
- 3 million were uprooted
- Many more were maimed (wounded/hurt)

2.1.3 [Explanation of concept from Source 2A – L1 – LO2 (AS1)]
- Based on Karl Marx’s belief in collective, socialist and communist practices for a state
- Karl Marx believed in a classless society
- Any other relevant response

2.1.4 [Interpretation and evaluation of evidence from Source 2A – L3 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2)]
- They mistrusted/ were very suspicious of each other
- They were not prepared to negotiate with each other/refused to compromise
- Power struggle between them because they desired total control of Angola
- Any other relevant answer

2.1.5 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2A – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
- Agreed to election
- Savimbi lost the elections and rejected the results
- UNITA resumed war
- Angola was politically unstable because of the power struggle between Dos Santos and Savimbi
- Any other relevant response

2.2
2.2.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2B – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]
- Angola had many landmine victims
- Many Angolans became amputees
- Angolans desired peace
- Any other relevant response
2.2.2 [Interpretation and analysis of evidence from Source 2B – L3 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS2); LO3 (AS2 and 3)]

- Angolans were tired of the war because it affected their lives
- Angolans wanted an end to war
- Angolans desired peace and stability
- Any other relevant response

(2 x 2) (4)

2.3

2.3.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2C – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]

- Reconstruction of bridges, streets, hospitals, schools and other infrastructure
- Ensure access to running water and other services
- Rebuilt sewage treatment plants
- Any other relevant response

(2 x 2) (4)

2.3.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2C - L2 – LO1 (AS4)]

- Lots of waste because all systems came to a standstill during the war
- Unhealthy/poor living conditions after years of non-collection of refuse
- The infrastructure was destroyed such as bridges, roads, hospitals etc
- Any other relevant response

(1 x 2) (2)

2.3.3 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2C – L2 – LO1 (AS4)]

Candidates can either AGREE or DISAGREE that the visual source gives a fair depiction of Angola re-imagining itself and support their response with relevant evidence.

AGREE:

- Temporary plans that were made to use roads/new bridge built
- The rebuilding of bridges as depicted in the visual source
- Shows government involved in the re-building of infrastructure
- Any other relevant response

DISAGREE:

- The photographer could be biased/government propaganda
- It only shows one aspect of the rebuilding process
- Any other relevant response

(2 x 2) (4)

2.3.4 [Comparing the written and the visual sources in Source 2C - L3 – LO2 (AS3)]

- Both sources refer to the damaged infrastructure/bridges
- Both sources indicate the effect that the civil war had on Angola
- Both sources refer to the reconstruction of Angola
- Any other relevant response

(2 x 2) (4)
2.4  [Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence from all sources – L3 – LO1 (AS 3 and 4), LO2 (AS1,2,3) LO3 (AS 1,2,3,4)]

Candidates must focus on the following aspects:
Candidates must select one source (2A, 2B or 2C) and indicate why it is USEFUL.
When answering this question, candidates need to show that the source is relevant to the investigation and reliable by interrogating the provenance (origin) and level of bias.

SOURCE 2A is useful because:
• It gives information about how the two rivals Jonas Savimbi and Dos Santos fought to gain total control of Angola
• Provides statistical information on the deaths of Angolans/duration of the war
• It give information about the power struggle between Savimbi and Dos Santos
• The information in the source confirms what other sources state about the war in Angola
• Any other relevant response

SOURCE 2B is useful because:
• It depicts Angolans desire for peace
• It depicts the devastation that the civil war had on ordinary Angolans
• It depicts the effects that the landmines had by showing the amputees
• It was drawn at the time of civil war in Angola
• The visual elements in the cartoon confirms the atrocities of the civil war in Angola
• Any other relevant response

SOURCE 2C is useful because:
• Provides statistical information about the lack of running water and toilets
• Gives evidence about the effects of the war
• The written source gives information about Angola and how it could re-imagine itself
• It gives evidence of the destruction of the civil war/need for reconstruction
• Photograph shows Angola re-imagining itself
• Gives information about the outcome of a research done in Angola about the effects of the civil war
• Any other relevant response
Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

| LEVEL 1 | • Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of explaining which ONE of the sources would be most useful to a historian writing about the effects of the civil war on Angola  
• Uses evidence partially to write on the topic or cannot write on topic | MARKS: 0–2 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LEVEL 2 | • Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. shows some understanding of explaining which ONE of the sources would be most useful to a historian writing about the effects of the civil war on Angola  
• Uses evidence in a very basic manner | MARKS: 3–5 |
| LEVEL 3 | • Uses relevant evidence e.g. shows a thorough understanding of explaining which ONE of the sources would be most useful to a historian writing about the effects of the civil war on Angola  
• Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic | MARKS: 6–8 |
2.5 EXTENDED WRITING

2.5.1 [Plan and construct an argument based on evidence using analytical and Interpretative skills - L1 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3(AS1, 2, 3 and 4)]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates should explain how Angola re-imagined itself after the collapse of communism in 1989 and support their line of argument with relevant evidence. Candidates need to make constant reference to the role of the fall of communism on the re-imagining.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- Introduction: Candidates need to state their line of argument and state how they will support it and explaining how Angola became a pawn in the Cold War.

ELABORATION
- End of the Cold War and the fall of communism in 1989
- Angola was now free of foreign influence and could re-imagine itself and negotiate her own future without outside influence (In June 1989 Savimbi of UNITA and Dos Santos of the MPLA met for the first time)
- The Bicesse Accord was signed on 31 May 1991 by Dos Santos and Savimbi which led to temporary peace and easing of hostilities
- The 1992 elections – Dos Santos’s MPLA was victorious
- Savimbi rejected the election results
- UNITA went back to the bush leading to the resumption of the Angolan Civil war
- In 1994 the Lusaka Accord was signed but was unsuccessful
- War resumed again in 1998 because UNITA was dissatisfied
- UN imposed sanctions on UNITA by banning officials from international travel, prohibiting aircrafts flying into UNITA controlled areas and closing UNITA offices abroad
- Death of Savimbi in February 2002 – created new possibilities for peace in Angola; a ceasefire came into effect in March 2002
- Luena Memorandum of Understanding in April 2002 brought about peace in Angola – 13 years after the collapse of communism in 1989
- Angola was now able to reconstruct itself after 30 years of civil war
- Any other relevant response

- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion. (30)

Use the matrix on page 6 in this document to assess this extended writing
2.5.2 [Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence from the sources and own knowledge to support the argument - L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)]

SYNOPSIS

Candidates should critically discuss how Savimbi’s death marked the dawn of healing and relief for the traumatised Angolans and support their line of argument with relevant information.

MAIN ASPECTS

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates need to state their line of argument and state how they intend supporting their argument.

ELABORATION

In answering the question candidates need to give a brief background about Angola before Savimbi’s death

- Power struggle between Dos Santos and Savimbi
- The Bicesse Accord was signed on 31 May 1991 by Dos Santos and Savimbi which led to temporary peace and easing of hostilities
- The 1992 elections – Dos Santos’s MPLA was victorious
- Savimbi rejected the election results
- UNITA went back to the bush
- In 1994 the Lusaka Accord was signed but was unsuccessful
- War resumed again in 1998 because UNITA was dissatisfied
- Death of Savimbi in 2002 brought an end to civil war in Angola
- Savimbi’s death brought some political stability
- New era in the history of Angola only came after the death of Savimbi through the Luena Memorandum of Understanding
- Many war victims, others killed and many others displaced
- Devastation caused by landmines
- Damage to infrastructure e.g. bridges, roads, schools etc
- Angola is slowly trying to re-imagine itself
- Angola starts rebuilding bridges, roads and other infrastructure
- Angola's rich resources e.g. diamonds, oil
- Any other relevant response

- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion. (30)

If candidates disagree with the statement, they need to support their arguments with relevant evidence.

Use the matrix on page 7 in this document to assess this extended writing [75]
QUESTION 3: HOW DID THE PROCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS AMONG THE VARIOUS POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS PAVE THE WAY FOR SOUTH AFRICA’S FIRST DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS IN 1994?

3.1
3.1.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1 – LO1 (AS3)]
- The NP’s own failure was openly admitted
- De Klerk decided to unban political organisations and release Mandela
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.1.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L1 – LO1 (AS3)]
- Led to the unbanning of the ANC, CPSA and PAC
- Scrapping of the Separate Amenities Act
- Media restrictions
- Suspension of the death penalty
- Release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners
- Ending of apartheid
- Lifted emergency restrictions (any 2 x 1) (2)

3.1.3 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L2 – LO1 (AS3)]
- To prevent violence, tension and conflict
- To reshape the character of South Africa
- De Klerk was under pressure to transform
- The NP could no longer continue to rule as a minority
- Morally incorrect for a minority rule to continue
- Local and international pressure
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.1.4 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L2 – LO1 (AS3)]

**Tutu**
- Surprised
- Shocked/Disbelief
- Happy
- Any other relevant response

**Andries Treurnicht**
- Shocked
- Outraged/angry
- Any other relevant response (2 x 1) (2)

3.1.5 [Interpretation and analysing of a visual source from Source 3A – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
- Depicts the release of Nelson Mandela/black South Africans
- The NP has finally surrendered white rule
- South Africa was being exposed to major political changes
- Irony of the white South Africans being big hearted/magnanimous at freeing black South Africa
- Size contrast between the black South African to the white South African
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
3.1.6 *Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L2 – LO1 (AS3)*
- De Klerk (white rule) takes full credit for the release of Mandela
- Despite opposition to Mandela’s release/black South Africans, De Klerk took the bold step to release him
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.1.7 *Comparing of evidence from Sources 3A – Written and Visual Sources – L3 – LO3 (AS4)*
Candidates need to identify how the written source and the visual source support each other
- Both sources mention the release of Nelson Mandela
- Both sources highlight the need for white minority rule to start negotiating with the black majority
- Both sources reflect the boldness of De Klerk (white rule)
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.2
3.2.1 *Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2 – LO1 (AS3)*
- To identify obstacles to negotiations
- To overcome the obstacles to negotiations
- To pave the way for negotiations
- It was the President’s residence
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.2.2 *Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L3 – LO1 (AS3)*
- It was the first meeting of both the NP and ANC
- Both did not know what to expect
- Both had come to the meeting with their own ideals
- Both had to protect the constituency of their own interests
- Both parties did not know how the negotiations would unfold
- Long history of an acrimonious relationship
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.2.3 *Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2 – LO1 (AS3)*
- To allay fears in the white community
- Wanted to protect the interests of the white minority
- Wanted to keep control over the process of transition and how the future of South Africa would be governed
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
3.2.4 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L3 – LO1 (AS3)]
Candidates could either state that the newspaper CONFIRMS or DOES NOT CONFIRM the statement and support their response with relevant evidence.

CONFIRM
- The Pretoria Meeting led to further compromise and negotiations which paved the way for further talks
- The Pretoria Meeting led the NP government to review the security legislation and end the State of Emergency in Natal
- The delegates concluded that the Pretoria Meeting was a milestone on the road to true peace and prosperity for South Africa
- Any other relevant response  

3.3  
3.3.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2 – LO1 (AS3)]
- Negatively
- Wanted to destroy CODESA
- Formed a joint offensive with the CP and HNP to oppose CODESA
- Any other relevant response  

3.3.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2 – LO1 (AS3)]
- CODESA paved the way for a democratic South Africa
- CODESA meant the end of minority rule
- Black majority rule would be established in South Africa
- Feared about major changes to their lifestyle
- Any other relevant response  

3.3.3 [Evaluation and interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2 – LO1 (AS3)]
Candidates could either AGREE or DISAGREE with the statement and support their response with relevant evidence.

AGREE
- At CODESA 1 the right-wing invaded the World Trade Centre
- The right-wing openly opposed CODESA
- The right-wing were not in favour of majority rule
- Any other relevant response

DISAGREE
- Not a real force to be reckoned with
- Did not have the military support to derail the process of negotiations
- Any other relevant response  

Copyright reserved
3.4 [Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence from all sources - L3- LO1 (AS3 and 4), LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3) LO3 (AS 1, 2, 3 and 4)]

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:
Candidates should make reference to both the Groote Schuur Minute and the Pretoria Minute in order to reach Level 3:

**Groote Schuur Minute**
- A broad agreement was reached
- Final agreement was reached on issues of the release of political prisoners and the return of political exiles
- The NP agreed to review security legislation and end the State of Emergency
- Any other relevant response

**Pretoria Minute**
- It paved the way towards negotiations on a new constitution
- It paved the way for exploratory talks between various political role players
- Set the tone for further talks
- Negotiations could continue
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of the significance of both the Groote Schuur Minute and the Pretoria Minute to the process of negotiations</th>
<th>MARKS: 0–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. shows some understanding of the significance of both the Groote Schuur Minute and the Pretoria Minute to the process of negotiations</td>
<td>MARKS: 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>Uses relevant evidence e.g. Uses relevant evidence that shows a thorough understanding of the significance of both the Groote Schuur Minute and the Pretoria Minute for the process of negotiations</td>
<td>MARKS: 6–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 **EXTENDED WRITING**

3.5.1 *Plan and construct an argument based on evidence using analytical and interpretative skills - L1 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)*

**SYNOPSIS**

Candidates should explain to what extent the process of negotiations between the various political organisations paved the way for South Africa's first democratic election in 1994.

**MAIN ASPECTS**

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- **Introduction:** Candidates should indicate the extent to which the process of negotiations between the various political organisations paved the way for South Africa's first democratic election in 1994.

**ELABORATION**

- Significance of De Klerk’s speech
- Release of Mandela
- Process of negotiations and reform
- Talks between major stakeholders begin in 1990
- Groote Schuur Minute
- Pretoria Minute
- Violence in Boipatong, Natal and Vaal Triangle
- Cosag Group and Freedom Alliance
- The role and significance of CODESA 1
- Referendum
- The role and significance of CODESA 2
- Negotiations boycotted by PAC; AZAPO; etc
- Bhisho massacre – impact on negotiations
- Assassination of Chris Hani - impact on negotiations
- AWB storming of World Trade Centre - effects
- Bophuthatswana coup - effects
- Role of Record of Understanding
- Sunset Clause and Multi-Party Negotiating Forum
- 1994 elections
- Any other relevant point

- **Conclusion:** Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion. (30)

*Use the matrix on page 6 in this document to assess this extended writing*
3.5.2 [Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence from the sources and own knowledge to support the argument L2 – LO1 (AS 3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates need to assess the validity of De Klerk's 2 February 1990 speech as the most remarkable day in the history of white minority rule. They need to support their line of argument with relevant evidence.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates should assess the statement and indicate how they intend supporting their argument.

ELABORATION
- De Klerk's announcement changed the social, economic and political landscape of South Africa - Was willing to negotiate with any political party to make South Africa a democracy
- De Klerk announced the release of political prisoners and Mandela
- Right-wing groups opposed the political direction taken by De Klerk/ right-wing prepared to use violence to protect their political interests
- National Party and African National Congress began with 'talks about talks' in March 1990
- Pretoria Minute and Groote Schuur Minute paved the way
- In September 1991 CODESA 1 started - 26 Political organisations formed the Multi-Party Negotiating Process
- National Peace Accord signed
- Referendum
- CODESA 2 met in May 1992 and its significance
- Record of Understanding
- Role of Record of Understanding
- Sunset Clause and Multi-Party Negotiating Forum
- Election date set: 27 April 1994
- Fears of civil war and violence did not happen
- Despite differences all had same concerns and aspirations
- Mandela first Black President of democratic South Africa
- Any other relevant point

- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion.

Use the matrix on page 7 in this document to assess this extended writing.
QUESTION 4: WHAT ROLE DID THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (TRC) PLAY IN HEALING SOUTH AFRICA FROM ITS DIVided PAST?

4.1
4.1.1 [Explanation of concept from Source 4A – L1 – LO2 (AS1)]
- Official or general pardon/forgiveness on condition of full disclosure of politically motivated human rights violations before the TRC
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

4.1.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 4A – L2- LO1 (AS3)]
- The act for which amnesty was required should have happened between 1960 and 1994
- The act must have been politically motivated
- Applicants should make full disclosure
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

4.1.3 [Interpretation and evaluation of reliability of Source 4A – L3 –LO1 (AS3 and 4)]
Candidates could either choose YES or NO and support their response with relevant evidence

YES:
- They were guaranteed amnesty if they satisfied the requirements
- They would avoid prosecution on atrocities that were committed
- Any other relevant response

NO:
- Their actions were secrets and unknown and they would not openly come out and confess
- Public confessions could be embarrassing for them and undermining the apartheid state/liberation movements
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 3) (3)

4.2
4.2.1 [Analysis and Interpretation of evidence from Source 4B – L2 –LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]
- There was no national consensus/absence of national consensus
- It was not accepted by all South Africans/great gaps in our society
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

4.2.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 4B – L2 – LO1 (AS3); LO3 (AS2)]
- Hatred and animosities of the past would go away/heal the wounds of the past
- It would restore the respect (worth) of the South African nation
- It would be an admission that something wrong was done
- Bring about reconciliation/unity
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)
4.3

4.3.1  **[Extraction of evidence from Source 4C – L1- LO1 (AS3)]**
- Equating the struggle against apartheid with those who enforced it despite the fact that apartheid was declared a crime against humanity by the UN
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 1) (1)

4.3.2  **[Evaluating the evidence in perspective 1 from Source 4C to detect bias – L3 – LO1 (AS3); LO3 (AS2)]**
- Written from the ANC's point of view
- Mathew Phosa was a member of the ANC/and an ANC premier
- Alternate views from other political parties were not included
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 3) (3)

4.3.3  **[Interpretation of evidence from Source 4C – L2 –LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]**

Candidates should indicate whether Hartzenberg's view is **FAIR** or **UNFAIR** and support their response with relevant evidence.

In answering this question candidates need to show that the source is relevant to the investigation and reliable by interrogating the provenance (origin) and level of bias.

**FAIR:**
- Two right-wing political prisoners J du Plessis and J v Wyk were denied amnesty even though they qualified
- Hartzenberg viewed the TRC as a witch hunt against the Afrikaners
- Hartzenberg viewed the TRC as being biased against the Afrikaners
- Any other relevant answer

**UNFAIR:**
- He was biased against the TRC
- Application for amnesty did not guarantee that it would be granted
- Some Afrikaners were granted amnesty
- The TRC looked at all organisations that applied for amnesty
- Any other relevant answer (any 2 x 2) (4)

4.3.4  **[Comparing extracts 1 and 2 from Source 4C to evaluate their similarity – L3 – LO2 (AS3)]**
- Both Extracts 1 & 2 blamed the TRC, though for different reasons
- Both Extracts 1 & 2 highlight the idea that the TRC was controversial
- Both Extracts 1 & 2 are for different reasons, biased against the TRC
- Any other relevant answer (any 2 X 2) (4)
4.4
4.4.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 4D – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]
- **Mandela** was not satisfied with the TRC report because it did not achieve its intended aims (TRC was controversial/incomplete work of the TRC)
- **Tutu** looks surprised because Mandela doesn't look happy with the TRC report
- **Tutu** expected Mandela to accept the report unconditionally
- Mandela was surprised at the ugly truth as depicted as a fish
- Both Tutu and Mandela expected reconciliation as well and not only the truth
- Any other relevant answer

4.4.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 4D – L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]
- The TRC did not achieve its intended aims
- The truth that was uncovered was ugly, painful without reconciliation
- The TRC report did not show that reconciliation was achieved
- The TRC was a failure and did not necessarily accomplish its mandate
- Any other relevant answer

4.4.3 [Interpretation and evaluation of bias in the cartoon (Source 4D) – L3 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO3 (AS2)]
Candidates should indicate BIASED to a great extent or BIASED to a less extent and support their response with relevant evidence.
In answering this question candidates need to show that the source is relevant to the investigation and reliable by interrogating the provenance (origin) and level of bias.

**BIASED TO A GREAT EXTENT:**
- Depicted the TRC as a failure
- The TRC unearthed ugly and painful truth and did not realise reconciliation and nation building
- Mandela not happy with the final report of the TRC
- Any other relevant answer

**BIASED TO LESS EXTENT:**
- The TRC faced many challenges
- The TRC did not achieve reconciliation
- The TRC did not bring about healing and nation building
- Any other relevant answer
4.5 [Interpretation, analysis and synthesis of evidence from all sources – L3 – LO1 
(AS 3 and 4), LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3) LO3 (AS 1, 2, 3 and 4)]

- One of the aims of the TRC was to grant amnesty to those guilty of human rights 
offences – for the sake of reconciliation
- Conditions for being granted amnesty: Application for actions committed within 
stipulated time (1960 and 1994); Offences committed should have been politically 
motivated; Applicants should make full disclosure
- Did not operate like a court of law
- Focused on bringing the truth through public confessions and not justice
- Provided a platform for perpetrators to disclose atrocities committed so they could be 
set free from feeling of guilt
- The Committee had to treat perpetrators of the liberation struggle movements and the 
apartheid government similarly
- Any other relevant answer

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. shows no or little understanding of the role of the Amnesty Committee during the TRC process</th>
<th>MARKS: 0–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses evidence partially to write on the topic or cannot write on topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. shows some understanding of the role of the Amnesty Committee during the TRC process</td>
<td>MARKS: 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses evidence in a very basic manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>Uses relevant evidence e.g. shows a thorough understanding of the role of the Amnesty Committee during the TRC process</td>
<td>MARKS: 6–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 EXTENDED WRITING

4.6.1 [Plan and construct an argument based on evidence using analytical and Interpretative skills - L1 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates should discuss to what extent the TRC was successful in reconciling South Africa from its divided past

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- Introduction: Candidates need to indicate to what extent the TRC was successful in reconciling South Africa from its divided past.

ELABORATION
SUCCESSFUL TO A GREAT EXTENT
- Aims of the TRC: investigate the causes and extent of human rights violations under apartheid; recommended compensation to victims and to grant amnesty to those guilty of human rights offences under set conditions
- The TRC hoped that the telling of truth, to promote national reconciliation through its three committees. Committee on Human Rights Violations; Committee on Reparation and Reconciliation and Committee on Amnesty – to grant amnesty from prosecution to perpetrators of gross human rights violations, if they met the set conditions – make full disclosure of what exactly happened for their politically motivated human rights abuses that happened between 1960 and 1994.
- TRC moved across South Africa listening to stories by both victims and perpetrators; National unity was promoted through hearings in East London, Queenstown, Nelspruit etc; both sides of the conflict came to testify i.e. activists from liberation movement and members from the apartheid government and security agency
- Listening to testimonies of perpetrators helped victims to reconcile and bring about healing e.g. Mrs Calata in East London; Many unaccounted victims were identified, graves located and bodies exhumed and given to families for reburial e.g. Jabulani Ndaba, Oscar Maleka, Reginald Kekana, the Mamelodi 10 etc.
- Reparations paid to families of victims e.g. R30 000 once-off payment of an individual grant, R15 000 once-off grants for reburial etc.
- Any other relevant answer

SUCCESSFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT
- Members of the old regime e.g. Eugene de Kock, Adriaan Vlok and Dirk Coetzee came forward to apply for amnesty but complained of having been sold by their leaders. (Vlok and Coetzee were granted amnesty)
- Amnesty led to perpetrators willingness to testify. (Only after former security forces appeared or testified, did others for fear of implication, also come forward/De Kock’s testimony encouraged many others to apply but he was not granted amnesty himself)
The Conservative Party regarded the TRC’s objective as to destroy the Afrikaners (their members who applied for amnesty were not granted).

SADF members did not co-operate with the Commission.

Some offenders, e.g. P.W. Botha refused to give evidence; FW de Klerk took legal action to prevent publication of a paragraph implicating him in ‘third force’ activities.

The Biko, Hani and Mxenge families and Azapo did not support the process adopted by the TRC – without justice.

Late payments of reparations.

Any other relevant response.

Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion.

Use the matrix on page 6 in this document to assess this extended writing.
4.6.2 Synthesise information to construct an original argument using evidence from the sources and own knowledge to support the argument - L2 – LO1 (AS3 and 4); LO2 (AS1, 2 and 3); LO3 (AS1, 2, 3 and 4)

SYNOPSIS
Candidates should indicate whether the statement is accurate or not. If they agree, candidates should provide evidence to show how perpetrators lacked the courage to reveal the truth. If they disagree, they must substantiate their line of argument.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:
• Introduction: Candidates should indicate their viewpoint.

ELABORATION

AGREE
• The Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act – laid down conditions for gaining amnesty (action that took place between 1960 and 1994/ political motivated/ full disclosure)
• Some offenders, e.g. P.W. Botha refused to give evidence; F.W. de Klerk took legal action to prevent publication of a paragraph implicating him in 'third force' activities; Conservative Party regarded TRC a witch hunt for Afrikaners
• Applications for amnesty did not willingly come forward, they availed themselves when implicated: e.g. Dirk Coetzee, after being implicated by Almond Nofemela killing Griffiths Mxenge
• General amnesty preferred by members of previous government and security forces
• Liberation movements were not willing to apply for amnesty for legitimate acts against apartheid; ANC did appear before the TRC but tried unsuccessfully to prevent the publication of the whole report
• Difficult to achieve reconciliation
• Any other relevant response

DISAGREE
• Two right-wing political prisoners Du Plessis and Van Wyk were denied amnesty even though they qualified
• Members of the old regime e.g. Eugene de Kock, Adriaan Vlok and Dirk Coetzee came forward to apply for amnesty (Vlok and Coetzee were granted amnesty)
• Conservative Party regarded TRC a witch hunt for Afrikaners
• Any other relevant answer
• Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion.
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