

## GENERAL COMMENTS

A number of candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge found it challenging to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These candidates were able to identify numerous factors or reasons when answering the chosen question, but they needed to develop these identified points into explanation.

### 1 (a) Describe the terms that applied to the German armed forces in the Treaty of Versailles.

It was fairly answered. Most of the candidates could not specify how German was punished militarily. Some candidates focused on territorial losses and/or described the aims and motives of the Big Three at the Treaty of Versailles.

The German navy was allowed a total of 36 ships: 6 battle ships, 6 cruisers, 12 destroyers and 12 torpedo boats.

No submarines were allowed.

Weapons and equipment beyond what was allowed should be 'surrendered to the Governments of the Allied Powers and Associated Powers to be destroyed or rendered useless'.

'Surplus weapons had to be destroyed.'

The Germany army was reduced to 100 000 men.

Conscription was not allowed in Germany.

The Rhineland was demilitarized.

An example of a developed point, worth 2 marks, e.g. 'Germany was not allowed any armoured vehicles (1) and this included tanks (2) [1–5]

### (b) Explain why the Germans were not satisfied with the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

Fairly answered as most candidates were able to identify the reasons why Germans were not satisfied with the territorial terms even though the majority of the candidates could not explain.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. It was harsh / they were humiliated / punished

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. Germany lost its productivity.  
German people were displaced.  
The Germans found it hard to produce food.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason only [4–5]  
e.g. Germany lost most of its productive land for example the Saar and overseas colonies which were very rich in terms of raw materials which they could have mined, process and export to other countries in exchange of other needed commodities. Due to the loss of this land, the Germans found it more difficult to make the money to pay the reparations bill.

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason [6–7]  
e.g. Level 3 + Self-determination did not apply to Germans as many of them found themselves as minorities in territories and colonies taken away from Germany and they were now ruled by people of those countries such territories were given to.

### (c) "Clemenceau was more motivated by revenge than Lloyd George in their aims at Versailles." How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

It was fairly answered, although candidates could not compare the aims of the two leaders mentioned in the question as this question required candidates to compare. Few candidates managed to reach an explanation level.

- Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. agree / disagree
- Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]  
e.g. Germany attacked France  
The war took place in France  
The war caused so much damage to France
- Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Level 2 + London was bombed several times  
Lloyd George promised to punish Germany  
Britain fought alongside France for four years
- Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]  
e.g. France wanted revenge for past attacks. Both times France suffered; therefore Clemenceau wanted to weaken Germany so that they will not have the strength to attack France ever again. Reducing Germany's armed forces and the demilitarization of the Rhineland was to protect France from a possible German attack as it has done in the past.
- Level 5:** Explains both sides [7-8]  
e.g. Level 4 + Lloyd George was not as vengeful as Clemenceau because he wanted the German economy to recover quickly so Britain could sell it industrial goods. Before the war, Germany had been Britain's second largest trading partner. He wanted Germany to lose its navy and its colonies because Britain thought they threatened the British Empire.

**2 (a)** Briefly describe the aims of the League of Nations.

It was fairly answered, most could be able to give the aims of the League of Nation although few described the work of the agencies.

- e.g. Discourage aggression from any nation  
To maintain peace / to prevent war  
To solve disputes between member states  
To encourage nations to disarm  
To encourage nations to co-operate especially in business and trade  
To improve the living condition of people worldwide, for instance, it repatriated 400,000 World War One prisoners of war.  
To uphold the terms of the peace treaties [1-5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

**(b)** Explain why the League of Nations failed to stop the Japanese invasion of Manchuria during the early 1930s.

Fairly answered as most of the candidates were able to identify the reasons why the League of Nations failed to stop the Japanese invasion of Manchuria but most of them could not explain the identified reasons.

- Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge. [1]  
e.g. They were afraid / They were weak
- Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. The League took too long to condemn Japan.  
League member were unwilling to impose sanctions.  
The League did not have an army.
- Level 3:** Explain one reason only [4–5]  
e.g. The League could be too slow or reluctant to act decisively. A League's Commission of Enquiry was sent to investigate who was the aggressor between Japan and China. The Lord Lytton Commission report was published almost a year later and condemned Japan of her actions. The League ordered Japan to withdraw but it was too late. Japan had already completed its invasion. In taking too long to respond the League failed to stop the invasion.

**Level 4:** Explain more than one reason. [6–7]

e.g. Level 3 + The League failed to stop the Japanese invasion because it lacked an army and its major powers, Britain and France, were not willing to go to war over this issue. Both powers did not want to get involved because it was a far off affair, not affecting Europe directly, and their armies were weak after the First World War. As Britain and France were not prepared to send an army and the League did not have one there was nothing the League could do to enforce its decision’.

- (c) “The Great Depression was the most important reason for the failure of the League of Nations.” How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Poorly answered, many candidates focused on the League of Nations, Identifying the aims instead of the reasons why it failed. Some mentioned about the failures of the League of Nations but could not explain the Great Depression.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. agree OR disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only. [2-3]  
e.g. The depression encouraged aggressive nationalism.  
Countries began to focus on own problems.

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Absence of superpowers.  
Lack of armed forces  
Britain and France looked at own interest

**Level 4:** One sided explanation. [5–6]  
e.g. ‘The Great Depression meant the major powers in the League were focused on their own problems and not on what happened in far-away places, outside of Europe. This meant the League lacked the teeth to succeed. When Italy invaded Abyssinia Britain and France were unwilling to commit to sanctions because of the effect it would have on their economy. It was clear the collective security rules of the League would not be enforced so the League lost respect. It became seen as a useless organisation only likely to act in self-interest meaning it lost respect and failed.’

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7-8]  
e.g. Level 4 + ‘The absence of the USA, from the start, was responsible. After the war the USA was stronger than European countries weakened by war so without them the League was powerless to oppose strong countries like Japan and Italy when they invaded weaker countries. The League’s economic sanctions were ineffective because, as non-League members, they could continue to trade with aggressor countries. The USA were the ones that had an army and resources that could stop aggressor countries and without their power the League could not command respect and failed.’

- 3 (a) Briefly describe Hitler’s foreign policy.

It was well answered, most candidates were able to describe Hitler’s foreign policy.

e.g. Hitler wanted to abolish the Treaty of Versailles.

Hitler wanted to unite all German speaking people.

Hitler wanted to regain all German land lost by the Treaty of Versailles

Hitler wanted to gain extra living space (lebensraum) to expand his empire and for the increasing German population. [1-5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

- (b) Why was the Nazi-Soviet Pact important to Hitler?

Poorly answered as most of the candidates were unable to identify the reasons why the Nazi-Soviet Pact was important to Hitler but rather some referred to the aims of Hitler’s foreign policy.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. ‘The Pact was important to Hitler because it gave him a free hand to carry out his plans’.

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
(One mark for each identification/description)

e.g. 'Hitler could now attack Poland.'  
'Hitler knew that Britain and France could do little to help Poland now.'  
'Defeating the Slavs was an important part of Hitler's plan to rule the world.'  
'Russia would not act when Germany invaded Poland.'  
'It meant that Hitler could avoid war on two fronts.'  
'It was important for Hitler to achieve the 'living space' he wanted in Eastern Europe.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason [4–5]

(One mark for each identification/description)

e.g. 'The Pact was important to Hitler because it meant that he could now go ahead and attack Poland. Hitler's greatest worry in invading Poland was that Russia would attack. The Pact was a non-aggression Pact between the Soviet Union and Germany in which the two countries agreed not to attack each other. It also divided up Poland and other parts of Eastern Europe between the two countries. This all meant that Germany could invade Poland knowing that Russia would not attack.

**Level 4:** Explains two reasons [6–7]

L3 + it was important for Hitler to achieve the living space he wanted in Eastern Europe. For that, the treaty defined the borders of soviet and German sphere of influence across Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland.

**(c)** To what extent was appeasement justifiable in the 1930s? Explain your answer.

Fairly answered as candidates could not explain why appeasement was justified. Few managed to identify the reasons but failed to explain.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]

e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]

e.g. Britain and France were not ready for war  
Britain felt the Treaty of Versailles was unfair to Germany.  
Britain and France wanted to buy time to prepare for war, if it came.  
Germany would be a buffer against communism.

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]

e.g. Level 2 + The policy encouraged Hitler to be aggressive.  
Germany became stronger  
The policy scared the USSR

**Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]

e.g. The Appeasement Policy was a success to the extent that many believed Chamberlain had no other choice at that time. It was widely believed that the British forces were not ready to face up to Hitler who had rearmed Germany remarkably. Public opinion was also against war as they felt that money should not be spend on buying weapons but should be used to improve economic and social welfare. The British government were also away of the fact that important countries in her empire such as Canada and Australia were against war and there was no guarantee that the USA would support them in a war against Germany. Chamberlain needed to buy time in order to rearm Britain and prepare for war which seemed inevitable by the day.

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7–8]

e.g. Level 4 + the appeasement policy failed as it encouraged Hitler to be more aggressive. Each gamble he got away with encouraged him to take a bigger risk. For example, when Hitler got Austria without any resistance, he started his demands over the Sudetenland and when he got Sudetenland, he invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia and then invaded Poland despite been warned not to attack Poland. Appeasing Hitler, basically, made him feel Britain and France were scared of him and would not stop him.

4 (a) Briefly describe the decisions taken at the Potsdam Conference of 1945.

Poorly answered as most of the candidates could not describe the decisions that was taken at the Potsdam conference but could rather refer to the different ideologies of the SuperPower.

e.g. To set up the four 'zones of occupation' in Germany as agreed at Yalta.

To ban the Nazi party and to bring Nazi war-criminals to trial.

Poland's border to be established at the Oder and Neisse River.

Repatriate Germans in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

To recognize the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and hold 'free and unfettered elections as soon as possible'.

Russia was allowed to take reparations from the Soviet Zone, and also 10% of the industrial equipment of the western zones as reparations.

America and Britain could take reparations from their zones if they wished.

[1–5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

(b) Explain why Stalin blockaded Berlin.

Not well answered, most candidates could not identify the reasons why Stalin blocked Berlin failed to explain.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge

[1]

e.g. To force the allies out of west Berlin

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons

[2–3]

e.g. Stalin felt threatened by the creation of Trizonia.

The introduction of the Deutschmark.

The desire to remove capitalism from east Germany.

To stop comparisons between east and west Berlin being made.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason

[4–5]

e.g. Developments in 1948 such as Britain, France and the USA combining their area to form Trizonia worried Stalin because he felt threatened, he worried that his old allies, who he knew distrusted him from the end of the Second World War were combining against him. He needed to appear strong in opposing this and chose to do this by cutting Berlin off from the rest of West Germany.

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason

[6–7]

e.g. Level 3 + Stalin felt they directly threatened him by promising to oppose authoritarian threats, by which they meant communism, (Truman Doctrine) and give to capitalist countries in the form of Marshall Aid. Whilst it was offered to Eastern European countries, under Stalin's control, he saw this as further undermining him.

(c) "The USSR was more to blame than the USA for the start of the Cold War." How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Poorly answered as candidates most of the candidates focused much on the Cuban missile Crisis and some focused on the ideology of the Superpowers and failed to explain who caused the Cold war.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge

[1]

e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only

[2–3]

e.g. Stalin wanted to create a buffer zone to be surrounded by states sympathetic to the USSR.

Stalin did not allow free elections to take place.

The USSR expanded into Eastern Europe

The USSR blockade Berlin

The Formation of the Warsaw Pact by the USSR or the military alliance for communist countries

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Level 2 + The USA kept the secret of the atomic bomb.  
The USA stopped the spread of communism.  
The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan also played a significant part in the split of Europe into two opposing camps.  
The USA spear headed the formation of NATO, a military alliance for the Western Allies against the spread of communism.

**Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]  
e.g. 'The USSR was to blame for the Cold War because Stalin had agreed to allow free elections to take place in countries liberated by the Red Army and this didn't happen. In Poland Stalin refused to acknowledge the Polish government in exile and in backing the communists allowed them to rig the elections when they finally did take place. In going against the agreements at Yalta Stalin showed he was not prepared to work with the USA any longer and this lack of co-operation led to the start of the Cold War.'

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7-8]  
e.g. Level 4 + 'The USA were to blame for starting the Cold War even before the Second World War ended. They kept the development of the atom bomb a secret from Stalin despite the fact he was their military ally. This led Stalin to worry they planned to use it on the USSR. The USA demonstrated that they did not trust Stalin and created the atmosphere of mistrust that led to the Cold War.'

**5 (a)** Briefly describe the aims of SWAPO (formally known as OPO).

This question was poorly answered. Candidates gave general answers instead of specific answer. They instead gave general reasons why Swapo was formed.

e.g. To improve the life and working condition of contract workers  
To bring Namibia under the direct protection of the UN  
To be a leading organization in the fight against South African rule  
To win the independence of Namibia from colonial rule  
To abolish the Contract Labour System which violated the rights of workers as they were not allowed to choose the type of work they wanted to do.

[1-5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

**(b)** Explain why SWAPO started the armed struggle against South Africa.

Poorly answered as most candidates focused on the aims of Swapo and more on the contract labour system. Most candidates could not explain why SWAPO started the armed struggle against South Africa.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. They wanted to fight

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. Discussions, petitions and demonstrations failed to persuade South Africa to leave the territory  
UN had failed to force South Africa out of the territory  
The failure of ICJ to declare the presence of South Africa as illegal meant that a legal way of opposing SA had gone  
When neighbouring Zambia became independent they offered havens for training camps for SWAPO to train fighters.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason [4–5]  
e.g. SWAPO felt they had to start an armed struggle against South African because peaceful means were failing. Discussions and petitions had failed and in December 1959 a peaceful demonstration in Windhoek was fired upon by the police killing 11 and injuring 54. Events like this meant SWAPO felt they had no choice to return the violence with violence of their own.'

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason [6–7]  
e.g. Level 3 + SWAPO turned to an armed struggle because in 1966 the International court of Justice failed to declare South Africa's rule in Namibia illegal.  
Decisions like this angered the Namibian people.  
Without passing judgement on the merits of the case brought against South Africa, the court accepted South Africa's contention that Ethiopia and Liberia had no legal standing.

- (c) "Nationalist Organisations such as SWAPO played the most important role in Namibian independence."  
How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Fairly answered. Most of the candidates were able to identify reasons on both sides but failed to reach an explanation level.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]  
e.g. SWAPO started the armed struggle  
SWAPO encouraged young Namibians to join the liberation struggle.  
SWAPO refused to participate in anything that was outside Resolution 435.

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Level 2 + The UN imposed sanctions on South African government.  
Independent Churches opposed South African government.  
The OAU through the Liberation Committee gave support to liberation movements.  
Other political parties were also against South African rule.

**Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]  
e.g. SWAPO started an armed struggle against SA in 1966. It received support from newly independent African countries like Ghana, Tanzania and Libya as well as the OAU's Liberation Committee. Many countries like China, East Germany, the Soviet Union, Romania and Bulgaria also helped by training PLAN fighters or providing weapons, ammunition and medical supplies. SWAPO's leaders visited as many countries as possible to talk to anti-apartheid organisations and to obtain support and money for the liberation movement.

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7-8]  
e.g. Level 4 + The UN started working and pressing for Namibian independence from as early as 1960, when it established the Committee for SWA as a first step in that direction. It replaced this Committee in 1967, after ending the SA mandate over SWA, by the UN Council for Namibia, under Sean McBride. This council's specific goal was to administer the country until independence and to move it towards independence along the lines set out by the UN. On 29 July 1970 the UN Security Council asked the ICJ for an advisory opinion on whether SA's continued presence in Namibia was legal. The ICJ found that SA's presence was illegal.

- 6 (a) Briefly describe how Namibia became a mandate of South Africa.

Poorly answered. Most of the candidates focused on South Africa interested in land and natural resources and cattle but failed to describe how Namibia actually became a mandate of South Africa.

e.g. Germany lost her colonies and they become mandated territories. Namibia was placed as C-Mandate of the League of Nations in 1920

It was given to Britain who in turn requested South Africa to govern Namibia on her behalf.

South Africa made commitments to safeguarding Namibian Human Rights and was seen as a suitable country to hold the mandate.

South Africa had to send annual report on the progress to the League of Nations

South Africa occupied Namibia during World War I, as part of Allied attack on Germany and did not leave.

[1-5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

- (b) Explain why the South African government confiscated Namibia's land and cattle.

Fairly answered as most candidates were able to identify the reasons but few managed to explain the reasons for confiscation.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. They wanted to benefit

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. The South Africans wanted to make black people poor to make them more dependent on white people  
To benefit from the natural resources  
To split the black majority of the population and secure white supremacy.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason [4–5]

e.g. 'The South Africans confiscated Namibian land and cattle to make it easier for South Africa to rule Namibia as a colony. The confiscated land was offered to white South African people as large commercial farms to encourage them to come to Namibia. This helped increase the number of white people and make it easier for South Africa to rule by not only increasing the number of people that supported their rule but also gave the white people a lot more power because they held land and made more money.'

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason [6–7]

e.g. Level 3 + Without their land and cattle Namibians would become poor and unable to sustain their lives. This would force Namibians to leave the reserves and to provide cheap labour to the white farmers which created black dependence on white people.

- (c) "The South African government was successful in implementing the conditions of the mandate system in Namibia to the benefit of its indigenous population." How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Poorly answered. Candidates focused much on the apartheid laws instead of explaining about the mandate system in Namibia and its implementation.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]

e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]

e.g. They sent annual reports to the Mandate Commission.  
They developed infrastructures in Namibia e.g. schools, hospitals etc.

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]

e.g. Level 2 + Social wellbeing of Namibians was neglected.  
South Africa confiscated land and cattle.  
Namibia was not ruled for the benefit of its indigenous population.  
South Africa introduced its apartheid policy.  
Exploitation of Namibian resources

**Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]

e.g. The task of South Africa was to administer South West Africa to the advantage of the inhabitants and guide Namibia to ultimate independence. More schools were to be built and extended to secondary level and expanded to include more subjects. It also recommended more hospitals and clinics be built, especially in the homelands, and that more nursing staffs be trained to man these facilities.

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7–8]

e.g. Level 4 + The South African ruling National Party introduced a series of laws to control black people, e.g. the pass laws, the Group Areas Act, etc. School for indigenous people only taught up to the end of primary level. The South African government was trying to turn Namibia into a fifth province of the Union of South Africa rather than giving Namibia independence.

- 7 (a) Briefly describe the main features of apartheid.

Fairly answered as most of the candidates were able to describe the main features of apartheid and scored high marks. A few were able to refer and confuse it with the forced removal of people from the old location to Katutura.

e.g. Made marriages between people of different races illegal.  
Apartheid made sexual relations between different races illegal  
Apartheid classified every individual according to race  
Apartheid made provision for separate residential areas for each race  
Apartheid caused the division of public services and spaces according to race e.g. beaches, buses etc  
Black children were taught according to a different syllabus, controlled by the apartheid government.  
Apartheid caused every black person outside the native reserves to carry a passbook (reference document) wherever he or she went all the time. [1-5]

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details). e.g. Apartheid made sexual relations between different races illegal (1) in the Immorality Act of 1950 (2).



(b) Explain why the National Party (NP) introduced the apartheid system in the late 1940s.

Fairly answered as most candidates were able to identify the reasons why the National Party introduced apartheid in SA and only a few were able to reach an explanation level.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. They did not want blacks

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. To make it easier to control blacks – divide and rule.  
To prevent blacks from uniting.  
To prevent competition from blacks.  
To enrich themselves.  
To preserve white supremacy.  
Purity of their race.  
To prevent black influx to towns.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason [4–5]  
e.g. The National Party invented apartheid as a means to cement their control over the economic and social system. Initially, the main aim of apartheid was to maintain white domination while extending racial separation.

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason [6–7]  
e.g. Whites feared blacks being the majority in South Africa would join forces in resisting the minority white government and they would eventually takeover the government. Apartheid would make blacks live in separate ethnic groups thus making it difficult for them to work together in resisting the white government.

(c) “The System of Apartheid brought only advantages to the South African government.” How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Poorly answered as the majority of candidates were only listing or mentioning the apartheid laws without explaining how Apartheid brought advantages or disadvantages to the government.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]  
e.g. White people controlled the economy  
Black people were not allowed to live in towns  
Black people were not allowed to share the best facilities with the white people.

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Level 2 + Black people resisted through resistance e.g. Defiance Campaign, Sharpeville uprising and the Soweto uprising.

**Level 4:** One sided explanation [5–6]  
e.g. The system was based on “divide and rule” and therefore affected black people negatively, while white people were advantaged. The SA government succeeded in its aim to sustain white supremacy for over 40 years by securing the best farmland and control over the economy for white people. Political rights were given to black people in homelands only, but the real political power was kept by the white people.

**Level 5:** Explains both sides [7–8]  
e.g. Level 4 + The policy could not last forever, as the blacks resisted. They were unhappy because they felt their human dignity was disregarded. They were also unhappy to be brutalized in their own country, and because their land and cattle were confiscated. Though their resistance was met with brutal repression by the army, police and the justices system, it helped to bring world’s attention to what was happening in SA. As a result SA Government was condemned and economic sanctions were imposed.

8 (a) Briefly describe the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM).

This question was fairly answered. Only a few managed to get good marks and were able to describe BCM activities.

e.g. It was formed and led by Steve Biko  
It raised African self-respect and confidence  
It united black South Africans of all ethnic groups in the struggle against apartheid  
Taught about black African heroes of the past  
Took pride in black culture, history and achievements  
Inspired a spirit of fearlessness and resistance  
Instrumental in organising strikes such as the Soweto uprising of 1976, the movement had an impact on many students, even though Steve Biko had not made any attempt to work with people of their age.

(One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting details).

(b) Explain why the Soweto uprising of 1976 took place.

It was not well answered, candidates identified the teaching of Afrikaans and Bantu Education but could not explain the identified reasons.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. They were not happy

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes reasons [2–3]  
e.g. Black students did not want to be taught in Afrikaans.  
They wanted the same education as white people.  
They were against Bantu Education.  
The syllabus for blacks was inferior.

**Level 3:** Explains one reason [4–5]  
e.g. The government ordered that Afrikaans to be used as the medium of instruction in South Africa's black secondary school. This was a big problem because most of the candidates could not speak or understand Afrikaans. Even the teachers did not know Afrikaans. Besides that, Afrikaans was seen as the language of the oppressor, therefore, they did not want to learn Afrikaans.

**Level 4:** Explains more than one reason [6–7]  
e.g. Level 3 + Black South African students protested because they believed that they deserved to be treated and taught equally to white South Africans. Students formed an Action Committee later known as the Soweto Students' Representative Council which organised a mass rally for 16 June to make themselves heard. This was also an opportunity to protest about the whole Bantu education system with its inferior syllabus.

(c) "The ANC played the most important role in ending the apartheid system in South Africa." How far do you agree with the statement? Explain your answer.

Fairly answered as most of the candidates were able to identify the role played by ANC in ending the apartheid system and were able to explain other factors.

**Level 1:** General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge [1]  
e.g. Agree / Disagree

**Level 2:** Identifies AND/OR describes one side only [2–3]  
e.g. Organised demonstrations throughout South Africa  
They formed military wings  
They started the armed struggle  
Moved around the country in disguise mobilizing people to join the struggle against apartheid

**Level 3:** Identifies AND/OR describes both sides. [4]  
e.g. Level 2 + The Sharpeville Massacre  
The Soweto uprising  
The role of Steve Biko  
The role of women  
The role of Desmond Tutu  
The role of international community  
The economic sanctions by the UN

Level 4: One sided explanation

[5–6]

e.g. 'The ANC was key in ending the apartheid system because they led the Defiance Campaign that was so important in defying the regulations and eventually leading to their overthrow. The Defiance Campaign was not the first action against apartheid but the first to have so many people united under one leadership. Thousands of people were arrested showing how many took part. Through their leadership of the Defiance Campaign membership increased and the ANC became the voice of resistance and this is why their role is so important in ending apartheid.'

**Level 5:** Explains both sides

[7-8]

e.g. Level 4 + The UN disapproved South Africa's apartheid policy. They recognised nationalist movements in South Africa. They also imposed economic sanctions. As a result, investors withdrew their money from South Africa. South Africa was isolated from the rest of the world. UN sanctions crippled the economy of South Africa which frustrated even those who supported the apartheid regime.