

A TEST OF INTELLECTUAL SKILLS

Die Olimpiade is nie 'n eksamen wat 'n leerling moet slaag om na 'n volgende graad te promoveer nie. Dit is 'n geleentheid vir leerlinge om hulle intellektuele vermoëns en kennis te toets in 'n hoogstaande kompetisie met toppresteerders vanoor die hele land. 'n Nie-amptelike nasionale norm van voortreflikheid word op hierdie wyse ontwikkel. Dit is daarom vir elke onderwyser, leerling en skool belangrik om met hulself te kompeteer en hulleself te toets binne so 'n nasionale standaard.

SENIOR OLYMPIAD

This year's senior second round paper differed from those of previous years in the way in which intellectual skills were put to the test. Half of the marks were linked to the study and interpretation of two sensitive political documents of great contemporary relevance. Answers could not be categorised as either right or wrong. It was possible to achieve very high marks by presenting a variety of answers which even included taking opposite positions. Utilising the correct factual information was of course a prerequisite. A well read and intelligent engagement with the post-1945 history of South Africa was necessary. But analysis and interpretation within its historical context and meaning was the key to success. The ability to understand and interpret the documents in their own right, and placing it in the context of historical developments, was the real challenge. Achieving a score of above 60% could be regarded as very good, above 70% as excellent and above 80% as outstanding. The trap to be avoided was

the mere repetition of political creeds, prejudices or ideological slogans.

DOELWITTE

Die vraestel het vier oogmerke gehad.

1. Dit wou die vermoë van leerlinge om histories te dink toets. Met ander woorde of hulle in staat is om op 'n nugtere, beredeneerde wyse oor moeilike kwessies te argumenteer. Die empatiese en kousale insigte en begrip van die rol van kontinuïteit en verandering, waardes, oordele en vooroordele, feit en mening het 'n belangrike rol gespeel. Dit was veral die geval met vrae 1, 3 en 5. (Die vraestel verskyn elders in hierdie uitgawe.)
2. Die vermoë om opletterend en krities te lees en antwoorde met skerpheid en presiesheid te formuleer.
3. Die toets van parate kennis.
4. Dit wou vasstel in hoe 'n mate leerlinge op hoogte met nuusgebeure is.

Vraag 2, wat 20 punte getel het, was veral op die laaste twee doelwitte gemik. Vrae 1, 3, 4 en 5 het op die eerste drie gekonsentreer hoewel doelwit 2 in al die antwoorde 'n rol gespeel het. Wat volg is uittreksels uit leerlinge se antwoorde om die hoë standaard van werk wat gelewer is, asook die slaggate waarin getrap is, aan te toon.

One or two general observations about the candidates' handling of the different types of questions deserve mention. The more challenging question 1 resulted in a higher average mark than the more factual question 2. The latter, however, did require a nose for the news and rewarded the regular newspaper reader. It was also noteworthy how the candidates in general approached the very challenging question 1.5 in a more balanced and historically mature way, but failed to do the same in the far less provocative question 1.9.

HISTORY AND MORALITY

The role of moral judgement in history is a very sensitive and difficult one. May the historian sit in moral judgement over past events and may it be judged in terms of the morals and standards of his own time? If the historian is not allowed to pass moral judgement, does he/she by implication condone immoral policies or events of the past? What about the difference between what people say or claim to do and what they actually do, or what really happens? These are the intellectual skills put to the test in question 1.5: compare the position of the two documents on the question of what policy is morally justifiable.

Here are a few examples of the actual answers given. The samples are quoted verbatim.

Sample A:

Both documents state that their own policies are justifiable.

Document A state that the: "the problem is unique ... the solution must therefore also be unique." Ipso Ergo it is stating that normal standards cannot apply to the situation because the situation has never before occurred. Later it states that the position of white supremacy is justified because if it is relinquished the white man will see: 'his country and his possessions and indeed ultimately his whole manhood and existence' be relinquish. Verwoerd then asks: "Where does morality come in if this is demanded?" He believes that "morality" in its sense of equality is not applicable because: "If there must be justice for the black man, there must be justice for the white man" Eventually he asks: "Where is the EVIL in this?" He believes that his policy is morally justifiable, which states that everything the minority government does is justified in that it is for the betterment of one or the other of the races in South Africa - whites being: "smaller in numbers but greater in experience and knowledge".

Document B states that: "no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people" - immediately stating that everything in Source A is immoral as it is the decision of a minority rather than of a majority. This is further reinforced by: "our people have been robbed of their birthright ... by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality". The Freedom Charter views injustice and inequality as immoral.

Thus Sources A + B view each other's stance as immoral as Source A is founded upon "separate development" which is viewed by Source B as "injustice + inequality".

Sample B:

Document B is morally justifiable as it wants equal rights for everyone. It favours democracy and equality politically, economically and socially. Document B, although it seems marked wants full development for whites only with Blacks having to depend on whites. The blacks would have no political freedom, their economy would be dependent on the "white" SA and socially they would have no rights. It is totally immoral to discriminate against people because of their colour. Although different they are still humans and should not be put aside and separate. Different does not mean inferior or not being able to vote or live wherever you choose. You cannot discriminate because of colour and by putting the Blacks separate to the whites is total discrimination. Verwoerd's policy of apartheid was totally immoral and unjustifiable whereas the freedom charter ie. Document A wanted basic human rights for ALL without any discrimination and called for peace and a moral policy for all, Black and White and non-white.

Voorbeeld C:

Dokument A voel dat rassesekeiding weens geskiedkundige redes regverdigbaar is vir die volgende rede: Blankes het dienste en ekonomiese ontwikkeling verskaf aan swartes. Die kans is goed dat swartes onder 'n meerderheidsregering minder welvarend gaan wees. Die ontsegging van swartes van politieke regte kan regverdig word deur blanke oorlewing en die feit dat swartes uit vrye wil aan die blanke ekonomie kom deelneem het, asook deur die andersheid van hul kultuur en waardestelsel. Ook omdat SA se situasie uniek is mag oplossings aangewend word wat vir die wêreld ietwat vreemd voorkom. Die dokument beweer ook dat, omdat blankes sekere dinge daargestel het, hulle dit mag vir hulself toeëien — dat dit inderdaad nie moreel regverdigbaar is om van die blankes te verwag om dit prys te gee nie. Skeiding is moreel regverdigbaar om getalle-oorheersing te verhoed.

Aan die ander kant beweer dokument B dat regering deur 'n minderheid geensins moreel regverdigbaar is nie en dat die ongelykheid wat heers nie regverdig is nie. Die skeiding op grond van ras is nie regverdigbaar nie, omdat dit sekere rasse hul geboortereg ontsê en broederskap, vrede en harmonie verhinder. Die ekonomiese verskille is volgens hulle ook verkeerd en so ook wetlike diskriminasie.

Sample D:

Document A is not morally justifiable because of the policy which is the separate development. Document B is morally justifiable because it was adopted by the majority of the country i.e. Black and white and it also recognises the equality of Human rights. Document A's policy was founded by a government formed on injustice and equality.

FEIT EN MENING

Vraag 1.2 was bedoel om te toets of leerlinge feit en mening met mekaar in verband kan bring. Die feite is nie in die teks verstrek nie, dit was kennis waaroor hulle moes beskik. Die vraag het gelui: 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 het? Dit was opvallend dat die meeste kandidate nie duidelikheid oor die presiese oorsprong van die Vryheidsmanifes gehad het nie. Vergelyk die volgende voorbeelde van antwoorde:

Voorbeeld E:

1.2) Dit was opgestel deur Vryheidsbewegings, die Congress of Democrats en alle demokratiese, nie-rassige en nie secsistiese organisasies in SA op daardie tyd. Die hele bevolking was betrek by die opstel daarvan wat dit demokraties maak. Die ANC was in beheer. Dit was 'n kongres van die volk wat die hele land verteenwoordig het. Hulle kan daarop aanspraak maak dat hulle die hele mense verteenwoordig het omdat dit demokraties was omdat hulle die hele mense by die opstel van die dokument betrek het. Dit was voorafgegaan deur huis-tot-huis-besoeke, bewusmakingsveldtogte en deur dat die mense hul verteenwoordigers na die kongres demokraties gekies het.

Sample F:

Document B was drafted by the African National Congress, Coloureds Representative Council and the Indian Congress. They met in Kliptown in 1955, where the parties were represented about 3 000 delegates in all, to discuss the problem of racial discrimination, implemented on them by the National

party government. It is true for organisers to say the represented the people, for all of us are free now.

Sample G:

The African National Congress adopted the freedom charter at a conference and the leaders can claim that they represent the people because it was adopted by the majority of the country.

Sample H:

The document was drafted by Albert Luthuli, and several other prominent resistance leaders at that time. The occasion was the Congress of the People, which was called to discuss resistance measures to apartheid, attended by several political groups. The ANC was instrumental in the Freedom Charter, and yet despite being almost certainly the largest resistance group, there were still a vast majority of rural, uneducated African, and whilst the Charter may be seen to be supporting their interests, the majority did not yet actively support the political movement, hence they were no truly representative. In 1955, they need to react to the Pass laws.

Voorbeeld I:

1.2 Die geleentheid was die "Kongres van die Volk" wat by Kliptown gehou is. 'n Komitee bestaande uit verteenwoordigers van die verskillende bevrydings-organisasies soos die ANC, SAKP en die Transvaalse en Natalse Indiër-Kongresse asook lede van die liberale party het dit opgestel — Mnre. Nelson Mandela, Albert Luthuli en Joe Slovo het veral 'n groot aandeel gehad daarin. Hulle het natuurlik nie werklik alle mense verteenwoordig nie, siende dat gematigde en konserwatiewe blankes, Kleurlinge en tradisionele swartes óf nie genooi was nie, óf nie die uitnodiging aanvaar het nie.

BEREDENEERDE HANTERING

Vraag 1 het deurgaans 'n beredeneerde hantering van aktuele kwessies vereis. 'n Vraag wat in hierdie opsig besondere intellektuele rytheid en beredenering vereis het, was vraag 1.9: Would you describe Document B as a charter of democratic principles or a set of political promises? Motivate your answer. Compare the following answers.

Sample J:

I believe it contains both. The statement it makes in especially the preamble are one is morale principle,

whereby all South Africans should live. Also the principles set in point form seem some to be political promising/propaganda eg. "There shall be ..."

Sample K:

It is a political promise as it forms the basis of what is known as the "struggle". The entire resistance against Nationalist government is based on this Charter and one similar to it, making it not the hope of the people, but rather a propagandistic political weapon.

Sample L:

I will describe it as a Charter for democratic principles because it says people shall govern, all national groups shall have equal right and there shall be peace, security, comfort and friendship.

Sample M:

Document B is a charter of democratic principles because it was still under discussion by parties of "oppressed" people. It was to be approved by the government before it was to be a promise.

Voorbeeld N:

Sekere bepalings daarin soos "die mense sal deel in die welvaart van die land" en bepalings wat werk, sekuriteit en vrede en vriendskap beloof, is uit en uit politieke beloftes. Die meeste bepalings, bv. dié oor gelykheid voor die reg, gelyke menseregte, gelyke geleenthede en die demokrasie ("regering deur die volk") is demokratiese beginsels — in geheel dus eersgenoemde.

NUUSVRAE

Oor die algemeen het kandidate getoon dat hulle 'n gesonde belangstelling in gebeure van die dag het soos deur vraag 2 getoets. Daar was 'n paar doelbewuste vangplekke wat heelwat kandidate netjies hanteer het. Hier moes veral op woorde gelet word. Engelssprekendes het meer gestruik oor die verskil tussen Herenigde Nasionale Party en Herstigte Nasionale Party as Afrikaanssprekendes. Afrikaanssprekendes het weer meer gestruik oor Grondwetgewende Vergadering en Nasionale Vergadering.

The majority of candidates was bowled out by Public Protector, confusing it with Public Prosecutor.

EXPLANATIONS

Questions 3 and 5 required the comparison of different arguments and explanations. Question 3 read: Discuss the arguments for and against a republican form of government for South Africa presented in the referendum of 1960. Compare the following explanations:

Sample O:

The main issue brought in favour of the Republic idea was that of South Africa's independence of Britain, particularly in the light of the Balfour Declaration/Statute of Westminster. The main argument against was that of South Africa's loyalty to Britain, which many English white felt.

Sample P: from a standard 8 candidate

In 1960 South Africans were asked to choose between remaining part of Britain or becoming independent. The National Party was pro-independence. He claimed that Britain did not have South Africa's best interests at heart. South Africa was a wealthy country and could stand on its own two feet. South Africans, especially Afrikaners, had their own special identity and language. South Africa had its own flag, currency, anthem, prime minister and a republic in all but name. In addition to this South Africa could remain a member of the commonwealth and still be a republic.

On the other hand many English speakers were opposed to this. They felt that remaining part of the British empire was important to ensure their position in South Africa. South Africa also needed to be able to rely on Britain in time of need and was not ready to become a republic. South Africa needed to continue enjoying the benefits of being part of the commonwealth.

Voorbeeld Q:

Die regering en NP het geargumenteer dat omdat alle Afrika-lande besig was om die koloniale juk af te werp dit 'n goeie ding vir Suid-Afrika sou wees. Hulle kon geen voordeel in 'n voorgesette verbintenis met Brittanje sien nie, en dit sou ook 'n omkering van die historiese vernedering van die Afrikanervolk by Vereeniging wees. Teenvoeters vir die argumente was dat sommige gevoel het dat ekonomiese bande met Brittanje sou verswak, Suid-Afrika sou geïsoleer wees in die internasionale politiek weens gebrek aan lidmaatskap van 'n groep en 'n groot deel van die Suid-Afrikaanse Engelse het steeds 'n historiese verbintenis met Brittanje gevoel. Die NP het weer gedink dat, histories gesproke, Suid-Afrika met sy

diverse bevolking nie by die Britse Ryk gepas het nie en boonop met 'n republiek totaal van Britse inmenging gevrywaar sal wees.

Sample R:

In the referendum of 1960 for a republican form of government, it was said that South Africa should have independence but, it had to maintain the ties or the relationship with Britain. Against the republic government, it was said that should do away with Britain and have its own independence which was based on self-determination and secondly against the republic government was the fact that they wanted to have an Afrikaner state and they did not want to mix with Englishspeaking people.

Vraag 5 het gelui: Waarom het die Verenigde Party van die Suid-Afrikaanse politieke toneel verdwyn en hoe sou u sy bydrae tot Suid-Afrika se politieke geskiedenis evalueer?

Sample S:

The United Party was in power for 14 years. Formed from the coalition of Smuts' South Africa Party and Hertzog's Nationalists, whilst in power it was led first by Hertzog and then by Smuts. Hertzog's government all but resolved the 'poor white' problem, and passed his Native Bills in 1936. After the World War, Smuts could not deal with the divisive nature of any racial policy and so lost out in 1948 to Malan. The UP had taken important steps in regulating the economy, and in 1939, albeit in a 'schism' it was responsible for bringing South Africa in to the 2nd World War. It played a vital role in leading South Africa out of the Depression, and it was only when it encountered problems with a racial policy that it began to falter. It was very much a coalition, consisting of several groups with conflicting interests, like liberals and Afrikaners, held together while it lasted by the strong leadership of Hertzog and Smuts. The divided nature of the party proved to be its' downfall in 1948, when the Nationalists were unanimous over apartheid, and after Smuts retired, and Esselen died, it lacked both strong leadership and an effective power base. It continued as a party even into the 1970s, but in order to win an election it needed to try to attract 2 opposite groups which proved impossible and resulted in its' downfall. The determination of the Nationalists like with the Coloured vote issue even destroyed it as opposition.

It's role was that as a final step before the

Nationalists, backed by the Broederbond, took control of South Africa. The coalition nature of the support base made it even easier for the Nationalists, for whom race relations was one area of real decisiveness.

Voorbeeld T:

Die Verenigde Party het verdwyn omdat hy nie geskikte en verkoopbare alternatief tot die NP se apartheidsbeleid kon aanbied nie. Daar was konstante struweling tussen die konserwatiewe en liberale faksies in die party en hulle kon nie besluit of hulle meer regs as die NP of byna so links soos die Progressiewe wou wees nie. Hul leierskap na genl. Smuts se dood het gewissel van gemiddeld (Sir De Villiers Graaff) tot swak (JGN Strauss). Die bemerking van hul beleid van rassefederasie was ook swak. Sy bydrae tot die SA politiek na sy nederlaag in die 1948-verkiezing was relatief klein en hy het meestal die NP op detail gekritiseer sonder om 'n konstruktiewe alternatief aan te bied of om effektief teen onreg te velde te trek.

Sample U:

Because the NP was so strong and had the support of the majority of the whites, the UP petered out. After the 1948 election, which the UP lost because of bad organisation, the UP was in a disarray and after Smuts died it had poor leadership and was no competition for the well organised and popular NP. The UP at one stage united Afrikaners (Smuts and Hertzog) and had the support of the people — when the UP came into being it had 111 out of 150 seats. When Hertzog left the UP because of the decision to enter WW II, the UP still had the support of the people as it got 89 seats in the 1943 election — a clear majority and it showed how the people supported it. But because Smuts was away from home so much and because of the UP's liberal policy people started to turn away from it and whites fearing Black domination turned to the NP and supported its policies and ideas of the "Swart gevaar". The UP played a definite role in SA politics uniting Afrikaners and at one stage did have the support of the people but it was too cumbersome and was opposed by many other parties and eventually petered out.

UITNODIGING AAN ONDERWYSERS. SIEN SELF HIERDIE ANTWOORDE NA. DIE VRAESTEL WAT DIE ONDERSKEIE PUNTE AANDUI, ASOOK DIE PANEEL SE PUNTE, VERSKYN IN AFRIKAANS EN ENGELS OP BLADSY 49.

SAMPLES FROM SENIOR OLYMPIAD

See pages 45-48

Average marks awarded by the panel

Sample A	8/10	Sample L	2/3
Sample B	5/10	Sample M	0/3
Voorbeeld C	7/10	Voorbeeld N	3/3
Voorbeeld D	2/10	Sample O	4/10
Voorbeeld E	2/5	Sample P	8/10
Sample F	2/5	Sample Q	9/10
Sample G	2/5	Sample R	2/10
Sample H	3/5	Sample S	10/10
Voorbeeld I	5/5	Sample T	10/10
Sample J	2/3	Sample U	6/10
Sample K	1/3		

GESKIEDENISOLIMPIADE 1996

Vraestel vir tweede ronde.

- Die eerste vraag is reeds vervat in die artikel op bladsy 50.
- Verduidelik kortliks elkeen van die volgende:
 - Herenigde Nasionale Party
 - Grondwetgewende Vergadering
 - CONTROLESA
 - Passiewe weerstand
 - Uitsluitklousule
 - Herstigte Nasionale Party
 - Nasionale Vergadering
 - Openbare Beskermer
 - Konstitusionele Hof
 - Verskanste artikels van die Unie-grondwet (2x10 =20)
- Bespreek die argumente wat voor die referendum van 1960 vir en teen 'n republikeinse staatsvorm vir Suid-Afrika gebruik is (10)
- Wat was Suid-Afrika se verhouding met die Organisasie vir Afrika Eenheid van sy stigting tot 1990? (10)
- Waarom het die Verenigde Party van die Suid-Afrikaanse politieke toneel verdwyn en hoe sou u sy bydrae tot Suid-Afrika se politieke geskiedenis evalueer? (10)

[100]

HISTORY OLYMPIAD 1996

Second Round paper

- The first question is included in the article on page 53.
- Briefly explain each of the following:
 - Herenigde Nasionale party
 - Constituent Assembly
 - CONTROLESA
 - Passive resistance
 - Lock out clause
 - Herstigte Nasionale Party
 - National Assembly
 - Public Protector
 - Constitutional Court
 - The entrenched articles of the Union constitution (2x20=20)
- Discuss the arguments for and against a republican form of government for South Africa presented in the referendum of 1960. (10)
- What was South Africa's relationship with the Organisation for African Unity from its founding until 1990? (10)
- Why did the United Party disappear from the South African political scene and how would you evaluate its role in South Africa's political history? (10)

[100]