



# basic education

---

Department:  
Basic Education  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

## SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION

**HISTORY P1**

**2015**

**MEMORANDUM**

**MARKS: 150**

**This memorandum consists of 24 pages.**

**1. SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS**

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

<b>COGNITIVE LEVELS</b>	<b>HISTORICAL SKILLS</b>	<b>WEIGHTING OF QUESTIONS</b>
<b>LEVEL 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extract evidence from sources</li> <li>• Selection and organisation of relevant information from sources</li> <li>• Define historical terms/terms</li> </ul>	<b>30% (15)</b>
<b>LEVEL 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation of evidence from sources</li> <li>• Explain information gathered from sources</li> <li>• Analyse evidence from sources</li> </ul>	<b>40% (20)</b>
<b>LEVEL 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpret and evaluate evidence from sources</li> <li>• Engage with sources to determine its usefulness, reliability, bias and limitations</li> <li>• Compare and contrast interpretations and perspectives presented in sources and draw independent conclusions</li> </ul>	<b>30% (15)</b>

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.

## 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

R

- Analysis

A√

- Interpretation

1√

## 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 extended writing will be to determine to what extent the main aspects have been covered and to allocate the **content level** (on the matrix).

C	LEVEL 4	



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

C	LEVEL 4	
P	LEVEL 3	

- (c) Allocate an overall mark with the use of the matrix.

C	LEVEL 4	}26–27
P	LEVEL 3	

**MARKING MATRIX FOR ESSAY: TOTAL MARKS: 50**

	LEVEL 7	LEVEL 6	LEVEL 5	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 1*
<b>PRESENTATION</b>  <b>CONTENT</b> 	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.	Very well planned and structured essay. Developed a relevant line of argument. Evidence used to defend the argument. Attempts to draw an independent conclusion from the evidence to support the line of argument.	Well planned and structured essay. Attempts to develop a clear argument. Conclusion drawn from the evidence to support the line of argument.	Planned and constructed an argument. Evidence used to some extent to support the line of argument. Conclusions reached based on evidence.	Shows some evidence of a planned and constructed argument. Attempts to sustain a line of argument. Conclusions not clearly supported by evidence.	Attempts to structure an answer. Largely descriptive or some attempt at developing a line of argument. No attempt to draw a conclusion.	Little or no attempt to structure the essay.
<b>LEVEL 7</b> Question has been fully answered. Content selection fully relevant to line of argument.	47–50	43–46					
<b>LEVEL 6</b> Question has been answered. Content selection relevant to a line of argument.	43–46	40–42	38–39				
<b>LEVEL 5</b> Question answered to a great extent. Content adequately covered and relevant.	38–39	36–37	34–35	30–33	28–29		
<b>LEVEL 4</b> Question recognisable in answer. Some omissions or irrelevant content selection.			30–33	28–29	26–27		
<b>LEVEL 3</b> 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	24–25	20–23	
<b>LEVEL 2</b> Question inadequately addressed. Sparse content.					20–23	18–19	14–17
<b>LEVEL 1*</b> Question inadequately addressed or not at all. Inadequate or irrelevant content.						14–17	0–13

**\*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: HOW DID THE WESTERN POWERS AND THE SOVIET UNION RESPOND TO THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPE AFTER 1945?**

1.1

1.1.1 *[Explanation of historical terms from Source 1A – L1]*

- It represented the symbolic/militarised border (from Stettin to Trieste) that separated the Communist bloc and Western European countries during the Cold War
- It represented the division between the Soviet (Communist) and Western (Capitalist) spheres of influence in Europe
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.1.2 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 1A – L2]*

- Eastern Europe came under increased control from Moscow
- Most countries in Eastern Europe were to a large extent under the control of the Soviet Union
- The Soviet Union wanted to expand its influence into Eastern Europe
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.1.3 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 1A – L2]*

- The Soviets hoped to benefit economically from the countries they occupied during the Second World War
- The Soviets had stripped the machines and industrial goods from the areas of Germany and Eastern Europe they had liberated from German occupation
- The Soviets did not want to engage in a military war but wanted to take advantage of the political opportunities which resulted from the Second World War
- The Soviet Union was only interested in the expansion of their power
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.1.4 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1A – L1]*

- Western Powers should show their strength
- Western Powers should stand together
- Western Powers should adhere to the principles of the United Nations (any 2 x 1) (2)

1.2

1.2.1 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 1B – L2]*

- Churchill (former Prime Minister of Britain) was 'warmongering' (creating war)
- Churchill's speech was considered by many in the Soviet Union to be responsible for the start of the Cold War
- Churchill acted in a hostile way towards the Soviet Union
- Britain was in alliance with the USA against the USSR
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.2.2 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 1B – L2]*

- To defend the Soviet Union from any future attack from Germany
- The Soviets did not want to risk any further loss of life of its citizens at the hands of the Germans/other countries
- Stalin believed that his expansion in this area would not be prevented by the allies
- To spread the ideology of communism / extend the Soviet sphere of influence
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.2.3 *[Explaining the usefulness of Source 1B - L3]*

**Candidates should indicate to what extent the source is USEFUL TO A GREATER EXTENT or USEFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT.**

**USEFUL TO A GREATER EXTENT**

- It provides information which is relevant to the historian's research topic
- It was created by Stalin, the leader of the Soviet Union during the post-war period when Soviet-friendly governments were being installed
- It provides a clear understanding of why the Soviet government felt the need to install governments friendly to the Soviet Union
- It shows how Stalin used the press for propaganda purposes to defend his government's actions in Eastern Europe
- Any other relevant response

**USEFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT**

- It only provides one perspective (Soviet) to explain why Soviet-friendly governments were installed in Eastern Europe
- Stalin was the author and creator of the source so its validity should be questioned
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 1.3

1.3.1 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 1C – L2]*

- Stalin is shown extending his influence into Eastern Europe – he is drawn literally stretching his body over the map
- Stalin extends Soviet control over Eastern Europe – shown by Stalin planting the USSR's hammer and sickle flag far beyond the western border of the Soviet Union
- Stalin is a threat to countries in Western Europe – two countries are shown as having question marks on them which suggests that they might still come under Soviet control
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.3.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1C – L1]*

- Finland
- Bulgaria
- Poland
- Rumania
- Eastern Germany (any 4 x 1) (4)



1.4 *[Comparison and analysis of evidence from Sources 1B and 1D – L3]*

- Churchill (Source 1A) refers to an Iron Curtain descending across Europe; this division of Europe into Soviet-friendly governments is indicated clearly in the cartoon (Source 1C)
- Churchill (Source 1A) claims that Stalin is exerting a high level of control over Eastern Europe; the cartoonist implies this control by drawing Stalin physically dominating the map of Eastern Europe (Source 1C)
- Churchill (Source 1A) suggests that if western powers do not stand together, the Soviets will continue to extend their influence further into Western Europe; the cartoonist (Source 1C) supports this idea by showing some countries with question marks, still undecided about their political alliance and Stalin planting Soviet flags far from the USSR's western border
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 1.5

1.5.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1D – L1]*

- To ensure the freedom of the USA and other countries to decide their own affairs
- To prevent any country bullying another
- To prevent the loss of freedom
- To help people maintain their free institutions
- To prevent domination of free peoples by totalitarian regimes (any 2 x 1) (2)

1.5.2 *[Explanation of a historical term in Source 1D – L1]*

- A regime characterised by extreme levels of central control over all aspects of social, political and economic life
- A political system where citizens are denied 'freedoms' such as speech or religion
- An undemocratic system of government where violence was often used to suppress opposition
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

1.5.3 *[Analysis and interpretation of evidence from Source 1C – L2]*

- Truman viewed it as an aggressive act by the Soviet Union
- Truman believed that it was a threat to peace and security
- Truman believed that the US must engage actively (through economic aid) to prevent additional countries being drawn into the Soviet sphere of influence
- Truman believed that without US action, to counter the Soviet actions in Eastern Europe, world peace will be threatened
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

1.5.4 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 1D – L1]*

- Economic aid
- Financial aid
- Taking a leadership position in world affairs (any 2 x 1) (2)

## 1.6 [Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response.  
Candidates should include both responses in order to score full marks

**Western Response**

- Churchill (Britain) viewed (responded to) the installation of Soviet-friendly governments in Eastern Europe as an act of aggression by the Soviet Union (Source 1A)
- Moscow was seen as extending its control into Eastern Europe. (Source 1A)
- Illingworth (British) concurred with Churchill and illustrated the Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe, suggesting that Stalin had his eye on Western Europe as well (Source 1C)
- Illingworth drew Stalin creeping up on Western Europe, like a cat ready to pounce, this implied that Western Europe was under threat (Source 1C)
- Truman (USA) also saw the Soviet action as an act of aggression which undermined the free peoples of the world (Source 1D)
- Truman believed that the Soviets were violating the Yalta Agreement which the allied powers signed (Source 1D)
- Truman feared that increased Soviet influence in Eastern Europe would result in the spread of totalitarianism and the loss of freedom (Source 1D)
- Any other relevant response

**Soviet Response**

- Stalin (USSR) defended the actions of the Soviet Union as defensive (Source 1B)
- Stalin cited the wartime sacrifices of the Soviet people as a justification for protection from future aggression (Source 1B)
- Stalin viewed the Teheran Conference as giving him a free hand in Eastern Europe (own knowledge)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<b>LEVEL 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses evidence in an elementary manner, e.g. <b>shows no or little understanding of how the Western Powers and the Soviet Union responded to the political developments in Europe after 1945.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 0–2</b>
<b>LEVEL 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic, e.g. <b>shows some understanding of how the Western Powers and the Soviet Union responded to the political developments in Europe after 1945.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 3–5</b>
<b>LEVEL 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses relevant evidence, e.g. <b>demonstrates a thorough understanding of how the Western Powers and the Soviet Union responded to the political developments in Europe after 1945.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 6–8</b>

(8)  
[50]

**QUESTION 2: HOW DID FOREIGN INTERVENTION HEIGHTEN COLD WAR TENSIONS IN ANGOLA BETWEEN 1974 AND 1976?**

2.1

2.1.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2A – L1]*

- Soviet Union/USSR/Russia
- China
- Cuba
- United States of America/USA (4 x 1) (4)

2.1.2 *[Explanation of a historical term from Source 2A – L1]*

- The two most powerful countries(USA and USSR) in the world during the Cold War
- Superpowers had significant control over the economy and military of other countries
- USA and Soviet Union emerged as leaders of the West (Capitalist) and East (Communist) after the Second World War
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

2.1.3 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 2A – L2]*

(a) United States

- For ideological reasons. To spread capitalism or to curb the spread of Communism
- For political reasons. To prevent the socialist MPLA with Soviet aid from forming the government of Independent Angola
- For economic reasons. To have access to oil and minerals
- For strategic reasons. NATO could use the coastline and harbours for monitoring purposes
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

(b) South Africa

- For ideological reasons. To prevent the spread of Marxism/Communism
- For political/strategic reasons. To defend Namibia against SWAPO attacks from Angola
- UNITA requested help from South Africa
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

2.2

2.2.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2B – L1]*

- MPLA had longstanding relations with Cuba
- The MPLA had negotiated with Castro for Cuban assistance
- UNITA had approached South Africa for assistance
- To halt South Africa's advance into Angola (any 2 x 1) (2)

2.2.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2B – L2]*

- The South African government was seen as an illegitimate government by most countries of the world
- The policy of apartheid was condemned by the world as a crime against humanity
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

- 2.2.3 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2B – L1]*
- They were wary of intervening abroad after the failed struggle in Vietnam
  - Others wished to avoid the South African connection
  - Others did not believe that the issue was important (3 x 1) (3)

2.3

- 2.3.1 *[Analysis and interpretation of evidence from Sources 2C – L2]*
- It supported all the Angolan liberation movements against Portuguese colonial rule before independence / after that China did not want to choose sides
  - China would only grant aid or help if a legitimate, coalition government was set up
  - Any other relevant answer (any 2 x 2) (4)

- 2.3.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 2C – L1]*
- To grab and exploit the natural resources
  - To exert control over the Angolan people
  - To establish a military presence in the Africa (3 x 1) (3)

- 2.3.3 *[Analysis of information from Source 2C – L2]*
- To establish multi-national corporations in Angola / to exploit the natural resources of Angola
  - To exert control over the destiny of the Angolan people
  - To gain neo-colonialist control over Angola / to spread capitalism
  - Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

- 2.3.4 *[Evaluation of the usefulness of Source 2C – L3]*  
**Candidates should indicate to what extent the source is USEFUL TO A GREATER EXTENT or USEFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT and support their argument with relevant evidence.**

**USEFUL TO A GREATER EXTENT**

- It provides relevant information to the historian's research topic
- All three countries, China, USSR and USA's roles in Angola are explained
- The source indicates which liberation groups were helped by foreign countries
- Shows the reasons why these (foreign) countries got involved in Angola
- I Wor Kuen was not aligned to either superpower so presents an independent interpretation
- Any other relevant response

**USEFUL TO A LESSER EXTENT**

- Information could be biased against both the Soviet Union and the USA
- All the negative information in the source is directed towards the USSR and the USA
- Does not take into consideration the motives given by the superpowers
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 2.4

## 2.4.1

*[Interpretation of evidence from Source 2D – L2]*

- Soviet Union attempts to extend its sphere of influence into Africa – shown by an arm reaching Angola
- The Soviets are determined to have control over Angola – this is shown by the tight grip the Russian hand has on Angola
- The grip also shows a strong hold (influence) over Angola
- The Soviet Union's involvement in Angola was opposed by the USA
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 2.4.2

*[Interpretation and analysis of evidence from Source 2D – L2]*

- USA was opposed to Soviet expansion into Angola
- Uses a small branch to hit the 'knuckles' shows that the US did not take strong action to try and stop the Soviet expansion in Angola
- The 'olive branch' signifies the soft and peaceful approach that the USA took to discourage Soviet expansion into Angola
- The USA's attempts to stop Soviet aggression was weak and had little impact
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 2.5

*[Comparison, evaluation and interpretation of evidence from Sources 2D and 2C – L3]*

- Source 2D suggests that the USA was opposed to imperialism because they were against Soviet expansion in Angola, whereas Source 2C suggests that the United States also played a strong role in undermining Angola's independence and self-determination
- In Source 2C there is a strong presence of the United States in Angola (through aid, CIA, multi-national corporation), whereas in Source 2D America is shown as standing outside Angolan territory
- Source 2D shows Kissinger using a small branch to tap Russia on the knuckles (a weak response) to Soviet expansion into Angola, whereas Source 2C suggests that the United States would strongly defend their interests in Angola ('strong hold', 'exploiting' and the phrase 'they are not about to give them up without a fight' to describe the US response)
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 2.6 [Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- Different foreign countries supported different nationalist movements – Soviet Union and Cuba supported MPLA and the USA and western powers supported FNLA and UNITA (Sources 2A, 2C and 2D)
- Spread of communism and capitalism (Sources 2A and 2D)
- Competition for Angola's mineral deposits and oil - USA's economic interests were threatened e.g. Cabinda (Sources 2A and 2C)
- Angola was of strategic interest to both countries in the East and West (Source 2A)
- Access to coastal harbours created tension between NATO and the Warsaw Pact (Source 2A)
- The Soviet Union wanted to establish a military presence in the Southern Atlantic (Source 2C)
- The South African government's involvement in Angola led to tension in the US government (Some in Congress in favour and others opposed support) (Source 2B)
- China outspoken against Soviet and America's imperialism (Source 2C)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

<b>LEVEL 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses evidence in an elementary manner, e.g. <b>shows no or little understanding of how foreign intervention heightened Cold War tensions in Angola between 1974 and 1976.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 0–2</b>
<b>LEVEL 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic, e.g. <b>shows some understanding of how foreign intervention heightened Cold War tensions in Angola between 1974 and 1976.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 3–5</b>
<b>LEVEL 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses relevant evidence, e.g. <b>demonstrates a thorough understanding of how foreign intervention heightened Cold War tensions in Angola between 1974 and 1976.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows an understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>	<b>MARKS 6–8</b>

(8)  
[50]

**QUESTION 3: WHAT EFFECT DID THE DESEGREGATION OF CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL HAVE ON RACE RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE 1950s?**

3.1

3.1.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]*

- It set aside a Kansas statute permitting cities of more than 15 000 to maintain separate schools for black and white Americans
- It ruled that segregation in public schools was 'inherently unequal'
- It ruled that all African Americans barred from attending public schools with white American pupils were denied equal protection of law as guaranteed by the 14th Amendment (any 2 x 1) (2)

3.1.2 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]*

- State-supported colleges
- Universities (2 x 1) (2)

3.1.3 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 3A – L2]*

- Desegregation had to be a process – not a once-off event
- The supreme court wanted all states to be cautious in introducing desegregation/slow process of integration
- To accommodate the fears of those opposed to desegregation
- Segregation should end eventually
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.1.4 *[Explanation of a historical term in Source 3A– L1]*

- Bringing an end the separation of different race groups (in this context the exclusion of African American students from a school for white Americans in Little Rock)
- The integration of different racial groups that were previously separated
- Bringing an end to the separation of African and white American students in different schools on the basis of race
- Any other relevant response (any 1 x 2) (2)

3.1.5 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3A – L1]*

- Federal district courts ruling on desegregation
- Desegregation laws in southern and border states
- Pupil placement laws/stopgap (makeshift) measures
- Forced integration
- Nine of the 17 states and the District of Columbia had begun the integration of their schools (any 2 x 1) (2)

3.1.6 *[Justification of evidence from Source 3A – L3]*

**Candidates should explain whether President Eisenhower's decision was JUSTIFIED or NOT JUSTIFIED and support their answer with relevant evidence.**

**JUSTIFIED**

- President Eisenhower had to enforce the court order and the provision of the constitution
- It would ensure integration of African American students into Central High School – implying recognition of their human and civil rights
- Segregation was declared unlawful according to the 1954 supreme court ruling
- The federal districts courts had jurisdiction over lawsuits to enforce the desegregation decision
- Any other relevant response

**NOT JUSTIFIED**

- Southern States felt that the federal government violated the rights of the local state
- Many people in the south were strongly opposed to desegregation
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 3.2

3.2.1 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 3B – L2]*

- To prove that Governor Faubus sided with the segregationists
- To show that pro-segregationists were organised
- To show that they were against the desegregation of schools (flying the flag of the Confederacy state)
- Any other relevant response (1 x 2) (2)

3.2.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3B – L2]*

- To ensure the entrenchment of segregationist ideology
- For indoctrination purposes
- Children would be directly affected by desegregation of schools
- Any other relevant response (1 x 2) (2)

3.2.3 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 3B – L2]*

- Symbol of sticking to pro-segregation policy of the southern states
- Showing pride in the segregation policies of the state of Arkansas and not of the federal government
- The young protestors would continue with the ideology of segregation
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)



## 3.3

- 3.3.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3C – L1]*
- ‘Serious situation that has arisen in Little Rock’
  - ‘Speaking from the house of Lincoln, of Jackson and Wilson ... clearly convey both the sadness I feel ...’
  - His words conveyed the firmness with which he intended to pursue this course until the orders of the federal court at Little Rock were executed without unlawful interference (2 x 1) (2)

- 3.3.2 *[Interpretation of evidence from Source 3C – L2]*
- They were in support of the mob that caused violence
  - They were opposed to the court order seeking an end to segregation
  - They sympathised with the pro-segregationist policies of the white American community
  - They supported segregation
  - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

- 3.3.3 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3C – L1]*
- The normal agencies (‘local authorities’) proved inadequate to the task / mob was disorderly
  - It was the president’s responsibility to direct federal troops in cases of emergency (2 x 1) (2)

- 3.3.4 *[Evaluation of the usefulness of Source 3C – L3]*
- This source is useful because:**
- It was an address delivered by US President Dwight Eisenhower
  - It is first-hand information (Eisenhower’s exact words) on why he intervened in the Little Rock crisis
  - The address was an official address delivered from the White House
  - It addressed the issue that was relevant to the research question
  - It provides an explanation for why the federal government intervened in Little Rock
  - It provides insight into how the federal government chose to intervene in Little Rock
  - Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

## 3.4

- 3.4.1 *[Extraction of evidence from Source 3D – L1]*
- The president called upon African Americans to have ‘patience’
  - The president said that African Americans must have ‘self-respect’
  - The treatment of African Americans accorded through the years (2 x 1) (2)

- 3.4.2 *[Analysis of evidence from Source 3D – L2]*
- He was one of the African American leaders opposed to segregation
  - He was a civil rights activist – for equal civil rights
  - He was an advocate for desegregation
  - He was concerned about the slow pace of change regarding desegregation
  - Any other relevant response (1 x 2) (2)

## 3.4.3 [Interpretation of evidence from Source 3D – L2]

**Candidates should explain whether the aims of the pro-segregation leaders were achieved and support their answer with relevant evidence.**

**NO**

- Central High School became integrated
- The process of integration was slow but ultimately there was integration
- The Civil Rights Movement grew in strength and power after 1958
- The Civil Rights Act (1964) and Voting Rights Act (1965) were passed which were victories for the Civil Rights Movement
- Any other relevant response

**YES**

- The call for patience in the process of integration by President Eisenhower was what the pro-segregationist wanted
- The call for patience crushed the spirit of freedom in African Americans
- Forbearance (patience) gave hope to pro-segregationist leaders
- Any other relevant response (any 2 x 2) (4)

3.5 *[Interpretation, evaluation and synthesis of evidence from relevant sources – L3]*

Candidates could include the following aspects in their response:

- 1954 – the supreme court declared segregation in public schools unlawful (Source 3A)
- The supreme court took a decision for integration (Source 3A)
- 1955 – the court (however) asked that desegregation proceed 'with deliberate speed' (Source 3A)
- 1957 – the Governor of Arkansas, Orval Faubus, defied the federal orders for integration (Source 3A) – but could not stop the process
- It increased tension / protest action between African American and white segregationists in Arkansas (Sources 3B and 3D)
- The issue of segregation and race relations became a matter of national significance (Source 3C)
- President Eisenhower gave an official address from the White House, issuing an executive order directing federal troops to enforce desegregation in Central High School (Source 3C)
- The call for patience and self-respect from African Americans by President Eisenhower did not stop the executive order (for integration) already released (Source 3D)
- Any other relevant response

Use the following rubric to allocate a mark:

LEVEL 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses evidence in an elementary manner, e.g. <b>shows no or little understanding of the effects that the desegregation of Central High School had on race relations in the USA in the 1950s.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence partially or cannot write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	MARKS 0–2
LEVEL 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence is mostly relevant and relates to a great extent to the topic, e.g. <b>shows some understanding of the effects that the desegregation of Central High School had on race relations in the USA in the 1950s.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence in a very basic manner to write a paragraph.</li> </ul>	MARKS 3–5
LEVEL 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses relevant evidence, e.g. <b>demonstrates a thorough understanding of the effects that the desegregation of Central High School had on race relations in the USA in the 1950s.</b></li> <li>• Uses evidence very effectively in an organised paragraph that shows understanding of the topic.</li> </ul>	MARKS 6–8

(8)  
[50]

**SECTION B: ESSAY QUESTIONS****QUESTION 4: EXTENSION OF THE COLD WAR: CASE STUDY – VIETNAM**

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

**SYNOPSIS**

In writing this essay, candidates must be able to take a line of argument and critically discuss why the USA, despite the investment of large amounts of money, arms and ammunition, was unable to defeat the communist forces of North Vietnam and the Vietcong between 1965 and 1975.

**MAIN ASPECTS**

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates should contextualise the question and establish a clear line of argument.

**ELABORATION**

- USA was committed to containing the spread of communism (policy of containment)
- In 1965 the USA sent ground troops to Vietnam – by 1967 there were 500 000 US soldiers serving in Vietnam – these were withdrawn by 1973
- USA tactics of mass bombardment with expensive weapons was largely ineffective in the jungle terrain and against the North Vietnam Army and Vietcong guerrilla soldiers who intended to unite Vietnam as a communist country
  - The USA launched 'Operation Rolling Thunder' (February 1965: Johnson)
  - The USA was involved in widespread bombing raid on military and industrial targets in North Vietnam and was extended to include cities in North and South Vietnam. The bombing campaign was supposed to defeat the North Vietnamese within eight weeks but had continued for over three years. Very high cost (unsuccessful)
  - 'Operation Ranch Hand' (1967: Johnson) destroyed the environment but not the Ho Chi Minh Trail which supplied the Vietcong forces in South Vietnam
  - Operation Linebacker (1972: Nixon) wide-scale bombing of Cambodia and Vietnam at great expense but failed to end the war
  - Nixon faced growing opposition from the anti-war movement in US
  - USA search and destroy missions frequently ended in civilian casualties (My Lai Massacre) which increased opposition against the USA within South Vietnam
- The communist forces of North Vietnam and their supporters in South Vietnam conducted a very successful guerrilla campaign against the US army
  - Effectively used ambush, booby traps, hit-and-run tactics
  - Developed a network of underground tunnels to move through the jungle
- The Tet Offensive (1968)
- The USA failed to win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people – many Vietnamese people saw the communist forces as liberators and nationalists

- In 1975 North Vietnam troops captured the South Vietnamese capital of Saigon.
  - The country was united under communist rule. The USA had failed to prevent the spread of communism
- The role of the media and the anti-war movement in the United States of America
- Any other relevant response
  
- Conclusion: Candidates should round up their argument with a relevant conclusion **[50]**

**QUESTION 5: INDEPENDENT AFRICA: COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY – THE CONGO AND TANZANIA**

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

**SYNOPSIS**

In writing this essay, candidates must take a line of argument as to whether the Congo and Tanzania were successful in developing their economies to full capacity after attaining independence in the 1960s. Candidates must provide information from the respective case studies to support their line of argument.

**MAIN ASPECTS**

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: Candidates should indicate whether the policies in the Congo and Tanzania were successful in developing their economies to their full capacity after attaining independence. Candidates should establish their line of argument.

**ELABORATION****CONGO:**

(Candidates must take a stance as to whether the following policies succeeded in improving the economy after independence)

**Successes**

- Substantial portion of Zairianised enterprises returned to original owners (retrocession)
- Mobutu Sese Seko kept Zaire economically afloat through aid from Western powers.
- Policies did benefit a small elite (mainly Mobutu's family and friends)
- Any other relevant response

**Failures**

- Zairianisation involved taking farmlands, industries, commercial and mining enterprises from foreign owners
- Foreigners were replaced with Congolese nationals in key positions - lack of skills and capacity led to the neglect and lack of appropriate infrastructure
- Corruption / mismanagement
- One-product economy continued
- Creation of a new elite – class differentiation
- Kleptocracy
- Any other relevant response

**TANZANIA:**

(Learners must take a stance as to whether the following policies succeeded in improving the economy after independence.)

**Successes**

- Nyerere introduced a system of villagisation called ujamaa
- Tanzanian society was stable and free from economic inequalities (socialism)
- Nyerere developed the rural economy
- Coffee exports increased
- New textile mills were established
- Collective labour was introduced
- Service delivery in the form of health and education was more easily accessible
- It led to highest literacy rates on the continent
- Any other relevant response

**Failures**

- Ujamaa managers lacked skills
  - A lack of resources (e.g. villages were far from sources of water)
  - There was resistance to villagisation/forced relocation by police and military forces – people who resisted were denied food and houses were burnt
  - The economy ceased to grow because fields and agricultural soil was destroyed or abandoned
  - The farming community was forced to sell crops at very low prices
  - Tanzanians dependence on foreign aid continued /self – reliance was not achieved
  - Tanzania remained one of the poorest and least developed countries in Africa
  - Any other relevant response
- Conclusion: Candidates should tie up their argument with a relevant conclusion

**[50]**

**QUESTION 6: CIVIL SOCIETY PROTESTS FROM THE 1950s TO THE 1970s:  
BLACK POWER MOVEMENT**

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

**SYNOPSIS**

Candidates should explain the Black Power philosophy and indicate to what extent the Black Panther Party was successful in promoting this philosophy. Candidates should substantiate their argument by giving examples of the activities of the Black Panther Party and how these aimed to promote the Black Power philosophy.

**MAIN ASPECTS**

Candidates should include the following aspects in their response:

- Introduction: A candidate should indicate to what extent the Black Panther Party was successful in promoting the philosophy of Black Power in the United States of America in the 1960s and how the argument will be supported.

**ELABORATION****Black Power Philosophy:**

- The Black Power philosophy emerged to address the African Americans' poor living conditions
- It was a way of thinking, to be proud and regain self-respect as African Americans
- Principles of Black Power (do things for themselves; control politics in their communities; take pride in own culture and defend themselves)
- Stokely Carmichael – advocated for the exclusion of white liberals as a philosophy of African Americans (for true liberation that would be achieved without assistance from whites)
- Malcolm X – advocated for self-respect and self-discipline
- Any other relevant response

**How the Black Panther Party promoted the Black Power philosophy:**

- The Black Panther Party was formed by Bobby Seale and Huey Newton for:
  - Community-based programmes (neighbourhood work) and feeding schemes (anti-poverty centres)
  - Defence against police brutality
  - Focus on socio-economic conditions of blacks
- A Ten-Point Plan was introduced, i.e. (called for freedom, employment, decent housing, decent education, free health care, ending wars & demand for land, bread and peace)
- Involved in street patrols; monitoring police activities and defend themselves by carrying guns (militant approach) – to stop on-going police brutality and harassment of young urban black men in particular
- Any other relevant response

- Conclusion: Tie up your argument with a relevant conclusion **[50]**

**TOTAL: 150**