



**NATIONAL  
SENIOR CERTIFICATE**

**GRADE 12**

**JUNE 2023**

**HISTORY P2  
ADDENDUM**

---

This addendum consists of 10 pages.

---

**QUESTION 1: HOW DID THE UNITED DEMOCRATIC FRONT (UDF) ATTEMPT TO RESIST PW BOTHA'S REFORMS IN THE 1980s?**

**SOURCE 1A**

The extract below explains constitutional reforms introduced by Prime Minister PW Botha in the South African Parliament in 1983.

PW Botha had been the Minister of Defence, and his rise to power enabled the army to increase its influence over the repressive (harsh) activities of the government. However, Botha was also backed by big Afrikaner businesses which wanted to reform apartheid. Botha symbolised both the repression and the reform sides of government policy.

A significant reform measure was the legal recognition of African trade unions in 1979. Another was the government's growing recognition of the permanence of an urban African population.

At the political level, government leaders proposed a departure from the principle of whites-only electorate. Plans were put forward for a 'tricameral' parliament, or a parliament of three chambers. This meant that Indian and Coloured people would be given the vote. Africans would still not have the right to vote.

Reform plans such as these led to sharp divisions within the National Party. In 1982, a sizable group of right-wingers broke away, under the leadership of Andries Treurnicht, to form the Conservative Party.

[From *Apartheid to Democracy South Africa 1948–1994*.]

**SOURCE 1B**

The extract below is taken from a speech delivered by Dr Allan Boesak, keynote speaker, at the launching meeting of the United Democratic Front (UDF) held in August 1983 in the Rocklands Community Hall, Mitchells Plain, near Cape Town.

We are here to say that the government's constitutional proposals are inadequate, and that they do not express the will of the vast majority of South Africa's people. But more than that, what we are working towards (aims), is an undivided South Africa which shall belong to all its people, an open democracy from which no single South African shall be excluded and a society in which the human dignity of all its people shall be respected.

We are here to say that there are rights that are neither conferred (granted) by, nor derived from the state; you have to go back beyond the dimmest (faintest) of eternity to understand their origin: they are God-given. And so, we are here to claim this.

In a sense, the formation of the United Democratic Front (UDF) both highlights and symbolises the crisis of apartheid and what its supporters have created for themselves. After a history of some 331 years of slavery, racial discrimination, dehumanisation (not concerned about human beings) and economic exploitation, what they expected was acceptance of the status quo (position remaining the same).

[From <https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/united-democratic-front-national-launch-august-20-1983>.

Accessed on 10 January 2023.]

**SOURCE 1C**

The photograph below shows Dr Allan Boesak, Archie Gumede and Mrs Naicker at the launch of the UDF on 20 August 1983.



Dr Allan Boesak

Archie Gumede

Mrs Naicker

[From <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/united-democratic-front-udf>. Accessed on 15 January 2023.]

**SOURCE 1D**

The extract below explains the reaction of the apartheid regime towards the UDF.

During the Delmas treason trial in June 1985, the state charged 22 UDF leaders and activists from the Vaal with treason, subversion (overthrowing government), and murder, in a marathon trial that began in the small town of Delmas. The accused included UDF national leaders Popo Molefe (national general secretary of the UDF, Mosiuo Patrick 'Terror' Lekota (national publicity secretary) of the UDF, and Moses 'Moss' Chikane.

The murder charges were brought on the legal grounds of 'common purpose', where the state admitted that the people who were charged had not themselves committed murder, but said that as leaders and organisers of the Vaal protests, they should be counted responsible when the protestors killed government officials.

The state dropped charges against three of the accused in 1986. Four years after the beginning of the Delmas treason trial, in November 1988, the judge ruled that the UDF had in fact acted as the 'internal wing of the ANC', had worked to make the country ungovernable, and to overthrow the government through violence. On December 8, the judge sentenced Terror Lekota, to 12 years in prison, and both Popo Molefe and Moss Chikane to 10 years in prison.

In 1989, the Appeal Court overturned the sentencing and the Delmas trialists were released. The trial was the longest political trial in South Africa, with 437 days in court.

[From [https://www.saha.org.za/udf/repressing\\_the\\_leadership.htm](https://www.saha.org.za/udf/repressing_the_leadership.htm). Accessed on 11 January 2023.]

**QUESTION 2: WAS THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (TRC) SUCCESSFUL IN HEALING THE WOUNDS OF A DIVIDED SOUTH AFRICA?**

**SOURCE 2A**

The following is an extract dealing with the exposure and expression of victims during the TRC.

There are two crucial things that have come out of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The first is that it has achieved a remarkable and far-ranging public exposure of the human rights violations and crimes committed under the apartheid regime ... It has forced a previously reluctant population (though, of course, there is still denial at one level) to see that apartheid was morally indefensible; that it is a crime against humanity. It has produced an archive which allows people to examine their past and hopefully learn from it.

Secondly, it has allowed ordinary people to find expression for the suffering under the regime. It has had a completely cathartic [therapeutic or healing] function for many of the victims ... It is in this sense that some form of reconciliation has already taken place.

[From *The South African Truth Commission* by K. Christie.]

**SOURCE 2B**

This source deals with the positive aspects of the TRC.

The TRC also had to deal with grievances stemming from actions of both black and white during apartheid. To encourage people to come forward, limited amnesty was offered. Amnesty does not imply forgiveness or acquittal, but simply means that for any confessed crimes the perpetrator cannot be tried later in court. Those wishing for amnesty had to testify at an open hearing.

The hearings were designed to give surviving victims the opportunity to confront those who have harmed them and to ask why; and to give perpetrators the chance to express remorse if they wished. At these hearings, many victims learned what had happened to loved ones who had disappeared or who had been found dead. Others confronted for the first time the individuals responsible.

Some people were told the location of the bodies of their loved ones and were thus able to find the remains for proper burial. Though the commission had its critics, among them relatives who were denied the chance to seek justice in the courts, it has generally been viewed as a success in encouraging the nation to move on after the horrors of the apartheid era.

[From *South Africa in the 20th Century* by P. Joyce]

SOURCE 2C

This cartoon by Zapiro depicts how the National Party (NP) denied knowledge about its involvement in the 'Dirty Tricks' campaign against ANC activists.

\*Zapiro – A well-known South African cartoonist



[From Sowetan, 9 June 1995]

THIRD FORCE

VLAKPLAAS

HIT SQUADS

POSTS DEPT  
 1980's  
 DIRTY TRICKS:  
 Involvement  
 in bombing,  
 phone tapping,  
 theft of union  
 funds, spying,  
 smear campaigns



**SOURCE 2D**

The following extract is an evaluation on the work of the TRC.

One of the greatest limitations to restoring victims' dignity – and which was largely beyond the control of the Commission – was the political tension that prevailed (existed) during its operations. This stemmed (coming from) from the reluctance of the National Party and some extreme right-wing groups to see the TRC investigating aspects of the past that might damage their political credibility. These parties accused the TRC of being a 'witch-hunt' rather than a genuine tool for national reconciliation, and frustrated the Commission's work by (bringing about) frequent legal actions against the TRC. The Commission's biggest political blunder was the tendency to (give in) to these political groupings in an attempt to keep them committed to the process.... (the) politically delicate task of the TRC worsened its relations with victims who were justifiably frustrated by the lack of proper justice that the position implied. For restorative justice to succeed, victims need to see offenders' express remorse (regret). That this was not forthcoming from the political party that governed the country under apartheid, dealt a severe blow to the process.

[From *The Truth and reconciliation Commission as a Model of Restorative Justice* by T. Maepa Pretoria]

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

*Apartheid to Democracy South Africa 1948–1994*

Christie, K. 2000, *The South African Truth Commission*

<https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/united-democratic-front-national-launch-august-20-1983>

<https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/united-democratic-front-udf>

<https://www.saha.org.za/udf/repressing-the-leadership.htm>

Maepa, T. *The Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a Model of Restorative Justice*, 2005, Pretoria.

Joyce P., *South Africa in the 20th century*

*The Sowetan*, 9 June 1995