



**EXAMINATIONS COUNCIL OF SWAZILAND**  
**Junior Certificate Examination**

***CONFIDENTIAL***  
*November 2018*

**MARK SCHEME**  
**HISTORY PAPER 1**  
**{530/01}**

**MARKS: 60**

**Question 1.**

- (a) Describe the challenges that King Sobhuza 1 faced when he succeeded his father Ndvungunye. [3]**

Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks e.g King Sobhuza I became king at the height of the Mfecane; times of trouble, when there was fierce competition for land resources. He was faced with the threat of King Zwide of the Ndwandwe and later Shaka of the Zulu who were in direct competition for the said resources including human resources.

- (b) Explain the reasons why King Sobhuza 1 did not want to fight King Zwide of the Ndwandwe. [5]**

**Level 1 General answer**

e.g he did not like fighting [1]

**Level 2 Identifies reasons [2-3]**

eg He was scared of Zwide  
He loved peace

**Level 3 Explains reasons. [4-5]**

eg King Sobhuza1 had a small army compared to Zwide's strong thousands. If he resisted Zwide would have annihilated his people, rather than fight it was best to deal with Zwide by peaceful means

- (c) "King Sobhuza I was a peaceful ruler." How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument. [7]**

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions [1]**

e.g. Yes, he was/ no he was not

**Level 2 Identifies reasons. [2-3]**

**e.g.** He used marriage as a peaceful tool to solve conflicts  
he gave paid/ tribute to powerful leaders  
He was not peaceful he destroyed weaker groups

**Level 3 Explains agreement or disagreement****[4-5]**

e.g. King Sobhuza I was a peaceful ruler he loved peace and preferred marriage diplomacy to avoid conflict with Zwide of the Ndwandwe. When that strategy didn't work he left the area of conflict establishing his nation away from Zwide. He further tried to appease Shaka by giving him two of his daughters to marry and ensured that Shaka never attacked his young nation.

**Or**

King Sobhuza I was not peaceful at all. He destroyed the Maseko of Cece and other small groups and absorbed those who did not resist. He only ran away from those who had the capacity to destroy him.

**Level 4. Explains agreement and disagreement****[6-7]****Question 2.****(a) Describe two groups of people that lived in Southern Africa 3000 years ago [3]**

Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks e.g The two groups of people who lived in Southern Africa 3000years ago were the San and the Khoikhoi. The San were short about 1.5m tall and lived as hunter gatherers only while the Khoikhoi were much taller and added pastoralism to hunter-gathering.

**(b) Explain why land was important for the first inhabitants of Southern Africa.****[5]****Level 1. General answer****[1]**

e.g. they liked it

**Level 2 Identifies reasons****[2-3]**

e.g. hunting and gathering  
grazing their animals and fishing

**Level 3. Explains reasons****[4-5]**

e.g. The Khoisan groups were hunter gatherers they hunted wild animals for food and gathered wild fruits to supplement their diet. The Khoikhoi further used land for grazing their animals, cattle, sheep and goats

**(c) The economic organization of the Bantu made them to be more powerful than the Khoisan groups. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument. [7]**

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions [1]**  
e.g. Yes, it did/ no it did not

**Level 2 Identifies reasons. [2-3]**  
e.g. they had developed metal weapons  
they grew their own food  
they were more numerous  
they were politically advanced

**Level 3. Explains agreement or disagreement [4-5]**  
e.g. The Bantu grew their own food which enabled them to multiply easily because they had a reliable source of food. Their numerical strength and their ability to invent iron weapons made them to be more powerful than the Khoisan people.

**Or**

It was their political organization that made them to be strong while the Khoisan groups live in isolated small settlements the Bantu lived in large communities under the rule of kings.

**Level 4. Explains agreement and disagreement [6-7]**

### **Question 3**

**(a) Describe the Difaqane among the African societies. [3]**  
Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks  
e.g The Difaqane is a Sotho version of the Mfecane which refers to the time of trouble or crushing of smaller groups by larger ones or more powerful. These took place in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century and reached its peak in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

**(b) Explain the reasons why King Moshoeshoe I moved his group of followers from Butha Buthe to Thaba Busiu. [5]**

**Level 1. General answer [1]**  
e.g He liked it

**Level 2 Identifies reasons [2-3]**  
e.g. He was attacked by the Tlokwa  
He needed a secure mountain stronghold

Thaba Bosiu was attractive

**Level 3 Explains reasons**

**[4-5]**

e.g. After he was attacked by the Tlokwa of Sikonyela Moshoeshe realized that Butha Buthe was not safe for his people as he had suffered numerous attacks. He then moved his people to Thaba Busiu which was more secure and had vast plains which were well watered and suitable for his people.

**(c) “Moshoeshe I was a good leader who loved peace.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument.**

**[7]**

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions**

**[1]**

e.g. Yes, he was /no he was not

**Level 2 Identifies reasons.**

**[2-3]**

e.g. He listened to the advice from Mohlomi

He treated his subjects well

Gave cattle to cannibals

Welcomed refugees

**Or** he raided weaker groups off their cattle

**Level 3 Explains agreement or disagreement**

**[4-5]**

e.g. Moshoeshe I was a good leader, he guided his people safely during difficult times to the safety of Thaba Busiu. He was not a vengeful man as he forgave the cannibals even though they had eaten his father. He gave them cattle to start a normal life and stop eating other human beings.

**Or**

He was not a good leader because he raided other people's cattle and left them with nothing hence he was called Moshoeshe.

**Level 4 Explains agreement and disagreement**

**[6-7]**

**Question 4.**

**(a) What challenges faced King Bhunu when he was installed in 1894**

**[3]**

Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks e.g. White men who came looking for concessions during the time of Mbandzeni were now interfering with the administration of the country. The British and the Boers were signing agreements about the country and the country eventually fell under colonial rule.

**(b) Explain why changes brought by the Boer administration angered emaSwati [5]**

**Level 1 General answer [1]**

e.g. they were unpopular

**Level 2 Identifies reasons [2-3]**

e.g. The foreign administrators were unpopular

They introduced Hut Tax

The King became Paramount chief

**Level 3. Explains reasons [4-5]**

e.g. The Boer administrators were very unpopular. They were rude to the Swazis hence they got nicknames befitting their characters. Johannes Krogh, for example, was nicknamed Nkoseluhlaza meaning rude master. The Boers also introduced the much hated Hut Tax to finance their administration something which the Swazis hated because they had to sell their cattle or be imprisoned for evading the tax

**(c) “Living under British Administration was good for emaSwati.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument. [7]**

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions [1]**

e.g. Yes, it was good/ no it was not

**Level 2 Identifies reasons [2-3]**

e.g. Agriculture improved

Mining and manufacturing industries were introduced

Formal education was introduced

Health improved as modern hospitals were introduced

**Or**

Swazis lost land through the Land Partitions Proclamation of 1902

Swazis were forced to pay taxes

The King and chiefs lost their powers

**Level 3. Explains agreement or disagreement [4-5]**

e.g. The British administration was good for eMaswati because a lot of improvements were made economically and socially. Agriculture was modernized and mechanized resulting in high yields and the opening up of job opportunities. And so were manufacturing industries and mines.

**Or**

British administration was not good. The King lost his powers and so did the chiefs and were reduced to tax collecting agents. Most of all eMaswati lost their land forever through the Land Partitions Proclamations of 1902 which confirmed the Concessions granted by Mbandzeni to the permanent possession of whites and awarded them title deeds while condemning the poor Swazis to reserves.

**Level 4 Explains agreement and disagreement**

**[6-7]**

**Question 5.**

**(a) Describe the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act introduced in South Africa in 1949.**

**[3]**

Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks e.g. This refers to the law that forbid marriage between blacks and whites. It was passed to maintain the racial purity of the whites.

**(b) Explain why the Pass Laws were greatly hated by the Africans in South Africa.**

**[5]**

**Level 1. General answer**

**[1]**

e.g. they were not good

**Level 2 Identifies valid reasons**

**[2-3]**

e.g. they were racist

they interfered with their freedom of movement

they caused unnecessary suffering to Africans

**Level 3. Explains Reasons**

**[4-5]**

e.g. Africans suffered greatly as they could not move freely in the cities without police stopping them demanding passes in the most degrading way. If these were not in their possession they were subject to imprisonment. To make matters worse renewal of the passes took days and people could lose their jobs while queuing.

**(c) The apartheid laws were the most terrible laws ever passed against the people of South Africa. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument.** [7]

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions** [1]  
e.g. Yes, they were/ no they were not

**Level 2 Identifies reasons.** [2-3]  
e.g. they dehumanized Africans  
Africans were given inferior education  
Families were broken up  
People were uprooted from their ancestral lands  
Europeans were enriched  
They received better education  
Had access to better facilities  
**Or** They ensured races developed separately  
Racial purity was preserved

**Level 3. Explains agreement or disagreement** [4-5]  
e.g. Apartheid Laws were the most terrible laws for Africans who suffered the brunt of its effects. The pass laws made life miserable for Africans working in the towns as they could be arrested for not carrying passes even if they had them.  
**Or**  
Whites benefitted from the apartheid regime as their children received superior education and better facilities as well as assurance to good jobs

**Level 4 Explains agreement and disagreement** [6-7]

### **Question 6**

**(a) Describe the role played by Christian Missionaries in the colonisation of Central Africa** [3]

Award one mark (1) for each valid point. If a point is developed award two (2) marks e.g. Missionaries were involved in the transition to colonial rule in many African countries. They encouraged many African leaders to accept colonial rule.



**(b) Explain why some African leaders refused to accept the Christian faith in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. [5]**

**Level 1 General answer [1]**

e.g. They did not like it.

**Level 2 Identifies reasons [2-3]**

They had their own beliefs and rituals

They had many wives

They came with oppressors

**Level 3. Explains reasons [4-5]**

e.g. African leaders were reluctant to convert to Christianity because they had their own Traditional Religions with their own rituals such as rain making. They feared that the Christian God might not be able to bring rain in times of drought. Other leaders were tied to delicate marriage alliances which tied them to polygamous relationships and could not give up their wives without ruining the alliances made as conversion to Christianity required.

**(c) “Missionaries were a blessing for Africa.” How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer giving both sides of the argument. [7]**

**Level 1 General answer/ assertions [1]**

Yes, they were. No they were not

**Level 2 Identifies valid reasons. [2-3]**

e.g. They brought education

they brought schools and hospitals

they brought civilization

**Or**

they were agents of colonial rule

they undermined African traditions and cultures

they stole a lot of land

**Level 3 Explains Agreement or disagreement [4-5]**

e.g. Missionaries were a blessing to Africa because of the formal education that they introduced and the health care system which continues to benefit Africa up to this day.

**Or**

Missionaries were not different from the concessionaires who defrauded many Africans so much land such that even up to this day Missionaries own vast lands in prime areas of the country.

**Level 4 Explains agreement and disagreement**

**[6-7]**