This memorandum consists of 23 pages.
1. SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS

1.1 The following cognitive levels were used to develop source-based questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE LEVELS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL SKILLS</th>
<th>WEIGHTING OF QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LEVEL 1          | • Extract evidence from sources  
                  • Selection and organisation of relevant information from sources  
                  • Define historical concepts/terms | 30% (15) |
| LEVEL 2          | • Interpretation of evidence from sources  
                  • Explain information gathered from sources  
                  • Analyse evidence from sources | 40% (20) |
| LEVEL 3          | • Interpret and evaluate evidence from sources  
                  • Engage with sources to determine its usefulness, reliability, bias and limitations  
                  • Compare and contrast interpretations and perspectives presented in sources and draw independent conclusions | 30% (15) |

1.2 The information below indicates how source-based questions are assessed:

- 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.

1.3 Assessment procedures for source-based questions

- Use a tick (✓) for each correct answer
- Pay attention to the mark scheme e.g. (2 x 2) which translates to two reasons and is given two marks each (✓✓✓✓); (1 x 2) which translates to one reason and is given two marks (✓✓)
- If a question carries 4 marks then indicate by placing 4 ticks (✓✓✓✓)

**Paragraph question**

Paragraphs are to be assessed globally (holistically). Both the content and structure of the paragraph must be taken into account when awarding a mark. The following steps must be used when assessing a response to a paragraph question:

- Read the paragraph and place a bullet (●) at each point within the text where the candidate has used relevant evidence to address the question.
- Re-read the paragraph to evaluate the extent to which the candidate has been able to use relevant evidence to write a paragraph.
2. ESSAY QUESTIONS

2.1 The essay questions require candidates to:

- Be able to structure their argument in a logical and coherent manner. They need to select, organise and connect the relevant information so that they are able to present a reasonable sequence of facts or an effective argument to answer the question posed. It is essential that an essay has an introduction, a coherent and balanced body of evidence and a conclusion.

2.2 Marking of essay questions

- 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 essay marking guideline for a specific essay.
- When assessing open-ended source-based questions, learners should be credited for any other relevant answers.

2.3 Global assessment of the essay

The essay will be assessed holistically (globally). This approach requires the teacher 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 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 marking of the essay 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
- The learner's interpretation of the question.
2.4 Assessment procedures of the essay

2.4.1 Keep the synopsis in mind when assessing the essay.

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

2.4.3 The following additional symbols can also be used:
- Introduction, main aspects and conclusion not properly contextualised

- Wrong statement

- Irrelevant statement

- Repetition

- Analysis

- Interpretation

2.5. The matrix

2.5.1 Use of the matrix in the marking of essays

In the marking of essays, the criteria as provided in the matrix should be used. When assessing the essay note 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.

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

(b) The second reading of the essay will relate to the level (on the matrix) of presentation.

(c) Allocate an overall mark with the use of the matrix.
## MARKING MATRIX FOR ESSAY: TOTAL MARKS: 50

<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>CONTENT</td>
<td>Very well planned and structured essay. Good synthesis of information. Developed an original, well balanced and independent line of argument with the use of evidence and sustained and defended the argument throughout. Independent conclusion is drawn from evidence to support the line of argument.</td>
<td>Very well planned and structured essay.</td>
<td>Well planned and structured essay. Attempts to develop a clear argument. Evidence used to support the line of argument. Attempts to draw an independent conclusion from the evidence to support the line of argument.</td>
<td>Planned and constructed an argument. Evidence used to some extent to support the line of argument. Conclusion reached based on evidence.</td>
<td>Shows some evidence of a planned and constructed argument. Attempts to sustain a line of argument. Conclusions not clearly supported by evidence.</td>
<td>Attempts to structure an answer. Largely descriptive or some attempt at developing a line of argument. No attempt to draw a conclusion.</td>
<td>Little or no attempt to structure the essay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVEL 7**  
Question has been fully answered. Content selection fully relevant to line of argument.

47–50

**LEVEL 6**  
Question has been answered. Content selection relevant to a line of argument.

43–46

**LEVEL 5**  
Question answered to a great extent. Content adequately covered and relevant.

38–39

**LEVEL 4**  
Question recognisable in answer. Some omissions or irrelevant content selection.

30–33

**LEVEL 3**  
Content selection does relate to the question, but does not answer it, or does not always relate to the question. Omissions in coverage.

26–27

**LEVEL 2**  
Question inadequately addressed. Sparse content.

20–23

**LEVEL 1***  
Question inadequately addressed or not at all. Inadequate or irrelevant content.

14–17

* Guidelines for allocating a mark for Level 1:

- Question not addressed at all/ totally irrelevant content; no attempt to structure the essay = 0
- Question includes basic and generally irrelevant information; no attempt to structure the essay = 1–6
- Question inadequately addressed and vague; little attempt to structure the essay = 7–13
SECTION A: SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1: WHY DID THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC DECIDE TO BUILD THE BERLIN WALL IN 1961?

1.1
1.1.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]
   - In 1948 a separate currency was introduced in West Berlin
   - In 1949 West German state was founded
   - 1954 West Germany joined NATO
   - 1958 West Germany took decision on atomic armament (4 x 1) (4)

1.1.2 [Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]
   - North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)
   - Warsaw Pact (2 x 1) (2)

1.1.3 [Interpretation of information from Source 1A – L2]
   - The wall was a peace keeping measure since East Germany saw West Germany as a threat to their security
   - Large numbers of skilled workers were leaving East Germany for West Germany and this meant that West Berlin threatened to cripple east Germany’s economy (loss of 3.5 million marks annually)
   - Any other relevant response (2 x 2) (4)

1.1.4 [Evaluate the reliability of Source 1A – L3]
   Candidates must indicate whether the source is RELIABLE or NOT RELIABLE and support their answer with relevant evidence.

RELIABLE
   - The source was created by the East German government and it outlines their view on the situation in East Germany
   - The events referred to in the extract are factually accurate from their viewpoint
   - Any other relevant response

NOT RELIABLE
   - The source was created specifically to give the East German point of view regarding the Berlin Wall
   - The pamphlet was written in English (not German) and was distributed in the United States of America and Britain
   - It presents the East Germans reasons for building the wall but does not give any other perspective
   - The events referred to in the extract are factually accurate but were interpreted by East Germany as acts of aggression (even if this was not the case)
   - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
1.2

1.2.1 [Extraction of information from Source 1B – L1]
- Glittering
- Capitalist
- Luxurious

1.2.2 [Explanation of historical concept in Source 1B – L1]
- An economic system based on the private ownership of the means of production (land, factories, businesses)
- An economic system motivated by profit maximisation
- Any other relevant response

1.2.3 [Interpretation of information in Source 1B – L2]
- The USA wanted to ensure that West Berlin was a role model for capitalism in Europe
- To increase the standard of living in West Berlin
- To prevent West Berliners from being tempted to move to East Berlin
- USA had committed itself to support free peoples of the world via the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan
- Any other relevant response

1.2.4 [Interpretation of information in Source 1B – L2]
- The quality of life appeared to be better in West Berlin as compared to East Berlin
- East Berlin lacked the same freedoms and liberties which people in West Berlin enjoyed
- Berlin was a free city so most people could move freely between the sectors
- They did not want to live under communist rule
- Any other relevant response

1.2.5 [Extraction of information from Source 1B – L1]
- West Berlin had become a major centre for espionage and spying
- West Berlin was situated ‘deep within the enemy’s territory’
- Any other relevant response

1.3

1.3.1 [Analysis of information from Source 1C – L2]

(a)
- It promises a high standard of living and quality of life (honey/ money) but in reality this was not the case
- Any other relevant response

(b)
- Life in East Germany is portrayed as comfortable and has everything a worker requires to survive (drawn as bees living in a rose garden)
- Any other relevant response
1.3.2 *Detecting bias in Source 1C – L3*

- The cartoon was produced and published in East Germany where anti-communist opposition was silenced.
- The picture presents life in East Germany in a positive light, this is a contradiction because East Germans fled from East Germany in large numbers.
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.4

1.4.1 *Extraction of information from Source 1D – L1*

- Large numbers of people fled East Germany through the open frontier in Berlin.
- There was unrest and discontent in the factories.
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 1) (2)

1.4.2 *Interpretation of information from Source 1D – L2*

- Ulbricht requested permission from the Warsaw Pact states to close the frontier in Berlin, hence freedom of movement would be restricted.
- The Berlin Wall was built on 13 August 1961.
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.5 *Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3*

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.

- The German Democratic Republic built the ‘anti-fascist wall’ because they believed that the western powers were endangering the peace (Source 1A).
- The East Germans viewed West Germany as a security threat (Source 1A).
- The actions taken by the western powers in Berlin and West Germany were viewed as acts of aggression (Source 1A).
- Large numbers of skilled professionals were leaving East Germany via the free city of Berlin (Source 1A and 1D).
- In the context of increasing Cold War tensions the building of a wall prevented military conflict between opposing forces (Source 1A).
- Western powers attempted to encourage East German workers to flee to the West/ lured them with promises of a better quality of life (Source 1C).
- The west used West Berlin as a centre of espionage to spy on East Germany and to spread anti-communist propaganda (Source 1B).
- The German Democratic Republic built the Berlin Wall to prevent people leaving East Germany via East Berlin (Source 1B).
- Communism was seen as a less attractive way of life than capitalism (Source 1B and 1C).
- East Germans/Berliners were attracted to the better quality of life in capitalist West Berlin (Source 1B and 1D).
- The East German economy was in danger of collapsing because so many skilled and professional people tried to leave for the west (Sources 1A, 1C and 1D) so a wall was the only way to stop this flow.
- The East Germans were attempting to collectivise the land and prevent private ownership which resulted in people fleeing to the west.
- The authoritarian regime and lack of freedom in East Germany caused people to flee to the west, the wall prevented this outflow of people (Source 1B and 1D)
- 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 why the German Democratic Republic decided to build the Berlin Wall in 1961.</th>
<th>MARKS 0–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.</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 an understanding why the German Democratic Republic decided to build the Berlin Wall in 1961.</td>
<td>MARKS 3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses evidence in a basic manner to write a paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>Uses relevant evidence e.g. shows a thorough understanding why the German Democratic Republic decided to build the Berlin Wall in 1961.</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>

(8) [50]
QUESTION 2: WHY DID SOUTH AFRICA AND CUBA BECOME INVOLVED IN THE COLD WAR IN ANGOLA AFTER 1975?

2.1
2.1.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]
   - Russia
   - Cuba

2.1.2 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]
   - Russians and Cubans entered Angola
   - Russians and Cubans interfered in the affairs of Angola
   - Russians and Cubans suppressed the people of Angola
   - Vorster wanted to prevent Cuba and the MPLA from taking control of the dams between Ruacana and Caleque

2.1.3 [Comparison of evidence and ascertaining the differences between statements in Sources 2A – L3]
   - Vorster stated that it was the involvement of Russia and Cuba in Angola which prompted South Africa’s intervention in Angola (paragraph 1) while Liebenberg and Spies indicate that it was South Africa’s desire to prevent a hostile MPLA government from taking control of Angola (paragraph 2)
   - Vorster indicated that South Africa went in to prevent Cuba and the MPLA from taking control of the dams (paragraph 1) while Liebenberg and Spies indicate that it was not the Russians and Cubans that were interested in the dams but rather SWAPO (paragraph 2)
   - Vorster stated that the Russians and the Cubans were subverting and suppressing the people of Angola (paragraph 1) while Liebenberg and Spies indicate that there were hardly any Russians and only a few Cubans in the country when South Africa invaded Angola (paragraph 2)
   - Any other relevant response

2.1.4 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]
   - President Kaunda
   - President Mobutu

2.2
2.2.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2B – L2]
   - Cuban intervention was of a military nature as shown by the gun in Castro’s hands and the uniform he wore
   - Russia controlled Cuba and forced them to intervene, as shown by the winding key on Castro’s back
   - Any other relevant response
2.2.2 [Evaluation of limitations of Source 2B – L3]

- The cartoon could be biased because it only gives an American artist’s viewpoint
- The cartoon only shows the Cuban and USSR intervention in Angola, while South Africa and other countries were also involved in the Angolan war but are not depicted
- The USSR is shown as the driving force behind Cuba, no mention is made of America’s role in supporting the South African intervention in Angola
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

2.3

2.3.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2C – L1]

- Bitter/unhappy (1 x 2) (2)

2.3.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2C - L2]

- The USA played a major part in supplying the SADF with arms and information and if Vorster spoke about the US’s assistance then South Africa could lose its backing and support
- The US government could be criticised on the international stage because of its support of the apartheid regime
- American citizens had not been informed of the role its government played in the Cold War in Angola
- The South African government did not want to breach the confidentiality of its communication with the US government
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

2.3.3 [Extraction of evidence from Source 2C – L1]

- When confronted by the statement that the USA had requested South Africa’s help in Angola, Vorster stated that ‘if you are making the statement, I won’t deny it.’
- When confronted by the accusation that Kissinger gave the go ahead for a South African military operation in Angola, Vorster answered ‘If you say it of your own accord, I will not call you a liar.’ (2 x 1) (2)

2.3.4 [Interpretation of evidence Source 2C – L2]

- Some African presidents did not support the communist ideology
- Some African presidents did not support the MPLA government in Angola
- Some African presidents supported the SADF’s intervention to help UNITA and the FNLA only
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
2.4
2.4.1  [Extraction of evidence from Source 2D – L1]
   • Zaire  

2.4.2  [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2D - L2]
   • Castro believed that America had directed Zaire to send troops into Angola
   • Castro believed that America had directed South Africa to send troops, tanks and artillery into Angola
   • Any other relevant response  

2.4.3  [Interpretation of evidence from Source 2D – L2]
   • MPLA was communist orientated government
   • To protect Cuban interests in Angola
   • The Angolan armed forces (FAPLA) were not able to prevent the invasion by South African troops
   • Any other relevant response  

2.4.4  [Extraction of evidence from Source 2D – L1]
   (a)
   • Angolan ‘patriots’  
   (b)
   • South African ‘racists’  

2.5  [Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]
   Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.
   • According to Vorster South Africa participated in the Cold War in Angola because of the USSR’s and Cuba’s involvement (Source 2A)
   • According to Vorster South Africa intervened in the Cold War in Angola because of the threat on the dams between Ruacana and Caleque (Source 2A)
   • South Africa got involved because of the threat posed by a hostile MPLA government (Source 2A)
   • South Africa intervened in Angola to support the FNLA and UNITA (Source 2A)
   • According to Fidel Castro South Africa intervened in Angola in response to a request by the USA (Source 2C)
   • South Africa supported other ‘moderate African presidents’ who were fighting against the MPLA government in Angola (Source 2D)
   • According to Vorster Cuba got involved in Angola in order to subvert the country and suppress the people through communism (Source 2A)
   • Cuba got involved in order to spread communism in Africa (own knowledge)
   • The USSR directed Cuba to participate in the Cold War in Angola(Source 2B)
   • According to Castro, Cuba was requested by the MPLA to help resist the South African invasion of Angola (Source 2D)
   • Any other relevant response
Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>MARKS 0–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uses evidence in an elementary manner e.g. <strong>shows no or little understanding of why South Africa and Cuba became involved in the Cold War in Angola after 1975.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>MARKS 3–5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. <strong>shows an understanding of why South Africa and Cuba became involved in the Cold War in Angola after 1975.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Uses evidence in a basic manner to write a paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>MARKS 6–8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Uses relevant evidence e.g. <strong>shows a thorough understanding of why South Africa and Cuba became involved in the Cold War in Angola after 1975.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.</td>
<td>(8) [50]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 3: HOW DID AMERICANS REACT TO THE INTEGRATION OF CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL IN LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS, IN 1957?

3.1
3.1.1 [Explanation of a historical concept from Source 3A – L1]
- A process of allowing African American students to attend Central High School with white American students
- A process of desegregating Central High School so that African American students can attend
- A process of ending the segregation of Central High School, as a former exclusively whites only school, by allowing the inclusion of African American students
- Any other relevant response

3.1.2 [Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]
- It enrolled a group of qualified and pre-selected African American students at Central High School
- It decided to integrate Central High School from 1957 as directed by the Supreme Court ruling

3.1.3 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3A – L2]
- To accept African American students as fellow students
- To refrain from causing quarrels or disrupting the school
- To refrain from putting themselves at risk of being arrested for disorderly behavior
- To concentrate on their studies and not to get involved in disruptive incidents at school
- Any other relevant response

3.1.4 [Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L2]
- ‘We can do that if each pupil and teacher will go quietly about our business here at school – learning and teaching’

3.2
3.2.1 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2]
- To show that white American students were against the integration of Central High School
- To show that white Americans disapproved of the integration of Central High School and were not prepared to share their educational resources
- Any other relevant response

3.2.2 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2]
- To defy the decision taken by the school board – to de-segregate the school
- To protest the de-segregation of Central High School
- In protest against the presence of African American students at Central High School
- Any other relevant response
3.3 **[Evaluate the differences between Sources 3A and 3B – L3]**

- Source 3A states that students were warned not to cause any disorder or confusion at the school but in Source 3B conservative American white students were seen causing chaos at school by marching out in protest against the integration of Central High School.
- Source 3A indicates that demonstrations would be regarded as contempt of the court order but Source 3B depicts conservative white American students at Central High School undertaking demonstrations against the integration at the Central High School.
- Source 3A requests that students maintain the reputation of Central High School as a leading public school but the ‘incident’ in Source 3B damaged the reputation of the school.
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.4 **[Extraction of evidence from Source 3C – L1]**

- She made it known in the Algebra class from the first day that she would not tolerate any objection to integration (1 x 1) (1)

3.4.2 **[Extraction of evidence from Source 3C – L1]**

- She shared her textbooks with Roberts
- She ‘pulled her desk next to mine to share books’
- She was kind to the African American students (3 x 1) (3)

3.4.3 **[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2]**

- Central High School was reserved for white American students and by allowing African-American students admission to Central High School was a violation of the social code.
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.4.4 **[Evaluation of the usefulness of Source 3C – L3]**

**The source is useful because:**

- It is an extract that contains the actual words of Terrence J Roberts
- It is an account of what happened in one of Roberts’ classes and gives new insights on the events that occurred at Central High School.
- It offers insights into the daily experiences of the Little Rock Nine at Central High School.
- It indicates the effects that racial discrimination had on African American students.
- The information can be corroborated by other sources on the same topic.
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)
3.5
3.5.1 [Extraction of evidence from Source 3D – L1]
- It would now be impossible for white Americans to say that African Americans had never graduated from the Central High School
- He was the first African American ever to graduate from Central High School

3.5.2 [Analysis of evidence from Source 3D – L2]
- He was the first African American student to graduate at Central High School after integration
- His graduation implied that desegregation of Central High School was a success story
- Any other relevant response

3.5.3 [Extraction of evidence from Source 3D – L1]
- There was an eerie silence
- Nobody clapped

3.5.4 [Analysis of evidence from Source 3D – L2]
- He felt he had achieved his goal
- He did not bother whether the white American audience did not applaud his success
- He didn’t care if his achievements were not recognised
- He wanted to leave the school as quickly as possible because he had accomplished his goal
- Any other relevant response

3.6 [Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]
Candidates could include the following points in their response:

- White American students were warned not to cause any disorder or demonstration at Central High School (Source 3A)
- They undermined the school bulletin that served as a guide on how students should handle themselves (own knowledge)
- About 60-75 conservative white American students marched out of the School in protest against the integration of Central High School on 3 October 1957 (Source 3B)
- White American students in an Algebra class accepted the presence of an African American student, Terrence Roberts (Source 3C)
- A white American student, Robin Woods shared her textbooks with an African American student (Source 3C)
- White American parents did not congratulate Ernest Green when he graduated and received his diploma in May 1958 (Source 3D)
- African Americans viewed the integration of Central High School as a victory for the Civil Rights Movement (own knowledge)
- 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 how Americans reacted to the integration of Central High School in Little Rock Arkansas in 1957. | MARKS 0–2 |
| LEVEL 2 | Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic e.g. shows an understanding of how Americans reacted to the integration of Central High School in Little Rock Arkansas in 1957. | MARKS 3–5 |
| LEVEL 3 | Uses relevant evidence e.g. shows a thorough understanding of how Americans reacted to the integration of Central High School in Little Rock Arkansas in 1957. | MARKS 6–8 |
SECTION B: ESSAY QUESTIONS

QUESTION 4

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates should indicate how the North Vietnamese (Vietminh) supported the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) to liberate their country from American interference. An analysis of how the Vietcong were able to defeat the US army should be elaborated upon. An outline of the tactics and strategies employed by the USA’s army and the Vietminh together with the Vietcong (National Liberation Front) during the war, should also be highlighted.

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

• Introduction: Candidates should critically discuss the statement and take an appropriate line of argument.

ELABORATION

Purpose of the Vietminh and the Viet Cong in defending Vietnam

• Vietnamese were united/patriotic/nationalists in the defence of their country against the US
• North Vietnam received military support from USSR and China therefore the Vietminh and the Viet Cong had access to some modern weapons
• Guerrilla warfare was effectively used by the Vietcong, supported by Vietminh from the north and used tactics such as booby traps, underground tunnels, hit and run and sabotage
• Strong leadership in Vietcong under Giap, led to defensive attacks on the US army
• Tet offensive (1968) was launched by Vietminh and Viet Cong against urban centres and USA bases throughout Vietnam
• The local Vietnamese population supported the Vietcong to liberate their country
• Ho Chi Minh Trail was used by Vietminh (north) to support the Viet Cong in the south
• The Viet Cong increased its support base because of the tactics used against US soldiers
• Any other relevant response

Purpose of the USA in Vietnam

• Intervened in Vietnam to stop the spread of communism to Asia/ war against the domino effect
• Villagisation (1963) (USA and South Vietnam government created new villages and attempted to separate villagers [farmers] from guerrillas) which was a failure
• Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (1964) gave President Johnson wide military powers resulting in the escalation of warfare in Vietnam
• The USA embarked on mass aerial bombing ‘Operation Rolling Thunder’ (conventional warfare)
• 'Operation Ranch Hand' (used chemicals to destroy forests (Agent Orange) and crops (Agent Blue))
• The USA sent young and inexperienced soldiers to Vietnam
• The US used search and destroy missions (My Lai massacre) to decimate villages supported by Vietcong resulting in large numbers of civilian deaths
• The role of media, students and disarmament movements in bringing pressure on the US government to withdraw from Vietnam
• President Nixon's Vietnamisation policy / including WHAM (Winning the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese) was an attempt by the USA to withdraw from war and 'save face'
• The USA withdrew all troops from Vietnam by 1973 and North Vietnam took control of Saigon in 1975 resulting in Vietnam that was united under a communist rule
• Any other relevant response

• Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion
QUESTION 5

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS
In writing this essay, candidates must explain how the leadership of Mobutu Sese Seko and Julius Nyerere had an impact on political and economic development in the Congo and Tanzania respectively in the 1960s. They need to provide relevant economic and political examples to support their line of argument.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:
• Introduction: Candidates should establish their line of argument by explaining to what extent the leadership qualities of Mobutu Sese Seko and Julius Nyerere impacted on the political and economic development in the Congo and Tanzania respectively.

ELABORATION

Political stability
Similar leadership qualities
• Both the Congo and Tanzania were under European colonial rule until the early 1960s
• After holding multi-party elections at independence both countries became one-party-states within the first five years of independence
• Both countries continued to hold elections
• Both leaders emphasised the importance of Africanisation of their political systems (they regarded democracy as ‘un-African’ and a western imposition)
• Both Sese Seko and Nyerere took pride in building their nations and vigorously promoted the pride of being Zairian or Tanzanian
• The leaders of both countries remained as ‘presidents for life’ between the 1960s and 1970s
• In both countries opposition leaders were silenced, imprisoned and in some cases killed to maintain ‘stability’
• Any other relevant response

Different leadership qualities
• Mobutu Sese Seko created a kleptocracy were a group of appointed public officials abused their position for financial gain whereas Nyerere introduced the ‘Leadership Code’ in the Arusha Declaration which demanded high levels of integrity from public officials
• Mobutu Seso Seko was extravagant and enjoyed expensive clothes and built himself palaces while Nyerere’s leadership style was one of personal integrity and humbleness
• Mobutu Sese Seko aligned himself with the West while Nyerere adopted a policy of non-alignment with either capitalist or communist countries
• Any other relevant response
**Economic development**

Similar leadership qualities
- Both countries relied heavily on agriculture and mineral extraction and neither countries were able to develop a credible manufacturing sector
- Neither country saw significant increases in the standard of living for the majority of its people
- Both countries experienced an economic crisis and therefore, relied on foreign aid/assistance
- Any other relevant answer

Different leadership qualities
- Mobutu Sese Seko initially nationalised industry with his policy of Zairianisation but when this failed he adopted a capitalist model while Nyerere adopted an African socialist model (as outlined in the Arusha Declaration) which led to the nationalisation of businesses and land
- Mobutu Sese Seko accepted aid, investment and financial support from the West (e.g. USA and France) while Nyerere was initially opposed to foreign aid and viewed it as neo-colonialism
- Mobutu created a new class of elite supporters while Nyerere attempted to rid Tanzania of class divisions
- Any other relevant answer

- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion
QUESTION 6

[Plan and construct an original argument based on relevant evidence using analytical and interpretative skills]

SYNOPSIS
Candidates should explain the role that the Black Panther Party (amongst others) played in the emergence of ‘Black Power’ in the USA in the 1960s. Candidates should indicate that the Black Panther Party was not solely responsible for the emergence of ‘Black Power’ in the USA in the 1960s.

MAIN ASPECTS
Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:
- Introduction: Candidates should indicate that the Black Panther Party was not solely responsible for the emergence of ‘Black Power’ in the USA in the 1960s.

ELABORATION

The philosophy of the Black Power Movement
- Believed in the concepts of self-pride and self-esteeem/ self-respect/ self help, that should be inculcated among African Americans
- Principles of Black Power (do things for yourself; control politics in their communities; take pride in their own culture and defend themselves) against racial oppression and manipulation
- Promotion of black interests and concerns
- The philosophy of Black Power emerged as an attempt to address the poor living conditions of African Americans
- Any other relevant response

The role of the Black Panther Party
- The Black Panther Party (BPP) was founded by Bobby Searle and Huey Newton, in 1966
- BPP were involved in the initiation and support of Black Power programmes, i.e. community based programmes and feeding schemes (anti-poverty centres); embarked on programmes that were responsible for the defence of African Americans against police brutality; focussed on socio-economic conditions of African Americans and also operated several community survival programmes
- The Ten Point Plan served as the Black Panther’s manifesto that covered its social, political and economic goals and objectives
- The Ten Point Plan aimed to ensure that African Americans attained equality in education, housing, employment and civil rights through demand of freedom, full employment, decent housing, need to learn the true history of African Americans, end police brutality, end the murder of African Americans and free health care
- The Black Panther Party got involved in street patrols; monitored police activities and defended themselves by carrying guns (militant approach) to stop the on-going police brutality and harassment of young urban African American men
- Any other relevant response
The role of Malcolm X:
- Malcolm X believed in black separation and self-determination (black nationalism) he advocated self-respect and self-discipline
- Called for assertiveness (aggressiveness) in their revolution against oppression e.g. race riots at Watts, Detroit
- Wanted African Americans to stand up against white authorities and authoritarianism in pursuit of freedom, justice and equality ‘by whatever means necessary’
- Promoted the use of violence as a means of self defence against those who attacked African Americans
- The Black Panther Party followed Malcolm X’s belief of unity among the international working class
- Any other relevant response

The role of Stockely Carmichael:
- Became chairman of SNCC (Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee) in 1966 and decided to embrace the teachings of the Black Power Movement
- Did not invent ‘Black Power’ but popularised it
- In 1966 he popularised the Black Power slogan ‘Black is beautiful’ and promoted ‘African Pride’
- He believed that the strategy of non-violence had failed because of the on-going violence that was used by white Americans against African Americans
- Advocated the exclusion of ‘white’ liberals as a philosophy for African Americans
- Was in favour of African clothing and African hairstyles as a symbol of Black Pride
- Carmichael joined the Black Panther Party (for Self - Defence) which put into action the philosophy of Black Power
- Elected ‘honorary prime minister’ of the Black Panther Party
- Any other relevant response

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

TOTAL: 150