

ONTLEDING VAN DOKUMENTE/DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

Die volgende vaardigheidstoets is 'n deel van die vraestel wat in die tweede ronde van die Senior Geskiedenisolimpiade 1996 gestel is. Toets u leerlinge se intellektuele vaardighede. An English copy follows immediately after the Afrikaans copy.

1. Bestudeer die onderstaande uittreksels uit oorspronklike bronne deeglik en gee dan weloorwoë antwoorde. Gee besondere aandag aan keurige formulering.

DOKUMENT A: DR. VERWOERD SE VERKLARING OOR DIE BELEID VAN AFSONDERLIKE ONTWIKKELING, GELEWER IN DIE SAVOY HOTEL, LONDEN, 17 MAART 1961.

Vir die doel van my toespraak vanaand oor rasseverhoudinge aanvaar ek 'n redelik uitgebreide kennis van die regering se beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling. Vanaand is dit belangriker om aan die wyer agtergrond van daardie beleid aandag te gee, in besonder die morele regverdiging en die doel van die beleid ...

Suid-Afrika het ver gevorder met die onderwys en opleiding van al sy mense vir professies en ambagte, in die verskaffing van gesondheidsdienste vir almal, in behuising, in inkomste per kop van die bevolking, in die verskeidenheid dienste wat elke groep vir sy eie mense verskaf, insluitende die opleiding van vakmanne, administrateurs en professionele persone van alle soorte. Ander lande kan tereg aanspraak maak op erkenning, en dit ook ontvang, vir wat hulle vir die massa se stoflike vooruitgang gedoen het, en vir die groot geleenthede ter bevordering van die massa se algemene welsyn wat hulle geskep het. Dit is net in Suid-Afrika se geval dat dit afgemaak word as 'n nuttelose aanspraak solank op die ontvangers neergesien word as minderwaardige mense vir wie deelname aan die regering ontsê word.

Dit is nodeloos om te beklemtoon dat die regering se beleid *nie* op die minderwaardigheid van mense gebaseer is nie, maar op hulle *andersheid*; of om

daarop te wys dat 'n lid van 'n Afrikastaat skaars as bevoorreg geag kan word as hy in vodde verkeer, met min om te eet, met lae lone, min deurlopende werkgeleentheid en net 'n plakkershut om in te leef, met as die enigste kompensasie hiervoor die feit dat hy oor die stemreg beskik ...

[Suid-Afrika se] probleem is uniek. Nêrens in die wêreld, en nooit in die geskiedenis, het 'n soortgelyke situasie bestaan nie. Die oplossing moet daarom ook uniek wees ...

Meer as driehonderd jaar gelede het twee bevolkingsgroepe, albei vreemd aan Suid-Afrika, hulle in klein getalle gevestig in 'n land wat feitlik onbewoond was. Die een het nie die ander se gebied gekoloniseer of dit gesteel nie ...

Die eerste punt is dus dit, dat hier geen kolonialisme was nie, net afsonderlike vestiging wat feitlik gelyktydig plaasgevind het en elkeen het vir meer as driehonderd jaar die geleentheid gehad om sy eie te ontwikkel en om sy groeiende bevolking te dien. Die blanke bevolking het meer ontwikkel as die swartbevolking maar die blanke het nie sy mag gebruik om die swartes se land af te neem nie. Die blanke het trouens doelbewus die swarte se grond vir

hom gereserveer en gepoog (meesal onsuksesvol) om die swartes op te lei om hulle grond ten beste te ontwikkel. Die blanke het sy grond so goed ontwikkel dat swartes by hom werk, kos en goeie dinge kom soek het - *maar hy het nie politieke mag kom soek nie.*

Die witman het daarom nie net 'n onbetwyfelbare aanspraak en reg op die land wat hy van 'n kaal veld, onbewoonde valleie en geïsoleerde berge ontwikkel het tot 'n moderne nywerheidsland nie, maar volgens alle morele beginsels *was* dit syne, *is* dit syne en *moet* dit syne bly. ...

Die nie-blankes wat die witman se land of die stede binnegekom het, het dit gedoen met die uitsluitlike doel om werk, veiligheid, gesondheid en onderwys (alles vryelik deur die blanke voorsien) te soek, en hulle het niks geweet van of verwag van of selfs gedink aan politieke regte nie. Daar was geen gedagte by hulle om deur die verkryging van politieke regte, deur die toevloei van groot getalle of deur vinnige natuurlike aanwas danksy die witman se beskerming en sorg, die witman van sy land te beroof nie ...

Vanweë hulle bepaalde ontwikkelingspeil is dit hoegenaamd nie bedink dat hulle teenwoordigheid eendag druk op die nasate van die blanke pioniers van 'n leë land sou plaas om hulle land en erfenis sonder protes of verset aan nuwelinge en beskermlinge weg te gee nie. Dit het trouens toe vir die blankes voorgekom of hulle vir altyd as voogde oor die swartman se land sal regeer in die swartman se belang omdat hy nie in staat is om so te ontwikkel dat hy dit self kan doen nie. Die blanke het die toestroming laat voortgaan totdat 'n getalle oorwig van vier teen een ontstaan het. Selfs vandag nog stroom groot getalle swartes van buite Suid-Afrika oor die land se grense uit baie dele van Afrika, omdat in hierdie land van onderdrukking beter lone en 'n beter lewenswyse moontlik is as in hulle eie lande! Wat is die oplossing vir hierdie dilemma wat die geskiedenis en die onverwagte ontwaking van die swartman in ons skoot gewerp het?

Teoretici ... verwag dat die blanke geleidelik sy land en al sy besittings en uiteindelik sy nasieskap en bestaan moet prysgee.

Is dit 'n moreel regverdigbare eis?

As geregtigheid teenoor die swartman moet geskied, moet daar ook geregtigheid aan die witman en die Kleurling geskied, wat albei geraak en onderdruk sal word. ...

Daar is drie moontlike oplossings. Die een is dat die blanke homself, sy besittings en sy nageslag moet opoffer. Hulle kan dit doen deur oor te gee aan 'n swart bewind, selfs al word dit 'n diktatorskap, die land van hulle voorvaders te verlaat of te versmelt tot deel van 'n swart nasie. *Sou u die opsie gekies het as dit Engeland se toekoms was wat hier ter sprake was?*

[’n Tweede opsie] is om jouself te bluf deur oënskynlik klein toegewings te maak in die hoop dat jy die noodlotsdag kan uitstel, wetende dat jou kinders en kleinkinders die opofferinge sal moet maak, nie jy nie ... [Dit is 'n stelsel van] junior vennootskap. Wat word daarvan as die junior vennootskap vinnig — *baie vinnig* — 'n eis vir swart *alleenregering* word? ... dit is geen oplossing. Die stryd om mag gaan net onophoudelik voort ...

Daar is egter 'n ander metode, *en dit is ... leef en laat leef — apart.* Sal enigiemand in die Verenigde Koninkryk dit as sy ideaal vir die Statebond aanvaar dat dit een sentrale regering moet hê, saamgestel net op grond van getalle en nie op die meriete van bewese leierskap nie? Hierdie enkele veelrassige staat, waarvan Groot Brittanje 'n provinsie sal wees, sal dan vanuit Indië regeer word onder die meerderheidsbeheer van die honderde miljoene nie-Europeërs wat daar woon. ...

Ons verkies om ons verskillende bevolkingsgroepe hulleself te laat regeer soos nasies hulleself regeer. Hulle kan dan saamwerk soos in 'n statebond, of in 'n ekonomiese assosiasie van nasies indien nodig. *Is dit 'n bose beleid?...*

- *Gekursiveerde gedeeltes soos in die oorspronklike*
- *Bron: Nasionale Party Inligtingsdiens, Bloemfontein, 1961.*

DOKUMENT B: UITTREKSEL UIT DIE VRYHEIDSMANIFES WAT OP 16 JUNIE 1955 OP DIE KONGRES VAN DIE VOLK (CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE) AANVAAR IS.

AANHEF

Ons, die mense van Suid-Afrika, verklaar vir die kennisname van ons ganse land en die wêreld:

Dat Suid-Afrika aan almal behoort wat in hom woon, wit en swart, en dat geen regering regverdiglik op gesag aanspraak kan maak as dit nie op die wil van die volk berus nie;

Dat die volk van sy geboortereg op die grond, vryheid en vrede beroof is deur 'n stelsel van regering wat op onreg en ongelykheid gebaseer is;

Dat ons land nooit vry en voorspoedig sal wees voordat al sy mense nie in broederskap leef en gelyke regte en geleenthede geniet nie;

Dat net 'n demokratiese staat wat op die wil van die volk berus vir elkeen sy geboortereg verseker sonder onderskeid op grond van kleur, ras, geslag of geloof nie;

Daarom aanvaar ons, die mense van Suid-Afrika, wit en swart tesame — gelykes, landgenote en broers — hierdie VRYHEIDSMANIFES. En ons verbind onself om, met die inspanning van al ons kragte en moed, saam te strewen totdat die demokratiese ideale wat in hierdie manifest vervat is, bereik is.

- Die volk sal regeer.
- Alle nasionale groepe sal gelyke regte hê.
- Die mense sal deel in die welvaart van die land.
- Die grond sal onder die wat dit bewerk verdeel word.
- Almal sal voor die wet gelyk wees.
- Almal sal gelyke menseregte geniet.
- Daar sal vir almal werk en sekuriteit wees.
- Die deure van die onderwys en kultuur sal vir almal oop wees.
- Daar sal huise, sekuriteit en gerief vir almal wees.
- Daar sal vrede en vriendskap wees.

VRAE:

- 1.1 Wat was die omstandighede waaronder die toespraak in dokument A gelewer is? (5)
- 1.2 Wie was die opstellers van Dokument B, wat was die geleentheid waar dit aanvaar is en kon hulle daarop aanspraak maak dat hulle al die mense verteenwoordig? (5)
- 1.3 Op grond waarvan maak dr. Verwoerd daarop aanspraak dat die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling nie op idees van raseminderheid -waardigheid gebaseer is nie? (4)
- 1.4 Sou u sê dat die aansprake in Dokument B op presies die teenoorgestelde uitgangspunte berus as die aansprake in Dokument A? Gee redes vir u antwoord. (5)
- 1.5 Vergelyk die twee dokumente se standpunte oor wat moreel regverdigbaar is. (10)
- 1.6 Wat was volgens dr. Verwoerd die wesenlike van Suid-Afrika se politieke probleem? Watter drie opsies identifiseer hy en waarom kies hy een van daardie opsies? (10)
- 1.7 Wat bedoel Dokument B as hy daarop aanspraak maak dat al die mense van die land in sy rykdom sal deel en dat die grond gedeel sal word deur diegene wat dit bewerk? (6)
- 1.8 Was was die leuse van die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling soos deur dr. Verwoerd uiteengesit? (2)
- 1.9 Sou u dokument B as 'n handves van demokratiese beginsels of as 'n stel politieke beloftes beskryf? Motiveer u antwoord. (3)

[50]

DOCUMENT A: DR H.F. VERWOERD'S STATEMENT ON THE POLICY OF SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT DELIVERED AT THE SAVOY HOTEL, LONDON, MARCH 17, 1961*

For the purpose of what I have to say on race relations tonight I shall presume a fairly extensive knowledge of the details of the Government policy of separate development. Today it seems more imperative to deal with the wider background of this policy, its morality and purpose ...

South Africa has progressed very far indeed in the education and training for professions and trades of all its peoples, in health services for all, in housing, in income per capita, in the scope of the services each group provides for its own people, including the provision of tradesmen, administrators and professional men of all kinds. Other countries would justifiably claim and receive great credit for creating such material benefits and great opportunity for the general advancement of their masses. It is only in the case of South Africa that all this is swept aside with the bland statement that all this is worth nothing as long as one looks upon the recipients as inferior beings to whom participation in the government is denied.

It is of no avail to emphasise that the Government's policy is *not* based on people being inferior but being *different*, or to point out that a member of an African State can scarcely be accounted fortunate if he is in rags, with little to eat, with low wages, little continuous employment and only a shack to live in, if the only compensation for all that he lacks and suffers is that he has the vote! ...

[South Africa's] problem is unique. Nowhere in the world, and never in history, has a situation developed which is quite similar. The solution must therefore also be unique. ...

More than 300 years ago two population groups, equally foreign to South Africa, converged in rather small numbers on what was practically empty country. Neither colonised another man's country or robbed him by invasion and oppression. ...

The first point is, therefore, that here there was no colonialism, only separate settlement by each, nearly simultaneously and each had the chance to develop his, to serve his growing population, for more than three hundred years. The white man did this but not the black man and the white man did not use his power to overrun and acquire black man's country. In fact only in South Africa the white man deliberately reserved it for him and endeavoured (mostly in vain) to train the black man to make the best use of it, as he

did with his own to such good purpose that the black man came to him for employment, food and the good things of life - *not for political conquest*.

The white man therefore has not only an undoubted stake in and right to the land which he developed into a modern industrial state from denuded veld and empty valleys and isolated mountains, but according to all principles of morality it *was* his, *is* his and *must remain his*. ...

The non-whites who entered the white man's country or the urban areas, came solely to seek employment, safety, health, education (all of which were provided freely by the white man) and knowing nothing of, and not expecting, and not even thinking of political rights. There was no question of robbing the white man of his country by any political result of this entry in huge numbers, or by the natural increase of his population under the white man's protection and care. ...

Particularly as the result of their stage of civilisation, it was never contemplated that their presence would one day cause pressure upon the children of the white pioneer settlers of empty land to hand over, without protest or resistance, their whole heritage to such newcomers and protégés. In fact, it seemed then that for all time the whites would as guardians even have to rule the black man's country as part of their own in his interest because he could not be developed to do this properly for himself. The white man therefore allowed the influx to continue until he was outnumbered four to one. Even now, against his will, streams of illegal black immigrants flow across his borders from many parts of Africa, because of the better wages and way of life they find in this land of so-called oppression! What is the solution to be to this dilemma which history and the unexpected awakening of the black man has handed us?

JUSTICE FOR BOTH

Theorists ... expect the white South African to give away gradually his country and his possessions and indeed ultimately his whole nationhood and existence.

Where does morality come in if this is demanded?

If there must be justice for the black man, there must be justice for the white man and the coloured too, who will both be affected and suppressed. ...

There are three possibilities. One is that the white people of South Africa should sacrifice themselves, their possessions and the generations to come. They can do this by surrendering to black rule, even if it became a dictatorship, and evacuate the country of their forbears, or by remaining become an indistinguishable part of a black nation. Would you really choose that *if it were England of which we are speaking?*

Another way is to bluff yourself by making apparently smaller concessions, hoping to stave off the evil day, so that your children or grandchildren may suffer, but not you. ...

[This is a system of] junior partnership [which] would quickly - very, very quickly - also lead in South Africa to the demand for black rule *alone*, ...

In fact, this second method of solving the problem, solves nothing at all. It only means that the struggle for power goes on and on ...

There is another method, however, *and that is to live and let live - apart*. Would anybody in the United Kingdom accept as his ideal for the Commonwealth that it should become one state with one central government, controlled solely by numbers and not by the merit of your country as a leader state, smaller in numbers but great in experience and knowledge? *That* one multi-racial state, including the province which Great Britain would then be, would of necessity be governed from India under the majority control of those hundreds and hundreds of millions of non-Europeans concentrated there ...

We prefer each of our population groups to be controlled and governed by themselves, as nations are. Then they can co-operate, as in a Commonwealth, or in an economic association of nations where necessary. *Where is the EVIL in this?*

*Italics as in original.

*Source: National Party Information Service, 1961.

DOCUMENT B: EXTRACT FROM THE FREEDOM CHARTER, ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE, JUNE 26, 1955

PREAMBLE

We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:-

That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people;

That our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality;

That our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities;

That only a democratic state, based on the will of the people can secure to all their birthright without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief;

And therefore, we, the people of South Africa, black and white together - equals, countrymen and brothers - adopt this FREEDOM CHARTER. And

we pledge ourselves to strive together, sparing nothing of our strength and courage, until the democratic changes here set out have been won.

- The people shall govern.
- All national groups shall have equal rights.
- The people shall share in the country's wealth.
- The land shall be shared among those who work it.
- All shall be equal before the law.
- All shall enjoy equal human rights.
- There shall be work and security.
- The doors of learning and of culture shall be opened.
- There shall be houses, security and comfort.
- There shall be peace and friendship.

QUESTIONS

- 1.1 Explain the circumstances under which the speech in Document A was presented. (5)
- 1.2 Who drafted Document B, what was the occasion at which it was formally adopted and

can the organisers of the event claim that they represented the people? (5)

1.3 On what grounds does Dr Verwoerd claim that the policy of separate development is not based on racial inferiority? (4)

1.4 Would you say that the claims in Document B is based on the directly opposite principles of those in Document A? Give reasons for your answer. (5)

1.5 Compare the position of the two documents on the question of what policy is morally justifiable. (10)

1.6 What, according to Dr Verwoerd, is the essence of South Africa's political problem? Which three policy options does he consider and why does he prefer one of them? (10)

1.7 What does Document B mean when it claims that all the people of the country should share its wealth and that the land should be shared by those who work on it? (6)

1.8 What was Dr Verwoerd's motto for the policy of separate development? (2)

1.9 Would you describe Document B as a charter of democratic principles or a set of political promises? Motivate your answer. (3)
[50]

Members of the SASHT voted for the new Executive Committee at the general meeting on 12 January 1996 at the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.

The Executive Committee of the South African Society for History Teaching 1996-1997

- Chairperson: Mr R. Siebörger (UCT)
- Vice-Chairperson: Prof. J. Mohlamme (Vista)
- Secretary/Treasurer: Dr E.S. van Eeden (PU for CHE)
- Additional members: Mrs J. van der Merwe (Teachers Training College Pretoria)
Mr G. Corsane (Albany College Museum, Grahamstown)
Mrs J. Bam (UCT)
Mrs M. Zwane (Soweto College of Education)

Membership of the Society will be *separate* from **Yesterday and Today**. Membership fee was raised from R5.00 to R15.00.

Please contact the Secretary of the SASHT at the following address:

Dr ES van Eeden
SASHT
Department of History
Box 248
PU for CHE
2523 POTCHEFSTROOM