

HISTORY

8234
Paper 1

GENERAL COMMENTS

Generally, the question paper was fair. Most candidates opted for the Paris Peace Conference, League Of Nations and Cold War. It is advisable to discourage candidates to deviate from choosing certain topics to study because this denies them the benefits of choosing the other option (Question 4) they were ill prepared in most cases. Most candidates managed to score better marks in the following questions 1, 2 and 5. **Most candidates still struggle with questions B and C.** Teachers/Tutors must address the following:

Choices: To choose three questions the candidates are most comfortable with in the question paper.

Reference: Candidates are expected to refer to key events or name of places, figures which happened in their explanations to show deeper understanding of the syllabus.

Lastly, misinterpretation of questions was evident on question 6 (a) where most of the candidates described how South Africa ruled while they supposed to focus on how South Africa took control of SWA from the Germans and Mandate Commission of the LON.

SECTION A: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1919 - 1939.

- 1 (a) Fairly answered. Candidates demonstrated limited knowledge on this question, but few managed to state and describe their points. Candidates were expected to demonstrate deeper subject content for instance, with the issue of Japan's demand for racial equality candidates needed to go beyond what could be assumed from the term/phrase i.e they need to be adding something that shows they have specific contextual knowledge.

Describe what Japan hoped to gain from the Paris Peace Conference? [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

One mark for each relevant point.
eg Racial equality to be discussed
To get more German trading rights in China
They wanted to be treated as a world power.

[1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each relevant description.
eg They wanted to be treated as a world power as this had been their main motivation for entering the war, to get their improved status recognised by other world powers.

[3-5]

- (b) Fairly answered. Candidates showed limited knowledge on this question. The majority managed to reach level 2/3 but failed to explain their identifications.

Explain why Italy was disappointed by the Paris Peace Conference. [8]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg agree/disagree

[1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

The Treaty of London was not fulfilled
Italy had been promised extra land e.g. parts of Dalmatia, parts of the Tyrol, parts of Albania, parts of the Ottoman Empire.
Italian leaders were under pressure from right wing nationalists to increase Italy's land/power
Wilson refused to give Italy more land because of self-determination
Italian nationalists occupying Fiume caused problems at the Peace Conference

One mark for each relevant point.

[2-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg Italy had been promised land in the Treaty of London for entry into the war on the side of the Triple Entente. They were promised large amounts of land for ending their neutrality and

traditional alliance as one of the powers in the Triple Alliance and when they did not get the land they were very disappointed. (5) They had been promised land from places like the Austro Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire and when this land was not given them, because Wilson would not give Italy areas that did not contain Italians, this increased the Italian's disappointment. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further detail, as above. [5-6]

Level 4: Explains two or more reasons

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates managed to reach the maximum identification level but only a few reached explanation level to show deeper understanding of the subject content which answer the question. Candidates need to be showing they understand how the issues led to hatred, there needs to be linking of factors to the question.

"The military terms of the Treaty of Versailles were more hated than the reparation payments by the Germans". How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [12]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge.

eg agree/disagree [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s) on one side

eg The army being reduced to 100,000 men represented a massive cut to the army
The reduction in arms meant that all the factories involved in supplying the military were put out of business
The demilitarised zone in the Rhineland would affect Germany's ability to defend itself

OR

The Germans viewed the reparation figure as too high for them to repay
The non-payment of the second reparation payment caused the invasion of the Ruhr
The repayment of the reparations meant that there was no money for government investment to help them recover from the war

One mark per example. [2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both sides

One mark per example. [4]

Level 4: Explain reasons on one side only

eg The German people hated the reduction of German armed forces because it was a huge blow to the German people who had traditionally valued the military as a source of great national pride. A large part of the economy was also linked to providing for and maintaining the army meaning it was an important part of German life so any attack on it was seen as an attack on the German people so they hated the military reduction.(5) The reduction from well over a million, before the war, to only 100,000 soldiers was a huge blow and the Germans felt that they could not defend their borders or maintain internal security with such a small force so they resented this term of the Treaty even more. (6)

OR

The Germans hated the reparation payments because the Kaiser had run up huge war debts in expectation of winning and charging reparations to the Entente Powers. This meant Germany had huge war debts as well as reparation payments to make and they thought they were too much to pay. (5) The Germans felt even more hatred when they had rich industrial land, like Alsace Lorraine, were given to France. These areas with natural resources and factories generated profits that would generate taxation payments to the government. Then there was the loss of the profits from the coalfields that were paid to France. Losing areas like this meant that it was made much harder for the German government to pay reparations. The burden of reparation was blamed for many problems in Germany leading to more hatred of them. (6)

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail [5-8]

Level 5: Explains reasons on both sides

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks. [9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer. [11-12]

- 2 (a) It was fairly answered. Candidates struggled with this question due to limited knowledge on this topic, though there were candidates who did well and reached description level. Answers to be limited to the events not the build-up or aftermath.

Describe the Mukden Incident of 1931. [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

One mark for each relevant point
The Mukden Incident gave them the opportunity they had been looking for to expand the Japanese Empire. [1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each relevant description
eg The Japanese army controlled the South Manchurian Railway. In September 1931 they claimed that Chinese soldiers had sabotaged the railway. [3-5]

- (b) Fairly answered. The majority reached maximum marks for identifications but only few scored explanation marks. The majority of the candidates confused international order with the League of Nations; the question did not ask about the failure of the League of Nations but the Collapse of International Order by late 1930s so the candidates have to show the flow of the impact of the Manchurian crisis to a point where it resulted into the collapse of International order by late 1930s.

Explain how the invasion of Manchuria contributed to the collapse of international order by late 1930s. [8]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg some countries looked up to Japan [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

Showed that economic problems could be solved with aggression
Showed that even permanent members of the Council didn't respect the League
Showed that collective security didn't work and that the League was reluctant to impose sanctions
Proved that European powers didn't care about problems far away
Showed that the League did not have the power to stand up to strong country
One mark for each relevant point. [2-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg The invasion of Manchuria encouraged aggressive nationalism in Europe that led to the breakdown of international order by the late 1930s. Since this was a time of world depression governments were struggling to solve their economic problems and seeing Japan solving theirs by using force to get resources from China paved the way for other powers such as Italy to follow the same path, using an aggressive foreign policy to solve its economic problems. (5) This was seen when Italy invaded Abyssinia as a way of distracting its populations from the issues of unemployment as Mussolini tried to compete with other European powers in increasing their empire. This event, ignored by the League, showed how truly useless it was to stop war and was an important step towards the breakdown of international order by the late 1930s. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further details as above. [5-6]

Level 4: Explain two or more reasons

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Fairly answered. Candidates failed to explain how “The unwillingness of Britain and France to get involved in international matters is the main reason why the search for international order failed by late 1930s,” the candidates mainly got marks for other factors like Great Depression of 1930s and the Treaty of Versailles. Candidates were required to provide specific example of event to be an explanation eg USA no army – Mussolini felt he could do what he liked eg attack Abyssinia without fear of economic sanctions.

“The unwillingness of Britain and France to get involved in international matters is the main reason why the search for international order failed by late 1930s.” How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [12]

Level 1: General answer with no specific contextual knowledge

eg agree/disagree. [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s) on one side

Britain and France were reluctant to go to war shown by the signing of the Hoare Laval pact
Britain and France would only act in self interest
The exhaustion of both countries after World War 1, militarily and/or economically meant they didn't have the power to act
The public, in both countries, would not support strong action that might lead to another war
Britain and France's policy of appeasement allowed Hitler to grow stronger

One mark for each relevant point. [2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both sides

The effects of the World Depression meant countries were reluctant to do anything that might mean more economic damage
Hitler's foreign policy was aggressive and it is impossible to know if Britain and France could have stopped him
The League had issues that stopped it from being an effective peace keeping force
America's isolation from world affairs meant that a strong world power was not acting to stop aggression [4]

Level 4: Explains reason(s) on one side

The unwillingness of Britain and France to get involved in international matters caused issues because their lack of action showed countries that they could be aggressive with no penalty. An example of this was in 1931 when Japan invaded China. Both countries had areas in China that they controlled as well as other countries nearby in their empires but because the invasion did not affect them they did not take action and did not encourage the League to take decisive action either. (4) They waited a year, until a representative had travelled to and from Europe, to decide Japan was in the wrong but by then it was too late. The world had seen aggressors would be rewarded, not punished. This sent a signal that Britain and France were not even interested enough in issues that did not directly affect them to encourage the League to take action to maintain international order meaning that countries with aggressive foreign policies, like Italy and Germany, would not be stopped.

OR

During the 1920s the world prospered, there were still wars but they did not disturb international order. After the Wall Street Crash, in 1929, unemployment rose and also aggressive nationalism. Germany is a good example it joined the League of Nations, started paying back reparations and building its economy. However after the Crash the Nazis, gained in popularity, gaining power. Their aggressive foreign policy is the main reason international order collapsed in the late 1930s and their path to power was helped by the Crash. (4) The other effect was that countries that might have stopped aggression did not have money or political power. France refused to stop Hitler re-militarising the Rhineland because it was too close to elections to be being sending soldiers, something that would not be supported by the public because they didn't want to see money spent on war. The World Depression made some countries more aggressive and others less aggressive as they tried to fight the effects of the Crash and this was an important reason the search for international order failed.

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations offering good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [5-8]

Level 5: Level 4 + Explains reasons on the other side (Disagree)

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks. [9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer. [11-12]

- 3 (a) It was fairly answered. Few candidates chose this question. Candidates managed to demonstrate sound knowledge of this topic, were by candidates even made references to OPEC members who have benefited the most, with statistics of the financial growth.

Describe the successes of OPEC. [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

eg One mark for each relevant point
Set up a fund for international development – the OFID
Helped fund agricultural development
Secured a stable supply of oil
Responded during the Kuwait War to ensure oil supply was steady
Stopped the ‘Seven Sisters’ controlling oil supply and price
Offered assistance to developing countries [1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each relevant description
eg In 1973 OPEC assumed full control over its oil resources, thus establishing once and for all member countries sovereign right to manage their oil resources in the interests of the producers. OPEC acts as a price Administrator, setting fixed prices for oil. [3-5]

- (b) Explain how the formation of NATO worsened tensions between the USA and the Soviet Union. [8]

Fairly answered; most of the candidates managed to reach maximum identification level but failed to develop their points into explanations.

Level 1: General answer with no specific contextual knowledge

eg It was against communism [1-2]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

eg USA placed their weapons in member states
Stalin saw the alliance as a threat to the Soviet Union.
USSR responded by forming WARSAW Pact
One mark for each relevant point [3-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg The formation of NATO worsened relations as it gave the Soviet Union an opportunity to increase its control over the satellite states. Through the 1940s the communist countries in the buffer zone were controlled more loosely by the Soviet Union but after the formation of NATO it gave Stalin the excuse he needed to take more control and force their foreign policy on what became the Eastern bloc, creating two well-armed camps in Europe. (5) The Warsaw Pact was always run by Soviets and it allowed the Soviet Union to not only extend control by organising the defence of the countries but keep them in line. This made relations with the USA worse because they saw this extra control as more proof of what they already suspected that Stalin wanted to extend communism rather than just protect the Soviet Union. This increase in suspicion made relations worse. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further details as above. [5-6]

Level 4: Explains two or more reasons

L3 + eg The Warsaw Pact was established in response to the establishment of NATO in 1949 and the fact that the Eastern bloc was surrounded by NATO countries. This allowed the Soviets to force their foreign policy on the rest of Eastern bloc, from 1955 Europe was divided into two armed camps the front lines of the old was had been established.

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to

a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Poorly answered. Candidates simply misunderstood the question, in the sense that they basically described Gorbachev's reform policies not how they led to the collapse of communism, however the majority of the candidates could state other factors.

"How far were Gorbachev's reforms responsible for the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe? Explain your answer. [12]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg responsible/not responsible [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s) on one side

Gorbachev's cuts to the Soviet military loosened control over the states in the bloc
Gorbachev withdrew Soviet troops and weaponry from communist countries in Eastern Europe
Gorbachev ended the Brezhnev Doctrine
Gorbachev decentralised the controls over the economy destabilising it and leading to increased opposition
Gorbachev's economic reforms reduced state control and this had the effect of lessening communist control in Eastern Europe
Gorbachev's reforms created a climate where opposition could grow and this allowed non-communists to take power in Eastern European countries

One mark for each relevant point [2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both sides

eg Success of Solidarity in gaining international support made it more difficult for the Soviets to crush their opposition and gave other countries hope they could do the same
The war in Afghanistan was unsustainable and showed the weakness of the Soviet state when they withdrew troops giving hope to opposition groups in Eastern Europe their opposition would succeed
Reagan's actions such as Star Wars showed that the Soviets couldn't hope to compete in an arms race so they had to change their strategy, a change that showed weakness in the Soviet state giving hope to opposition groups in Eastern Europe
Reagan's actions in taking a hard line against the USSR, supported by other European leaders like Thatcher, meant the USA's support for anti-communists in Afghanistan and Nicaragua were not opposed by the international community leading to Eastern European countries to increase their opposition to Soviet control [4]

Level 4: Explains reason(s) on one side

eg Gorbachev's reforms including things like glasnost gave people the power to openly criticise communism meaning movements all over communist controlled countries in Eastern Europe became stronger. A good example is Solidarity in Poland. Solidarity had been banned but under Gorbachev's reforms was legalised in 1989 and won the next election. This was the start of collapse of communist control in Eastern Europe (5) Other Eastern European countries were also getting braver and in Hungary people started dismantling the barbed wire that stopped them getting into non-communist Austria. When these actions weren't stopped, because Gorbachev refused to force people to be communist, opposition and protests grew to the point that the communist governments could not control their countries without support from the Soviet Union and when this wasn't given communism control collapsed across Eastern Europe. (6)

OR

Solidarity had formed in 1980 out of strikes against the communist government in Poland. They attracted the support of the Catholic Church as well as gaining the attention of the West. Solidarity logos were soon seen in posters on bedroom walls and badges. They were soon banned and were until Gorbachev took over so whilst it could be said their success was down to his reforms this is not the whole picture. Their movement was secretly kept going meaning that when it was legalised they were ready to take power leading to the start of the collapse of communism. (5) When Poland held elections in 1989 Solidarity put candidates forward and they won enough seats to become the government, ending communist control. When other countries saw this they saw what was possible and started their own protests, such as taking down the Berlin Wall, leading to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. (6)

One mark for each relevant explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations offering good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [5-8]

Level 5: Explains reasons on both sides

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks. [9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion.

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer. [11-12]

- 4 (a) Well answered. Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge on this topic. The majority specifically stated MPLA not just Angola in general and could even link it to the help given to Namibians though the question did not require it.

Describe the role played by Cuba in the Angolan Civil War. [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

One mark for each point
eg Cuba provided armed forces to MPLA
Cuba provided military training to MPLA
Cuba provided humanitarian assistance with Cuban doctors and teachers
Cuban troops helped fight against the SADF and Zairean troops [1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each valid description

eg Cuba provided military intervention in support of MPLA, who were supportive of communist ideas, against the FNLA and UNITA because they were backed by the USA and the Civil War became a Cold War proxy war. [3-5]

- (b) Fairly answered. The majority reached maximum marks for identification but only few scored explain marks.

Explain why the USA got involved in the Angolan Civil War. [8]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg To support the Angolans [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

eg The USA played a role for political and logistical purposes.
To prevent the spread of communism
To fight a proxy Cold War in Angola by supporting UNITA
The USA saw themselves as the world policeman and got involved to stop violence in their 'back yard'.

One mark for each relevant point. [2-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg 'The USA got involved in the Angolan Civil War to use it as a surrogate battleground for the Cold War. This was an opportunity to fight against their rival, the Soviet Union, without actually engaging the super power in a war. Both super powers were wary of getting involved in a war that could be costly and involve the use of nuclear weapons on their populations. This meant they looked for other areas where they could win against their rival without face to face war. (5) So, the USA joined in to back up the UNITA forces to go against the support given to their opponents Communist Cuba. This allowed the USA to effectively fight against the Soviet Union by helping those fighting communism. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further details as above. [5-6]

Level 4: Explains two or more reasons

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates showed limited knowledge on this topic, though they managed to reach maximum identification level.

“The popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) played an important role in ending Portuguese rule in Angola.” How far do you agree? Explain your answer. [12]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg agree/disagree [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s) on one side

They took up arms to fight the Portuguese in 1961 – 1974.
They sabotaged Portuguese infrastructure in Angola.
One mark for each relevant point [2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both side

eg Cuba played an important role through its military assistance
There was a coup d’etat in Portugal and they withdrew troops from all their colonies, including Angola
The Carnation Revolution in Portugal meant there was a change in government that withdrew troops
Other nationalist groups such as UNITA and FNLA played a role
One mark per example [4]

Level 4: Explains reason(s) on one side

eg The MPLA played an important role in ending Portuguese rule in Angola because they were one of the first organisations to be set up to oppose Portuguese rule and they swiftly became one of the strongest gaining support from communist countries like the Soviet Union and Cuba as well as communist organisations across Europe. Having powerful supporters, giving them money and weapons, helped make them the one of the strongest groups fighting against Portuguese rule. (5) The armed wing of the MPLA had around 5,000 fighters and used to lead guerrilla strikes against the Portuguese making it increasingly difficult and expensive for the European state to maintain control meaning that they were an important part in ending the country’s control. (6)

OR

An important reason why Portuguese rule ended in Angola was because there was no support for it within Portugal. From the end of the Second World War European empires were being dismantled with former colonies gaining their independence. This led to domestic pressure in Portugal as there was growing dissatisfaction with the Portuguese military fighting colonial wars in Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Angola. These changes are an important reason why Portuguese rule ended. (5) This dissatisfaction led to the Carnation Revolution where the people took to the streets to voice their opposition. This led to a change in government who ended colonial conflict, including that in Angola. Without this change in attitude in Europe and Portugal the war in Angola could have dragged on indefinitely meaning that this domestic reason is an important one explaining the end of Portuguese rule. (6)

One mark for each relevant explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations offering good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [5-8]

Level 5: Explains reasons on both sides

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks. [9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion.

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer. [11-12]

SECTION B: NAMIBIAN HISTORY

- 5 (a) Well answered. The majority of the candidates were able to reach level 2, though they couldn't really get to full marks, only a few could do so, however, some candidates simply repeated the question with limited content.

Describe the Protection Treaties signed between the Germans and Namibian leaders. [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

One mark for each relevant point

These were agreements between the Germans and the Namibians to protect the interests of Germans in Namibia.

The agreements between the Germans and Namibians to protect the indigenous people To stop other colonial powers from moving into the area [1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each relevant description

E.g. The agreements that were mostly in favour of the Germans which gave the Germans rights and freedoms to carry on unrestricted trade in their territories.

The Treaties would stop other colonial powers from moving into the area, no concessions no entering into treaties and to dispose no land to any other nation without the German consent. Some indigenous leaders refused to sign the protection treaties in fear of losing their autonomy. [3-5]

- (b) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates managed to score maximum identification level but only few could reach explanation level. Successful candidates mainly got Level 3/5-6.

Explain why the Germans established colonial administration in Namibia?

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg They wanted to control the Namibians To take over [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

eg They wanted to take over land

To have an upper hand in Namibian resources

The Germans wanted to develop an empire like other European powers.

One mark for each relevant point [2-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg The Germans established a colonial administration for economic reasons. They wanted to ensure they had a safe market for their goods. The Industrial Revolution in Europe meant there was a big increase in the amount of goods being produced and the Germans, like other Europeans, wanted to expand their markets. Gaining markets by controlling other countries was one way to do this and this is one of the reasons why the Germans wanted colonial rule. By establishing tighter control over the area they could ensure they could control what went in and out. (5) The other economic advantage of having complete control through colonial rule was they could claim ownership of the land and its natural resources. Any resources found in Namibia could be used to feed their industries. Colonial rule was important in this factor because it meant they could stop any opposition stripping the land of resources through their claim to legal controls. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further details as above. [5-6]

Level 4: Explains two or more reasons

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates reached the maximum identification levels but few reached explanation level and it mainly came from loss of land and cattle. Candidates could not give key examples of the Germans' violent colonial methods, rather just described the term violent. Candidates were required to link to how the issue sparked a war for explanation.

“The violence of colonial rule was the main reason why the War of National Resistance began? How far do you agree? Explain your answer [12]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg agree/disagree [1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

eg The Germans used violence rather than negotiation when there were problems
The Germans attacked the Nama in 1893 with no reason or warning
The Germans refused to stop unlawful violence by settlers, soldiers etc
The Germans used superior resources/weapons against indigenous people

One mark for each relevant point. [2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both sides

eg The Germans took away tribal lands
The Germans took away the Namibian's cattle
The Police Zone meant the best land was taken and allowed the Germans to take more cattle [4]

Level 4: Explains reasons on one side

eg One reason why the War of National Resistance began was because German rule was very violent. The Germans refused to negotiate with tribal leaders and any resistance was met with extreme violence. For example in 1894 the chief of the Khaua refused to hand over the murderer of a German trader so the Germans raided their headquarters, executing Lambert as an example to other tribes who might try to oppose colonial rule. Violent events such as this meant anger against German rule was building. (5) Further examples increased the tension like when the Bondelswarts refused to pay tax and a minor revolt broke out, a military force was sent to crush the uprising. As the Germans tightened their control through violence and by 1904 the situation became unbearable so the Namibians decided to take up arms against the Germans on 12 January 1904. (6)

OR

The violence inflicted on the Namibian people was only part of the problems that led to the War of National Resistance. Another reason was that the Germans took away the Namibian people's cattle meaning they many had no means of providing for themselves. Cattle were a necessity of life for many as they depended on them for food and other resources such as the skins. The Germans knew this and confiscated cattle to create a cheap form of labour for the German settlers. By taking away their means of livelihood the Germans hoped to make the Namibian people easier to rule but they were wrong because taking away their way of life meant they were more likely to be desperate enough to fight. (5) One of the final straws was in 1903 when Leutwein stopped German traders giving credit to the Namibians and when they couldn't pay for their goods cattle were taken as payment. The loss of livelihood drove many to desperation meaning they had little to lose by taking part in a war against the Germans leading to the War of National Resistance. (6)

One mark for each relevant explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations offering good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [5-8]

Level 5: Explains reasons on both sides

eg One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks. [9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer. [11-12]

Note: The question asks about what led to the outbreak of the war of National Resistance so contextual knowledge beyond 1904, such as concentration camps and genocide cannot be credited.

- 6 (a) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates wrote about how South African government ruled SWA while the question asked about how SA took over or took control.

Describe how South Africa took control of Namibia [5]

Level 1: Identifies point(s)

One mark for each relevant point

eg South Africa was given the power to govern after World War One

Namibia was taken away from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles and South Africa ended up in control

Namibia was made a mandated country and South Africa ended up with control [1-2]

Level 2: Describes point(s)

One mark for each relevant description

At the end of the First World War former German colonies were placed under the control of the League of Nations. As Namibia was a former colony it became a mandated country and eventually control went to South Africa.

The Mandate was given to the British. South Africa was a member of the British Empire and it was given the task of administering Namibia.

“Namibia was a C Mandate which gave South Africa the widest power” [3-5]

- (b) Fairly answered. Few candidates managed to reach explanation level, while the majority got stuck at identification level. Candidates had to link to why they needed complete control for explanation.

Explain why South Africa wished to keep control of Namibia after World War Two. [8]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg To spread wider

[1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s)

eg To give land to whites (farming land)

For economic benefit e.g. Natural resources

It was already in control,

Because a referendum said it was what was wanted.

One mark for each relevant point.

[2-4]

Level 3: Explains one reason

eg South Africa wished to keep control of Namibia because it did not wish to lose control over a land that it had controlled for so long it had come to see it as part of South Africa. Namibia had become part of the structure of the state of South Africa meaning South Africa saw it as a sign of weakness to give up control. As with many countries the post war period saw difficulties as returning soldiers wanted jobs back that had been taken by, in South Africa, black people and the South African government did not want to show any weakness. This meant keeping control of Namibia. (5) Controlling the black people of Namibia was seen as a show of strength by the white government of South Africa and when the National Party won the election in 1948 on the basis of controlling black people there was even less chance that South Africa would give up control of Namibia. (6)

Additional mark to be awarded for further details as above or more reasons. [5-6]

Level 4: Explain two or more reasons

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 8 marks eg 6 marks for 2 basic explanations, 7 marks for one of the explanations having good detail, 8 marks for both explanations offering good detail. [7-8]

- (c) Fairly answered. The majority of the candidates managed to explain resolution 435 but failed to explain other factors.

“Evaluate how important the work of the United Nations was in achieving independence for Namibia.”
Explain your answer. [10]

Level 1: General answers with no specific contextual knowledge

eg very important/not important

[1]

Level 2: Identifies reason(s) on one side

The UN worked through its International Court eg declared South Africa could not void the mandate

The UN made Resolutions to support Namibia eg 264, 385 and 435

SWAPO was recognised by the UN as a legitimate voice for Namibia

The UN sent a peacekeeping force (UNTAG) to support Namibians

One mark per example

[2-3]

Level 3: Identifies reasons on both sides

The role of organisations within Namibia were important in the fight for independence eg OPO/SWAPO

SWAPO taking up arms, PLAN, helped draw attention to the fight for independence

The Organisation of African Unity gave money to help fight for independence

The assistance of other nations helped fight the South Africans eg Cuba, Angola

The Church helped mobilise opposition to South African rule

One mark per example

[4]

Level 4: Explains reason(s) on one side

The United Nations was important in helping Namibia achieve independence because it used the General Assembly to pass resolutions to force South Africa to give up control. For example it passed a resolution to end South Africa's mandate in October 1966 and declared that the UN had direct control over the country and later set up a committee, the United Nations Council for South West Africa. In this way the UN started the process of Namibia gaining its independence. (5) It continued its support by re-naming the area Namibia in 1968, to help show that it should be treated as a country in its own right and went further in 1970 declaring that South Africa's presence was illegal. These were important steps to removing South Africa from Namibia so it could achieve its independence. (6)

OR

The struggle for independence was started within Namibia and the groups that began the fight are an important reason for Namibia gaining its independence. One group was started by Toivo ya Toivo. He formed the Ovamboland People's Congress (OPC*) modelled on the ANC in South Africa. It started with the simple goal of improving working conditions but grew and developed to become a movement for ending South African rule eventually becoming the main group seeking independence. (5) The OPC became the Overlamboland People's Organisation (OPO*) and then the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO*) starting a military wing, the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN*) who fought South Africa. It was SWAPO that was recognised by the UN as a legitimate voice for Namibia in the 1970s and it was their actions in gaining international support that was a major reason why Namibia gained independence. (6)

*The initials in brackets can be accepted rather than the name written in full.

[5-8]

Level 5: Explains reasons on both sides

One mark for each explanation with an extra mark available for more developed explanations to a maximum of 10 marks.

[9-10]

Level 6: Level 5 + a valid conclusion

There needs to be an answer to the question and marks awarded on the quality of evaluation providing the answer.

[11-12]