



# **NATIONAL SENIOR CERTIFICATE**

**GRADE 12**

**SEPTEMBER 2022**

**HISTORY P2  
ADDENDUM (DEAF)**

---

This addendum has 14 pages.

---

**QUESTION 1: HOW DID WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS CHALLENGE THE APARTHEID GOVERNMENT DURING THE 1980s?**

**SOURCE 1A**

This **source** below **explains** the **reasons** for the establishment(creation) of the **End Conscription Campaign (ECC)** in 1983.


The End Conscription Campaign was established in 1983, after Black Sash decided in July of that year to establish an organisation for conscientious(honourable) objectors. The main aim of the ECC was the broadening of the rights of conscientious(honourable) objectors and the creation of a system of alternative military service without the element of punishment. The ECC was formed as a coalition, spearheaded(led) by the existing Conscientious Objectors Support Groups, consisting of human rights, religious, student and woman's organisations opposed to conscription(recruitment) and militarisation and committed to working for a just peace in our land.

The ECC's opposition to conscription(recruitment) is based on the fundamental belief that no person can be forced against their will to take up arms and to take life. Because of the increasing involvement of the South Africa Defence Force (SADF) in operations against South African resistance organisations within and outside the country and in defending and upholding(maintaining) the apartheid system in the mid-eighties, a growing number of young men began to rebel against national service. Most of them fled from South Africa to avoid military service, while a minority were jailed after refusing to undergo military training. The ECC grew so rapidly that by the end of 1985 it had more than 4 000 members in seven branches.

[From <https://omalley.nelsonmandela.org>index.php>. Accessed on 9 November 2021.]

**SOURCE 1B**

This poster was designed by the ECC for its official launch at the Claremont Civic Centre, Cape Town, in October 1984.



[From [pri.org/file/ECCjpg-o](http://pri.org/file/ECCjpg-o). Accessed on 9 November 2021.]

**SOURCE 1C**

This **source** explains the **reason** why a **young white South African refused to serve** in the **SADF**.

The first young man to stand trial (prosecution) for refusing to serve in the SADF was Anton Eberhard. He has completed his initial(earlier) service in 1970. He was called up for camp again. He replied with a letter to his camp commander in which he wrote: “I acknowledge receipt of your call-up papers, but for reasons of conscience (principles) I am unable to attend. I have given the matter much thought and am fully aware of the consequences(cost) of refusing ... It is my belief that the present government has no right to remain in power and any organisation which enables it to do so cannot be supported.”

His boss, in reaction which typifies (demonstrates) the prevailing(usual) white attitudes asked him in fury (angry). “So who will stop our daughters being raped?” A crucial(important) factor in his decision was the fact that a friend was detained at the time of his call-up. In an interview he stated: “I befriended (supported) Vusi and got a taste what life was like for black South Africans. I knew I could not put on an SADF uniform.” Eberhard was sentenced to 12 months in detention barracks (camps), of which he served two.

[From <https://core.ac.uk. >download>pdf 145042157.pdf>. Accessed on 9 August 2021.]

**SOURCE 1D**

This **source** below **explains** the **reaction** of the **National Party** government towards the ECC in the 1980s.

By, 1985, the country was on fire. That year – shortly after the assassination<sup>(planned killing)</sup> of Matthew Goniwe and other Cradock leaders – the ECC hosted an international peace conference in Johannesburg. In 1985 it was announced in Parliament that 7 589 conscripts<sup>(recruits)</sup> had failed to report for the January national call-up, compared to 1 596 for the whole of 1984. By then 7 000 war resisters (opposes) were living in Europe, but many others simply dodged (avoided) the call-up by evading the military police or prolonged their studies indefinitely (forever).

As the ECC grew in support, the government attempted to suppress its activities. It carried out a vicious (brutal) smear campaign against the ECC in an attempt to show that it was unpatriotic (untrustworthy) and dangerous. The ECC's offices were raided<sup>(searched)</sup> and over 75 activists were detained, while others were personally harassed or attacked. The then Defence Minister, Magnus Malan said: "The ECC is a direct enemy of the SADF. It's disgraceful that the SADF, but especially the country's young people, the pride of the nation, should be subjected to the ECC's propaganda (publicity), suspicion-sowing and misinformation." He declared that the ECC was part of the 'revolutionary onslaught against South Africa'. The P.W. Botha government also increased the period of imprisonment from two to six years for refusing military service.

In August 1988, the ECC became the first white organisation in more than 20 years to be banned by the apartheid regime. In 1989 in response to a national defiance campaign the ECC 'unbanned' itself. Soon thereafter conscription was cut from two years to one year and after 1990 it was effectively phased out, officially ending in 1993. The ECC put pressure on the conscription system and in the end made it impossible for the state to enforce it.

[From <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/end-conscription-campaignn-ECC>. Accessed on 9 August 2021.]

**QUESTION 2: HOW DID THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (TRC) DEAL WITH THE KILLING OF ACTIVIST, SIPHIWO MTIMKULU?**

**SOURCE 2A**

This **source** below explains the **reasons** for the **formation** of the **Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)** in 1995.

Since April 1996, the Truth Commission's job has been to listen to victim's stories, often told by surviving relatives and to offer amnesty<sup>(forgiveness)</sup> in exchange for the truth from the perpetrators of political crimes during the era of whites-only rule. The commission's rock of credibility (trustworthy), is its diminutive (little) chairperson and father-confessor, retired archbishop Desmond Tutu, who also won the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts to end apartheid. But as it heads into the final phase of its mandate, recently expanded to handle the flood of amnesty applications, it has become as controversial as the crimes it investigates.

Many blacks believe the commission is biased (unfair) in favour of whites and many whites believed that it was in favour of blacks. The televised hearings were supposed to be Oprah-styles tell-all sessions promoting national reconciliation<sup>(understanding)</sup> and healing. Many victims and their families, however, complain bitterly that the amnesty hearings have become legally tugs-of-war.

Some victims found closure at the amnesty hearings, while others were 'unhappy' as they believed that some perpetrators never revealed the full truth of their crimes.

[From <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/the-painful-truth>. Accessed on 1 November 2021.]

**SOURCE 2B**

This **source** below **focuses** on the **testimony** that Siphiwo Mtimkulu's mother, Joyce Mtimkulu gave at the TRC hearings at the Centenary Hall in New Brighton in June 1996.

Mtimkulu was part of a new wave of anti-apartheid activism (involvement) in the 1970s, grounded in the ideals of black empowerment and youth activism. When the Congress of South African Students (COSAS) was formed in 1979, Mtimkulu joined the Port Elizabeth branch as soon as he was released from jail. His crime was the possession of banned literature. Mtimkulu's political activities soon made him well-known to the Port Elizabeth security police. At the time, it was common knowledge that COSAS was heavily **invested** in the liberation struggle and affiliated to banned political parties, operating from exile. This helps to explain why the security police kept such a close watch on Mtimkulu and his movements. It was only a matter of time before matters came to head – and in 1981 saw a confrontation that was to influence the course of Siphiwo's life (and ultimately, end it far too early).

Monde Mditshwa, one of Siphiwo's friends explained to the TRC how Siphiwo was caught for what would be his final stay in police custody. Siphiwo was shot in the arm, captured and taken (via hospital) into custody. Mtimkulu was detained for five months and was released on 20 October 1981. He immediately complained of severe pain in his legs, feet and stomach, as well as being vocal (outspoken) on the kinds of torture he had to endure (experience) while in custody. Joyce Mtimkulu, Siphiwo's mother, listened and recorded much of what Siphiwo said in 1981, and was able to re-tell her son's torture at a Human Rights Violation hearing at the TRC, fifteen years later. She explained that Siphiwo would be tortured through electrocution, beating and almost suffocated to death with a wet towel.

As the pains got worse, he was taken to Livingstone Hospital on 26 October 1981 and then transferred to Cape Town's Groote Schuur Hospital for more comprehensive tests. Tests has shown that thallium (poison) was present in Siphiwo's body, a rare, colourless and difficult to detect chemical. Siphiwo had been poisoned.

[From [sabcnews.com/sabcnews/life-and-times-of-a-youth-activist-the-murder-of-siphiwo-mthimkhulu](http://sabcnews.com/sabcnews/life-and-times-of-a-youth-activist-the-murder-of-siphiwo-mthimkhulu). Accessed on 1 November 2021.]



**SOURCE 2C**

This **photograph shows** Siphiwo Mtimkulu being **discharged** from **Groote Schuur Hospital** in **1982** after being **treated** for **thallium poisoning** given to him by the security police while held in detention. The photographer is unknown.



[From [journals.openedition.org/etudesaficaines/22209?long=en](https://journals.openedition.org/etudesaficaines/22209?long=en). Accessed on 1 November 2021.]

[THIS POSTER READS: 'POISONING PEOPLE WON'T STOP US']



**SOURCE 2D**

The **source** below **explains** the **testimony** given at the **TRC** in **Port Elizabeth** on 26 January 1997, by a police general on how he executed<sup>(killed)</sup> drugged activist Siphiwo Mtinkulu.

Retired security police General Nic van Rensburg admitted executing Eastern Cape student leader Siphiwo Mtinkulu in 1982 after drugging him with spiked<sup>(has drugs in)</sup> coffee, and lying about the murder to the Harms Commission of Inquiry. Testifying before the TRC's Amnesty Committee, Van Rensburg also admitted lying in an application to the Cape High Court to temporarily gag (block) Mtinkulu's mother. In the false statement he made to the Harms Commission in 1990, he had denied personal involvement in Mtinkulu's death.

Van Rensburg for the first time publicly told the committee of his role in the abduction<sup>(kidnap)</sup> and murder of Mtinkulu and fellow activist Topsy Madaka. He is seeking amnesty<sup>(forgiveness)</sup> for the killings along with three former security policemen. Testifying earlier, Van Rensburg described Mtinkulu and Madaka as 'two large cogs (parts) in the revolutionary struggle'. After their abduction<sup>(kidnap)</sup> outside a Port Elizabeth hotel on 14 April 1982, the activists were taken to a disused police station near Cradock where they were interrogated<sup>(forcible asked)</sup> and then given spiked drinks, he said. After shooting both activists their bodies were placed on piles of wood and set alight. The following morning, they raked up the remains and threw it into the Fish River. The same day they drove the activist's car to the Lesotho border to create the impression that they had left the country. "I am sorry for what I have done," Van Rensburg said.

In 2000 the murderers of Mtinkulu and Madaka were granted amnesty. The Commission found that they had disclosed the whole truth of the story of the deaths of the two activists.

In 2007, ten years after the hearings took place, the Missing Persons Task Team found the remains of Mtinkulu and Madaka at Post Chalmers, the isolated site in the Eastern Cape where they were murdered.

[From [justice.gov.za/trc/media1997/9701/s970924c.htm](http://justice.gov.za/trc/media1997/9701/s970924c.htm). Accessed on 1 November 2021.]

**QUESTION 3: WHAT IMPACT DID GLOBALISATION HAVE ON UNDER-DEVELOPED NATIONS?****SOURCE 3A**

This is an **extract** of a **speech** made by **Horst Kohler**, the **managing director** of the **IMF** on the intentions of globalisation. It was **delivered** at the **US Conference** in **Washington DC** on the 28 January 2002.

Globalisation is the process through which an increasingly free flow of ideas, people, goods, services and capital leads to the integration (mixing) of economies and societies. It is often viewed as an irreversible (permanent) force **which** is imposed upon the world by some countries and institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank. However, that is not so. Globalisation represents a political choice in favour of international economic integration, which for the most part has gone hand-in-hand with the consolidation (strengthening) of democracy. Precisely because it is a choice, it may be challenged, even reversed, but only at a great cost to humanity. The IMF believes that globalisation has great potential to contribute to the growth that is essential to achieve a sustained (continued) reduction of global poverty ...

Trade liberalisation (freedom) is the best form of help for self-help, both because it offers an escape from aid dependency and because it is a win-win game, all countries stand to benefit from free trade. The true test of the credibility of rich countries efforts to combat<sup>(fight)</sup> poverty lies in their willingness to open up their markets and phase out trade subsidies in areas where developing countries have a comparative advantage as in agriculture, processed foods, textiles, clothing and light manufacturers.

[From [www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2002/031502.htm](http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2002/031502.htm). Accessed on 20 November 2021.]

**SOURCE 3B**

The **source** below **describes** the **negative effects** of **globalisation** on **poor nations**.

Globalisation has resulted in: increased international trade; a company operating in more than one country; greater dependence on the global economy; free movement of capital, goods and services and recognition of companies such as McDonalds and Starbucks in less economically developed countries.

Although globalisation is probably helping to create more wealth in developing countries, it is not helping to close the gap between the world's poorest countries and the world's richest. Globalisation has resulted in many businesses setting up or buying operations in other countries. Companies that operate in several countries are called multinational corporations (MNCs) or trans-national corporations (TNCs). The US fast-food chain McDonalds is a large MNC – it has nearly 30 000 restaurants in 119 countries.

Globalisation operates mostly in the interest of the richest countries, which continue to dominate<sub>(control)</sub> world trade at the expense of developing countries. The role of less economically developed countries in the world market is mostly to provide<sub>(give)</sub> the North and West with cheap labour and raw materials. There are no guarantees that the wealth from inward investment will benefit the local community. Often profits are sent back to the more economically developed country where the TNC is based.

[From [https://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/geography/globalisation/globalisation\\_rev5.shtml](https://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/geography/globalisation/globalisation_rev5.shtml). Accessed on 20 November 2021.]

**SOURCE 3C**

The cartoon appeared in the *Eritrean News* with the title, 'How the World Bank and International Monetary Fund destroy Africa.' The cartoonist and publication date is unknown.



[From <https://www.tesfanews.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Africa-indebted-to-IMF-World-Bank.jpg>.

Accessed on 20 November 2021.

**SOURCE 3D**

The **source** below **describes** the **positive effects** that **globalisation** has had on **developing countries**.

Importantly, globalisation is playing a pivotal (key) role in the Third World. In particular globalisation is shaping politics, promoting technological development, enhancing(improving) economic processes and improvement of social, health and the natural environment. International trade remains a booster for most of these economies, as they are markets for developed nations and get chance to export their products to the global market. However, besides these, globalisation is two-sided. It is leading to unemployment, widening income inequalities and cultural imperialism among other negative factors.

The first effect is improved standards of living for million in the Third World. In particular, with globalisation, governments of developing countries have access to foreign lending, when they channel these funds to improving transport infrastructure, healthcare systems, irrigation, education and other social services, the standard of living go high. However, in case this money does not serve the right people, it may breed (lead to) corruption and entrench (create) developing countries. Today Third World countries are connected to the rest of the world through satellite and cable.

[From <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/impact-globalisation-developing>. Accessed on 20 November 2021.]

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Visual sources and other historical evidence were taken from the following:

[https://archive.macleans.ca>article>the-painful-truth](https://archive.macleans.ca/article/the-painful-truth)

[https://core.ac.uk. >download>pdf/145042157.pdf](https://core.ac.uk/>download>pdf/145042157.pdf)

[https://omalley.nelsonmandela.org>index.php>](https://omalley.nelsonmandela.org>index.php)

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/geography/globalisation/globalisationrev5.shtml>

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/impact-globalisation-developing>

<https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/end-conscription-campaign-ECC>

<https://www.tesfanews.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Africa-indebted-to-IMF-World-Bank.jpg>

[journals.openedition.org/etudesafricaines/22209?long=en](https://journals.openedition.org/etudesafricaines/22209?long=en)

[justice.gov.za/trc/media1997/9701/s970924c.htm](https://justice.gov.za/trc/media1997/9701/s970924c.htm)

[pri.org/file/ECCjpg-o](https://pri.org/file/ECCjpg-o)

[sabcnews.com./sabcnews/life-and-times-of-a-youth-activist-the-murder-of-siphiwo-mthimkhulu](https://sabcnews.com./sabcnews/life-and-times-of-a-youth-activist-the-murder-of-siphiwo-mthimkhulu)

[www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2002/031502.htm.](https://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2002/031502.htm)