

19+++  
/19

Julianne

Apartheid DBQ

Sept. 14 2017

## 1. Primary source Documents

Document 1 is a speech dated from 1948 - the time when apartheid was first beginning. One is led to believe that the South African House of Assembly is of white morality, as they are in favor of separation of race in order to keep their "distinctive identities." Although no quotations or a specific speaker was defined, it states their argument clearly and from one perspective - lacking retrospect and synthesized data; therefore, most likely created at the time of debate.

Document 2 is a photograph that demonstrates life in a black settlement in 1962. Solely on observation, the homes are like shacks - overpopulated, unstable, and dilapidated. Photographs illustrate past events at a particular time, providing visual proof, in this case, of poverty in the unkept black settlement.

Document 3 is spoken from Winnie Mandela, a South African activist, in 1986. First, she is a witness to being treated unfairly by her white ruler, as she is referring to a personal experience. She is explaining how she is unable to "choose a home in the residential area of her liking because the white man" determined where she lived. The document was said at the time African's had white rulers, and it is taken from Winnie's point of view that she is forced to live in Soweto based on her skin color - a first hand witness.

Document 4 is a quote from Dollie Fourie, a white South African. Just from noticing the word "white," it is evident they want to make it clear that they are white and not just a "South African." With that title comes a biased perspective. Dollie states that African's "can't think"; creating a generalization that ALL African's never worry about food, school, or their children. His message clearly states that the "African morality" will never compare to the "European morality"; therefore, African's will always be inferior to whites. The statement is unreliable, as it is one person's opinion and is biased.

## 2. Secondary sources

Document 5 provides figures that evidently show the huge disparity in wealth between the whites and the blacks. Just by observing the different percentages, it is easy to see that the majority of money is invested in white people.

The graphs are a secondary source because it is data reflecting the years 1987-88, synthesized by Zelinski, a Twentieth Century Viewpoints. It was created and calculated well-after the event.

Section 11.5  
impeccably  
well done

This is one of the most talked, respected & "well seen"

Document 6 was created in 1998, written well-after apartheid ended.

It was analysed and written by B. O'Callaghan, A History of the Twentieth Century Textbook. Since textbooks have been reviewed by a myriad of different authors and editors for accuracy, it is therefore more reliable.

It refers to the Group Areas Act law enforced in 1950 by the Nationalist government - a fact rather than stating an opinion about it.

Document 7 was an excerpt from Twentieth Century History, The World since 1900, written by Tony Howarth. Textbooks analyze, evaluate, contextualize, or synthesize evidence. The authors develop their interpretations of events based on primary sources and secondary sources written by other historians to piece together what actually happened. The document is stating that after the Bantu Education Act of 1953, African children were trained only for manual work and from 1959, Africans were forbidden to attend white universities. This statement is based on previous facts for proof rather than solely a first-hand witness explaining their side. In addition, the textbook was considered a "white book," created well-after to reflect on an event that occurred starting in 1953.

### 3. Reliability of Document 4

Given that Document 4 is a primary source, one would consider this statement biased and more unreliable, especially since it is one person's opinion. However in regards to its evidence about apartheid, I would argue it is a confirmation and explains a lot about the separation. One is able to identify the perspective of a white South African. "They can't think." Three simple words that actually make a massive, bold, and generalized statement. Although there is no evidence provided that proves African's aren't "worried about their kids," I believe

the way Dollie thinks is a source of evidence about apartheid. Back then, it wasn't just Dollie who saw African's as inferior. White people used blacks for cheap labour, and provided them with small shacks <sup>and</sup> unsanitary washrooms.

All actions begin with ideas, and hearing Dollie refer to African's in such a negative way without hesitation concludes that being separated <sup>based</sup> on color was a priority for people. Today, since the termination of apartheid, people are less likely to stand before others, creating a generalized statement that speaks critically to another race's differences. Humanity has increased in respect and acceptance by learning from past historic mistakes.

Wow,  
a thoughtful  
+ thorough  
analysis

4. Document 6 corroborates with Document 1 in the sense that apartheid will be better for society. Document 6 is pulled from a textbook considered a "white book" and although it does not give an opinion, it speaks of the Group Areas Act - one of the "most important apartheid laws." This could be interpreted as the author subconsciously choosing the white side by his word choice. If the textbook had been designed by a team of African's, I am sure they would have never referred to the Group Areas Act as an "important" apartheid law. Document 1 provides the two alternatives they're considering at the Debates of South African House of Assembly. It is evident that they chose to take the route of apartheid; their reason being to "protect the character of each race." In their eyes, it is better to send different races to their "own territory" rather than granting equality to every person - no matter their skin color. I noticed that while they argued both sides, they compared "national suicide for white race" to destruction of distinctive identity" for the non-whites. Even this comparison suggests that integration would be far worse for the whites, as suicide is <sup>such</sup> a strong, extremely negative, powerful word. Both documents refer to most of South Africa being used by the whites because they see themselves as superior and more powerful than the African's. As well, the fact that the white people call them "non-whites", as opposed to African's, concludes that the whites didn't even see them as a different race, but a lesser, unworthy version of themselves.

2  
Wow - such a thorough & thoughtful response

5. Document 7 discusses the Bantu Education Act of 1953, in which the government took control of the African schools. The curriculum was then altered so that the African children were only "trained for manual work." This implies that the government believed in using black children for cheap labour rather than properly educating them and investing in a better program for them. The fact that from 1959, African's were "not allowed to attend white universities" reiterates that the white people saw themselves as a higher, more skillful rank than the African's. With the government in control of education, Document 5's graph shows the lack of support

the blacks were receiving. In 1987-88, black students were financed 504 compared to 2 538 per white student - basically blacks were given 5x less money solely based on their darker skin.

This results in only 32% of black adults who can read and write compared to 93% of white adults. Automatically, this decreases the success rate of black children. As they are not provided with a decent education, they will always remain "lower" than the whites.

Their future is already compromised at a young age because they are receiving a poor education, less financial support, and a lower income per person. (\$4 880 white income per person vs \$1 246 per black person.) This creates a massive disadvantage for African's because they are black. The income comes from their different job opportunities and the fact that blacks are restricted to cheap labour, most unable to read or write.

2  
Splendid  
evidence  
based  
response  
replete  
w/ specific  
details

6. I would say apartheid affected every aspect of their lives, ensuring impoverishment everywhere. Truthfully, the most ongoing impact it had on them was low self-esteem issues. From being prohibited from engaging in activities with whites, to living in lower, wiped out "urban black spots," they were continuously reminded of their inferiority. Apartheid created a society of racism - a terrible and disgraceful environment that denied blacks basic human rights. African's were forced into desolate, unfertile "homelands" that were less desirable, overcrowded, and unsanitary. They lived in these shacks in isolated areas because their "white ruler had determined they live in the black ghetto of Soweto." Doc. 3. They were provided with their own benches, waterfountains, and small, unhygienic washrooms because they were forbidden to mesh with the whites. Throughout this time period, the white South African's looked down on them, making it clear that their morality was lower and stating that "they can't think." Just because their skin was darker, the whites established a generalization that they "didn't worry about their kids, if they got food, or if they're doing OK in school." <sup>Doc. 4</sup> To be honest, it was essential <sup>for</sup> African's to work extra hard, given their harsh living environment. Most families had illiterate children and often parents, as the state chose to spend 504 per black student compared to 2 538 per white student. As well, with the income per black person being 1 246 in contrast to income per white person being 14 880, the blacks <sup>were</sup> automatically obligated to work cheap labour in order to provide and support their family. Therefore, it's shocking to hear a privileged white person make <sup>Doc. 5</sup> the statement that they don't care; especially when they're doing all <sup>that</sup> they can with nonexistent support. As a result, young children with dark skin see themselves as less. There are videos created as proof, such as the doll test, where children choose the white skinned doll because it is "good," and the black is "bad." They begin to see themselves as ugly, wishing for lighter skin as a way to fit in and be seen as an equal. Their original concept of apartheid in the Debates of the South African House of Assembly was to "protect the character of each race," and keep their "distinctive identity." <sup>Doc. 1</sup> But the actions were far from those statements. The blacks were pushed around, humiliated, and given no political representation to voice their opposition.

I must  
try THAT  
your ABILITY  
TO  
synthesize  
information  
AND TO Build  
COBENT  
Argument  
w/ DETAILED  
EXAMPLES  
I S EXCEPTANCE

you appear  
ready for  
university

6/6

Simply because the National Party in 1948 classified "race" based loosely on physical appearances and lineage. In their eyes, they were undoing unacceptable integration. However, along the way, they twisted and damaged the social and political life of non-whites - to the point where the system of white minority ruling over black majority became normal. With their citizenship revoked, it finally fueled the fire to fight against white domination. In some ways, I am glad apartheid happened so that we can learn from it and never repeat it in the future. In other ways, I understand that the consequences of this event imprinted longlasting, irreparable emotional wounds on many African's. However, through past violence and anger, the African's never gave up. And I believe that strength and determination will always stay within them.

✓  
excellent  
conclusion.