



NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE EXAMINATION
NOVEMBER 2011

HISTORY: PAPER I

MARKING GUIDELINES

Time: 2½ hours

150 marks

These marking guidelines were used as the basis for the official IEB marking session. They were prepared for use by examiners and sub-examiners, all of whom were required to attend a rigorous standardisation meeting to ensure that the guidelines were consistently and fairly interpreted and applied in the marking of candidates' scripts.

At standardisation meetings, decisions are taken regarding the allocation of marks in the interests of fairness to all candidates in the context of an entirely summative assessment.

The IEB will not enter into any discussions or correspondence about any marking guidelines. It is acknowledged that there may be different views about some matters of emphasis or detail in the guidelines, and different interpretations of the application thereof. Hence, the specific mark allocations have been omitted.

SECTION A INDIVIDUAL SOURCE ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1 VISUAL SOURCE ANALYSIS

LO 3 AS 3.4 [LEVEL 2]

1.1 *Use your knowledge to identify the three figures that appear in this photograph and explain the reason for their meeting.*

Winston Churchill; Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Josef Stalin. (3)

The Big Three representing the Allied powers met to discuss the fate of Germany at the end of World War 2, and to decide on arrangements for a post-war future, e.g. the creation of the UN. (2)

LO 1 AS 1.3 [LEVEL 5]

1.2 *By referring to ONE visual clue in the photograph explain the mood of the conference at the moment that this photograph was taken.*

At this moment it seems that the mood was friendly. The three figures are talking informally/ interacting easily. OR some tension as FDR and Churchill are talking but FDR has turned his shoulder to Stalin. Stalin has been kept out of FDR and Churchill's conversation. (4)

LO 1 AS 1.4 [LEVEL 6]

1.3 *How might a Soviet history teacher use this photograph to teach students about the origins of the Cold War? Use your knowledge and refer to ONE visual clue in the photograph to formulate your answer.*

Candidates must make use of evidence drawn from the photograph as well as their knowledge of the Cold War.

Candidates must indicate how the teacher would use bias in teaching.

Visual evidence: – Yalta was in the Crimea on Stalin's own homeland, yet the Western powers have not acknowledged his central role. They have placed him on the side.
 – Stalin is leaning towards the Western powers showing his willingness to engage in meaningful dialogue. But the imperialist powers are deliberately ignoring him/turning away from him/shunning his friendly gestures.

Use of bias: (Knowledge/ Understanding) – Should include derogatory terms when referring to the Western powers, e.g. imperialist pigs, capitalists, evil, etc.
 – Should use glowing terms when referring to Stalin.
 – Should indicate that while Stalin is making a great effort and is treating the alliance as real, the Western powers are not to be trusted.

5	Excellent and accurate use of evidence to indicate bias. Uses the photograph comprehensively.
3 – 4	Accurate use of evidence but some inaccuracies in the use of bias OR indicates bias, but same inaccuracies in terms of knowledge and comprehension. Uses the photograph well.
2	Good use of evidence, but limited use of bias. Shows some comprehension of the photograph OR Limited use of evidence, but some use of bias.
1	Very limited answer. Little use of evidence and bias. No clear understanding of the photograph.
0	Incorrect use of evidence, no understanding of photograph, no bias.

(5)

- 1.4 *In 1997 the clothing brand Diesel launched its advertising campaign using historical moments to bring attention to the brand through the use of humour. The campaign involved the altering of the original photograph by inserting Diesel-clad models into the historical scene:*

LO 3 AS 3.4 [LEVEL 6]

- 1.4.1 *Media critics have claimed that only those who have studied the origins of the Cold War can understand the humour in the campaign. Explain how your understanding of the historical context of the original photograph has enabled you to understand the humour in this advertisement.*

The Yalta conference was a serious gathering. The three historical figures were respected, elderly statesmen tasked with determining the fate of the post-WW II world. The humour that has been created suggests that the Yalta Conference was a party/ informal gathering and that the three historical figures were engaged in frivolous activities involving young women which is out of keeping with their historical images. Only students of history would have knowledge of the purpose of the gathering and the nature of the characters of the three characters. The presence of the Diesel-clad models change the mood and meaning of the meeting.

(4)

LO 1 AS 1.4 [LEVEL 7]

- 1.4.2 *Having analysed both of the above photographs write down ONE limitation of photographs as historical evidence.*

Photographs can be easily altered or manipulated/ they are only a snapshot in time and do not contain information of what has happened just before the scene was captured or what happens afterwards; bias can be achieved by the selection of the photographer of what is contained or not contained in the photograph. Evidence in the photograph can be interpreted in more than one way. [Any ONE limitation]

(2)

[20]

QUESTION 2 TEXTUAL SOURCE ANALYSIS**AS 1.2 [LEVEL 3]**

- 2.1 *Why, according to De Klerk, was 1989 such an important year? Provide TWO reasons.*

The SA general election indicated that the SA white population was interested in a peaceful negotiation towards peace in SA.

1989 saw change and upheaval in SA and the entire world.

There were political and economic upheavals in Eastern Europe.

China squashed resistance by young protestors.

1989 saw the end of Stalinist Communism.

(Any 2)

(2 × 2 = 4)

AS 2.2 [LEVEL 2 & 3]

- 2.2 *Use evidence in this source and your own knowledge to explain why communism collapsed in the USSR and Eastern Europe in 1989 but not in China.*

Own knowledge: The will of the people was unstoppable in Eastern Europe and the USSR and overwhelmed the governments/the governments did not use force.

Written Evidence: The Chinese government used force to stop the protests – 'temporarily smothered with brutal violence the yearning of the people ... for greater freedom.'

(4)

AS 2.2 [LEVEL 3]

- 2.3 *According to this source, what consequences did the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe have for South Africa? Write down TWO points.*

The USSR will focus most of its attention on Eastern Europe abandoning its interest in Africa, which means it will stop funding to the ANC.

The collapse of Communism in Europe is a warning to those who think that Communist Marxism will work in Africa. It won't work in SA either.

The collapse happened without foreign intervention. It came from the people. The same will happen in South Africa and therefore foreign countries should back off.

(Any 2)

(2 × 2 = 4)

AS 1.4 [LEVEL 5]

2.4 *What emotional impact was De Klerk hoping to achieve in delivering this speech? Quote a phrase from the source to support your answer.*

He was appealing to a sense of **fairness/justice/peace** – 'only a negotiated understanding ... lasting peace.'

He is appealing to the need to **change** one's attitude/mind-set – 'irrevocably on the road to drastic change./'past year ... one of change and major upheaval./'growing realisation.'

He appeals to a sense of **excitement** – 'The year 1989 will go down in history./'unpredictable consequences for Europe.' (Any 1 emotion and supporting quote.)

(4)

AS 3.2 [LEVEL 2 & 6]

2.5 *This speech has become famous and is often referred to as one of history's iconic* speeches. Use your knowledge of the historical context of this speech to explain why.*

This speech heralded a shift/change in the SA National Party government's policies – this speech announced the unbanning of parties and organisations such as the SACP and ANC. It also announced the release of Nelson Mandela./It was the start of the official negotiation process and announced the government's intention to negotiate with the ANC. Thus began the journey towards the first democratic elections in SA in 1994.

(4)

3 – 4	Knowledge of Context & Significance Shows an understanding of the context in which the speech was delivered and the changes that it brought. Also identifies this speech's significance – the road to negotiations and SA's first democratic elections.
2	Knowledge of Context OR Significance but not both Shows an understanding of the context of the speech – 1980s South Africa – ANC/SACP banned (supported by the USSR) but this speech signified their unbanning.
1	Errors/Limited Knowledge of Context & Significance Attempts to answer the question but major errors/shows a lack of understanding of the context and/or significance of the speech. Just comprehends the source/describes the source.
0	No attempt to answer the question (historical knowledge, context & significance).

[20]

QUESTION 3 MEDIA/GLOBALISATION QUESTION**3.1 AS 1.2 [LEVEL 3 & 5]**

- 3.1.1 *The figure on the extreme left is HF Verwoerd – the South African Prime Minister responsible for the introduction of the Apartheid homelands policy. Use this information to explain what message the cartoonist has attempted to convey. Be sure to include THREE comprehensive points in your answer.*

Whereas Verwoerd had attempted to introduce Separate Development (Homelands Policy) or Grand Apartheid in South Africa in order to separate white from black people; international/transnational organisations such as the IMF and WTO serve to divide the rich Northern countries from the poor Southern countries. This separation is similar to Verwoerd's policy of separate development which advantaged the whites and made life unbearable for black people in South Africa. In this case, it is the rich who are advantaged and become richer while the poor become poorer. In fact compared to global economic policies, Verwoerd's separation of people based on race is amateurish.

(6)

AS 1.3 [LEVEL 3]

- 3.1.2 *Refer to ONE other visual clue that has been used to communicate the cartoonist's message.*

The world has been divided/cut in half. **OR**

Sign above SDA Map = Apartheid and sign above globe = Global Apartheid.

(2)

AS 1.3 [LEVEL 2 & 3]

- 3.1.3 *Explain the meaning of the phrase 'trickle down' as it has been used in the context of this cartoon.*

'trickle down' refers to an economic theory that allows, in the context of the global economy, multinational corporations to establish businesses in Third World countries, in the belief that this will create jobs and thereby grow the economy. In other words, the growth 'trickles down' from the wealthy to the poor.

(4)

3.2 AS 2.1 [LEVEL 2]

- 3.2.1 *What do the abbreviations IMF and WTO stand for?*

IMF = International Monetary Fund

WTO – World Trade Organisation

(2 × 1 = 2)

AS 2.2 [LEVEL 2 & 3]

3.2.2 *Explain the role played by the IMF and the World Bank in the creation of the North-South divide that characterises the global economy.*

Learners should provide a holistic answer that address the issues set out below:

The IMF and the World Bank provided financial assistance to Third World/developing countries. The World Bank gave low interest loans for development and the IMF provided loans to help the developing countries pay off their loans. In return for this help, the developing countries (mostly in the Southern hemisphere) had to adopt Structural Adjustment Programmes – a set on economic conditions which insisted on less state control over the economy and the privatisation of government enterprises. This resulted in less money being spent on health care, education and social services, which led to greater social inequalities and left many developing countries in debt. This intensified the North (rich) – South (poor) divide.

(6)
[20]

60 marks

SECTION B SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS**1.1 AS 1.1 [LEVEL 2 & 3]**

- 1.1.1 *Use Source A as well as your own knowledge to explain why Nasser wanted to 'challenge' the USA.*

Nasser saw himself as someone who could and wanted to stand up to Imperialist bullies and thus he wanted to challenge America which he saw as a bully. However, he was first and foremost anti-Israeli (saw Israel as an American agent) and therefore wanted to take on Israel first and in so doing would be challenging the USA.

(4)

AS 1.1 [LEVEL 3]

- 1.1.2 *According to Source A, why did the Soviet Union support Nasser's challenge?*

The Soviet Union wanted to create another trouble spot for the USA in addition to the Vietnam War. The Soviet Union believed that the USA would suffer political reverses by getting involved in the Middle East. It would more than likely weaken the United States' global standing and stretch their resources.

(4)

1.2 AS 1.3 [LEVEL 5]

- 1.2.1 *According to Source B, the Soviet Union supported the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Why had they changed direction in 1967? Use your own knowledge to answer the question.*

Needs to be seen in the context of the changing terrain of the Cold War. In 1948, the Soviet Union was concerned with events in Europe. But by the 1960s, there was no scope for expansion by either the USA or the USSR in Europe. Thus the superpowers began to look for new areas where they could expand their influence. The Third World and the Middle East provided a new area of possible expansion of influence for the Soviet Union. (4)

AS 1.3 [LEVEL 3]

- 1.2.2 *How did Robert McNamara, the US Secretary of Defence, see the role of the United States in the Middle East conflict in 1967?*

He saw the United States as playing the role of an international policeman maintaining peace. He saw the United States as a mediator that would be able to persuade Israel not to carry out a pre-emptive strike against the Arab world.

(4)

AS 1.3 [LEVEL 3 & 6]

- 1.3 *Was the USA a trustworthy ally of Israel's during the Middle East crisis of 1967? Formulate your argument by drawing on TWO pieces of evidence from Source C.*

No. Ally suggests a friend/supporter/backer. USA was attempting to play the role of the negotiator to prevent war between Israel and the Arab states yet also suggested to Israel that she would not be alone in the war against the Arabs unless she wanted to be – i.e.: USA would assist. USA was therefore hypocritical and untrustworthy.

OR promised to assist Israel but then once war had broken out, stated that she was neutral. This proves that USA was not reliable/trustworthy.

(6)

AS 2.3 [LEVEL 3 & 6]

- 1.4 *Compare how these sources (C and D) differ in their assessment of the United States' role in the Arab-Israeli conflict of 1967. Be sure to compare at least TWO points comprehensively and to provide relevant quotes to support your answer.*

Source C suggests that the USA was not involved in the conflict of 1967 – that the USA was attempting to diffuse the tensions. – 'The United States tried to prevent the war through negotiations.' Source C suggests that the USA was not fuelling the conflict and in fact had imposed an arms embargo. 'Moreover, while the Arabs were falsely accusing the United States of airlifting supplies to Israel, Johnson imposed an arms embargo on the region.'

AND Source C suggests that Israel went into the conflict alone – 'on June 5 1967 Israel was indeed alone'.

Source D, however, suggests that the USA was heavily involved in the conflict by supplying spying equipment, photographing the Egyptian posts for Israel, jamming the Egyptian defense equipment, and transmitted orders of the Egyptian command back to Israel.

AND Source D suggests that Israel was not alone – 'Israel was not [fighting] on its own in the 1967 war'.

(8)

AS 3.2 [LEVEL 6]

- 1.5 *Many Israeli educationists have criticised this textbook (Source D), describing it as anti-Israeli propaganda. Do you agree with their criticism? Support your answer using both Sources C and D.*

Many Israelis would look on the 1967 (Six Day War) as a brilliant victory for Israel, particularly as Israel, on its own, affected a military victory over the Arabs (as stated in Source C). However, Source D suggests that Israel did not achieve the victory on her own, that the victory was because of the USA. This takes away the glory of the victory and is therefore 'anti-Israeli.'

(4)

1.6 **AS 2.1 [LEVEL 2]**

- 1.6.1 *Define the term 'détente' in the context of the Cold War.*

It was a 'cooling off' period in the tension and rivalry between the USA and USSR that had characterised the Cold War/period of friendlier relations/talks and negotiations rather than threatening war.

(2)

AS 2.2 [LEVEL 3]

1.6.2 *How did 'détente' between the USA and the Soviet Union affect events in the Middle East in the 1960s?*

It made little difference as the Russians stepped up military aid to the Arab world and the USA began to give military aid to Israel. (2)

AS 1.2 [LEVEL 3]

1.7 *Write down THREE examples provided by the speaker (Source F) to suggest that the USSR was inciting conflict in the Middle East in 1967.*

The USSR has spread 'alarmist and incendiary reports' of Israel's 'intentions' to the Arab government./USSR has encouraged Arab suspicion of Israel's intentions./It had added to an armaments race in the Middle East. It failed to criticise the Arab governments when Israel had been under threat./It had failed to remain objective. (Any 3) (6)

AS 1.4 [LEVEL 7]

1.8 *Evaluate the reliability of Source F for historians researching the role of the USSR in the conflict in the Middle East in 1967.*

5 – 6	Evaluation/Limitation & Bias Comprehends the source/acknowledges limitation/focuses on origin and intention and acknowledges bias (anti-USSR) in order to deduce that the source is unreliable. Must quote/provide some reference to the bias in the source to be credited with 6 marks.
3 – 4	Analysis & Limitation Shows an ability to comprehend the source/acknowledges origin and/or intention and vague mention of the limitation of the source if used on its own./No attempt to evaluate the source (Bias, etc.)
1 – 2	Comprehension Describes the information obtained from the source/only able to comprehend the source but no attempt to evaluate./Only refers to the contents of the source and no attempt to evaluate the source itself. (Limited discussion of origin or intention)
0	No attempt to answer the question (Usefulness & reliability)

(6)

50 marks

SECTION C SOURCE-BASED ESSAY

Assess the role played by the USA and the USSR in the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1967 by comparing and contrasting their actions in the Middle East.

Candidates need to focus only on the roles played by the United States and the Soviet Union. They should highlight the contrasting roles played by the two superpowers, as well as demonstrate that the United States often played a contradictory role.

The Soviet Union

Initially supported the creation of the State of Israel. (Source A)

Shift in stance by the 1960s when they supported Nasser's challenge to the USA and to Israel. (Source A)

Explanation for shift in stance – shift in terrain of the Cold War. Attempts by superpowers to expand their influence into the Third World and Middle East as Cold War in Europe was established and defined.

Saw in Nasser's challenge an opportunity to challenge the USA by creating another trouble spot. The USSR was using the crisis in the Middle East in the 1960s to gain ground in the Cold War. (Source A)

In the light of this, in 1961, the USSR began to help Egypt to conquer Israel by supplying military aid. (Source F)

Even during period of detente between the superpowers in the 1960s, the Soviet Union continued to provide military aid. (Source E)

Abba Ebban criticised the USSR in very strong terms at the United Nations shortly after the end of the Six Day War. (Source F)

- Accused the Soviet Union of playing a provocative role.
- Spreading alarmist reports and encouraging suspicion concerning Israel's intentions.
- Refused to criticise aggressive declarations by Arab world threatening independence of Israel.

Assessment

No doubt that the USSR exploited the tensions in the Middle East to its own advantage.

Used Nasser and Arab nationalism to further their own aims in the Cold War. (Source A)

Exploited Israel's victory in the Six Day War to its own ends.

- Denounced Israel's aggression.
- Stepped up military aid to Arab World.
- Dispatched naval forces into the eastern Mediterranean. (Source E)

Played a far more aggressive role in the events leading to war than the USA.

Actively took steps to encourage and support the Arab World.

Actively fermented trouble between Egypt and Israel.

USA

The United States played a far less aggressive role in the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1967.

Often played a contradictory and confusing role in the crisis, suggesting that a clear policy towards Israel and the Middle East had not yet been formulated by 1967.

Although Egyptian propaganda has tried to portray direct American involvement on Israel's behalf in the Six Day War, 'Hundreds of volunteers, pilots, military officers, etc. (Source D) evidence suggests otherwise.

Israel fought alone. (Source C)

Nothing in America's actions prior to the Six Day War suggest such direct involvement in the conflict.

USA saw its role as a mediator/international policeman whose duty it was to 'persuade Israel against a pre-emptive strike. (Source B)

Did not confine negotiations to Israel only. Tried to prevent war, but not able to persuade Nasser or other Arab states to cease their belligerent statements and actions. (Source C)

USA was not detached from the events unfolding in the Middle East.

When war was imminent, USA announced that it would support Israel. (Source C) This should be seen in the light of Cold War politics. If the USSR supported the Arab world, the USA would support Israel.

But when war broke out, USA declared its neutrality. (Source C)

President Johnson imposed an arms embargo on the region. (Source C)

Therefore, the USA did not supply Israel with military aid during the Six Day War. (Source C)

Assessment

USA was the natural ally of Israel in the context of the Cold War as Israel was part of the Western bloc.

But it is clear that the USA did not have a fully formed policy with regards the conflict in 1967. This led to the USA playing a contradictory role.

It saw its role as preventing conflict as compared to the USSR who positively urged the Arabs to engage in war.

40 marks

Total: 150 marks