

Markscheme

May 2022

History

Higher and Standard level

Paper 1

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2022

All rights reserved. No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without the prior written permission from the IB. Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, whether fee-covered or not, is prohibited and is a criminal offense.

More information on how to request written permission in the form of a license can be obtained from <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2022

Tous droits réservés. Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite préalable de l'IB. De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, moyennant paiement ou non, est interdite et constitue une infraction pénale.

Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour obtenir une autorisation écrite sous la forme d'une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2022

Todos los derechos reservados. No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin la previa autorización por escrito del IB. Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales—, ya sea incluido en tasas o no, está prohibido y constituye un delito.

En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una autorización por escrito en forma de licencia: <https://ibo.org/become-an-ib-school/ib-publishing/licensing/applying-for-a-license/>.

Prescribed subject 1: Military leaders

For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.

1. (a) What, according to Source A, were the consequences of Richard I's arrest? **[3]**

- It was advantageous for King Philip of France.
- Philip and John came to an agreement against Richard I.
- Armies were raised against John.
- The authorities imposed a tax to pay Richard I's ransom.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[3]**.*

(b) What does Source B suggest about Richard I and John? **[2]**

- John submitted to his brother Richard I.
- A diverse group of people accepted Richard I as king.
- Their mother played a significant role in their relationship.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[2]**.*

2. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source C for an historian studying the political impact in England of Richard I's absence.

[4]

Value:

- It is a 12th century chronicle which aims to depict the history of the Plantagenets.
- As a contemporary chronicle, it is a first-hand account of Richard I's reign.
- It provides information about John's actions during Richard I's absence.

Limitations:

- Since it is based on contemporary accounts it lacks the benefit of hindsight.
- The chronicle's scope is wide and not specifically focused on the reign of Richard I.
- The information could have been exaggerated as Richard I was the ruler at the time.

*The focus of the question is on the value and limitations of the source. If **only** value **or** limitations are discussed, award a maximum of [2]. Origin, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the value and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either** the value **or** the limitations.*

3. Compare and contrast what Sources C and D reveal about the political situation in England during Richard I’s absence.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	• The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	• The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	• The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

*Apply the markbands that provide the “best fit” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

Comparison:

- Both sources mention John’s alliance with King Philip of France against Richard I.
- Both sources state that John promoted armed clashes.
- Both sources claim that the situation in England was troubled.
- Both sources state that John ended up requesting a truce.

Contrast:

- Source C states that the nobles of England stood against John, whereas Source D mentions that some of them helped John or did not get involved.
- Source C claims that John’s troops were criminals, whereas Source D states he was helped by people such as the bishop of Coventry.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the political impact in England of Richard I's absence.

[9]

Marks	Level descriptors		
	Focus	Use of sources	Own knowledge
7–9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4–6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1–3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. While it is expected that there will be coverage of **at least two** of the sources, candidates are not required to refer to all four sources in their responses.

Indicative content

Source A Richard I's arrest in Germany facilitated the alliance formed by his brother John and Philip to overthrow him. But John's attempt to take the throne in England failed due to the opposition of the clerics.

Source B Richard I is pictured as the leading political authority, imposing his power on his brother John, who was finally subject to his command. Eleanor of Aquitaine, mother of Richard I and John, was important in maintaining their relationship.

- Source C** During Richard I's absence, John disturbed the provinces of England with the help of troops of criminals, since the nobles of the kingdom opposed him. However, John's surrender of Windsor Castle suggests a reduction in political turmoil.
- Source D** Richard's captivity caused a state of panic in the government in England. Philip took advantage of the situation by allying with John and planning an invasion of Richard I's lands. But in England, John faced many obstacles since he was able to gather few people, and the need to pay Richard I's ransom added difficulties. He finally accepted a truce.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may consider that Richard I's main interest was leading the crusade, rather than planning the future of the English monarchy. This had an impact on the royal treasury as well as in the political arena since the king sold sheriffdoms, rights and lands to gather resources for the enterprise in the Middle East. Candidates may also mention the agreement between Richard I and Henry VI for his release, which encompassed the formal surrender of his kingdom to Henry VI, taking it back as a fief. Candidates may discuss Richard I's return to England and the political risks the kingdom underwent that forced Richard I to celebrate a second coronation in order to confirm his authority. Soon after, Richard I left for Normandy and never returned, leaving England under the rule of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter. Candidates may also offer information on John, who was banished and deprived of all his lands but later reconciled to Richard I, recovering some of his domains.

Prescribed subject 2: Conquest and its impact

Read sources E to H in the source booklet and answer questions 5 to 8. The sources and questions relate to case study 1: The final stages of Muslim rule in Spain — Context and motives: Political context in Iberia and Al-Andalus in the late 15th century; internal conflicts and alliances in Granada in the late 15th century.

5. (a) What, according to Source E, was the political situation in the Iberian Peninsula in the late 15th century? **[3]**

- The Iberian Peninsula lacked political unity.
- The provinces of Castile and Aragon were dominant in political and economic terms.
- The Castilian monarchy had more power than Aragon.
- Civil wars debilitated the peninsula.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[3]**.*

(b) What does Source F suggest about the Iberian Peninsula up to 1492? **[2]**

- The Peninsula was ruled by different kingdoms.
- Castile was the largest kingdom.
- Granada was surrounded by the kingdom of Castile.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[2]**.*

6. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source G for an historian studying the unification of the Iberian Peninsula.

[4]

Value:

- As a contemporary letter it is a first-hand account of the motives for the Christian conquest of the Moorish territories.
- It shows how a contemporary writer justified the need for taking action against the Moors.
- It shows the importance of religious motives as justification for the unification.

Limitations:

- As a contemporary Christian account, it may be an emotional response to the events, lacking the benefit of hindsight.
- Christian motives for attacking the Moors could have been exaggerated in order to persuade the monarchs to act.
- The source is focused only on Christian motives.

*The focus of the question is on the value and limitations of the source. If **only value or limitations** are discussed, award a maximum of [2]. Origin, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the value and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either the value or the limitations**.*

7. Compare and contrast what Sources G and H reveal about the reasons for the unification of the Iberian Peninsula.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	• The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	• The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	• The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.

Comparison:

- Both sources reveal the leading role of the Catholic monarchs in the unification process.
- Both sources consider religion as an important reason.
- Both sources suggest that unification was urgent.
- Both sources suggest that fear of the Moors rallying support from abroad encouraged the Christian monarchs to act.

Contrast:

- Source H describes the external rivalry with France as a motive for unification whereas Source G only refers to the need to address the internal threat posed by the Moors.
- Source G suggests that religion was the main motive for the unification, whereas Source H also highlights the importance of other contributing factors.

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree that the unification of the Iberian Peninsula was politically motivated? [9]

Marks	Level descriptors		
	Focus	Use of sources	Own knowledge
7-9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4-6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1-3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. While it is expected that there will be coverage of **at least two** of the sources, candidates are not required to refer to all four sources in their responses.

Indicative content

Source E The peninsula lacked political unity. There were independent kingdoms and the problems among nobles made the political situation unstable. The provinces of Castile and Aragon were dominant in political and economic terms, which may suggest why they took the lead in the unification process.

Source F Shows the political divisions of the Iberian Peninsula, emphasizing the territorial significance of the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon. It also suggests the weaker political position of Granada, surrounded by enemies.

Source G Contemporaries of the Catholic monarchs were supportive of political unification and an expansion over the Moors' territories. However, it also emphasizes the crucial role that religious reasons were to have in this process.

Source H Suggests that the attack was launched out of political necessity, even if religion had an important role in the war against Granada. There was a concern that the Moors would call the Turks to their aid. There were geopolitical reasons too, for example the rivalry with France.

Own knowledge Candidates may support the statement by referring to the competition among Christian kingdoms that led to the conquest of new lands. Candidates may also consider the internal political struggles affecting the kingdom of Granada and the problems connected to the succession to the throne, and how the vassalage to Castile had weakened its economy. Candidates may challenge the question by referring to the extent to which the struggle was inspired by a "crusade spirit" since a great stimulus to the offensive was given by the Church and the papacy. Candidates may state that Pope Eugenius IV (1431–1447) strongly encouraged the Castilian crusade, granting it the usual indulgence and forbidding all sale of foodstuffs and strategic materials to the Moors. Candidates may also consider the possibility of gaining access to the Mediterranean and controlling the Straits of Gibraltar. It could also be argued that the conquest had clear economic motives, such as the need for fertile lands and livestock, and the greed for plunder.

Prescribed subject 3: The move to global war

Read sources I to L in the source booklet and answer questions 9 to 12. The sources and questions relate to case study 1: Japanese expansion in East Asia (1931–1941) — Events: Pearl Harbor (1941).

9. (a) What, according to Source I, were the proposals made to Japan by the United States? [3]

- Conclude a multilateral non-aggression pact.
- Reach an agreement so that the territory of French Indochina would be guaranteed.
- Japan had to withdraw all military, naval, air and police forces from China and from Indochina.
- That the two governments would not support any government or regime in China other than the national Government of the Republic of China.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award [1] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3].*

(b) What does Source J suggest about the attack on Pearl Harbor? [2]

- There was some form of collaboration between Germany and Japan.
- The attack was bloody.
- It was a part of a wider global strategy.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award [1] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [2].*

10. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source I for an historian studying relations between Japan and the United States before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

[4]

Value:

- It is the official position of the United States government at the time
- It sets out the position of the United States in negotiations.
- It gives detailed information on American demands.

Limitations:

- As the note is from November 1941, there is no indication of how Japan reacted to these demands.
- Since the aim was to pressure Japan, the demands of the United States Government may not represent their actual position.
- It gives no information on preceding events that led to this proposal being issued.

*The focus of the question is on the value and limitations of the source. If **only value or limitations** are discussed, award a maximum of [2]. Origin, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the value and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either the value or the limitations**.*

11. Compare and contrast what Sources K and L reveal about why the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in December 1941.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	• The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	• The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	• The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

*Apply the markbands that provide the “best fit” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

Comparison:

- Both sources identify that the economic embargo on Japan was significant.
- Both sources indicate that the negotiations between the United States and Japan were not successful.
- Both sources indicate that the vital issue to be resolved was the withdrawal of Japanese troops from China.
- Both sources suggest the significance of weather in the planning of the attack.

Contrast:

- Source K suggests that only the Japanese were preparing for war, whereas Source L refers to American and British preparations for war.
- Source K suggests that the embargo was imposed only by the United States, whereas Source L states that economic sanctions were an international response.

12. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the reasons for the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

[9]

Marks	Level descriptors		
	Focus	Use of sources	Own knowledge
7–9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4–6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1–3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. While it is expected that there will be coverage of **at least two** of the sources, candidates are not required to refer to all four sources in their responses.

Indicative content

Source I The terms of the proposed agreement contained measures that would be completely unacceptable to the Japanese government, heightening tensions.

Source J Indicates that Japan and Germany collaborated and that they considered war as part of a wider global strategy.

- Source K** The intransigent nature of United States policy led to a failure of negotiations. United States government demands were unacceptable to the Japanese government, and this hastened Japan's military preparations.
- Source L** The decision to attack Pearl Harbor was a consequence of international economic sanctions. Difficulties in the negotiations with the United States and no clear means of settling the China Incident led to the attack. In Japanese eyes, the United States Government was not willing to negotiate. The weather also acted as a catalyst for the timing of the attack.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may discuss United States–Japanese relations prior to 1941, such as the response of the United States to the Manchurian Crisis, tensions with regard to Japan's war with China from 1937, subsequent support for the Chinese government, and the impact of the signing of the Tripartite Pact. The abandonment of the Strike North option by Japan led to a focus on the Pacific. Candidates could also discuss the rift in policy decision making within Japan, the importance of Japanese public opinion and the changing role of the military as Japan became more authoritarian in the lead up to Pearl Harbor. Candidates could also contend that the Hull Note of 26 November 1941 was a deliberate provocation, so that the United States could enter the war. However, other factors such as the weakness of the League of Nations, and in the short-term the Non-Aggression Pact with the USSR, may have encouraged Japanese expansionism.

Prescribed subject 4: Rights and protest

Read sources M to P in the source booklet and answer questions 13 to 16. The sources and questions relate to case study 2: Apartheid South Africa (1948–1964) — The role and significance of key actors/groups: Key individuals: Nelson Mandela.

13. (a) What, according to Source M, was the role of Nelson Mandela in the formation of the MK? **[3]**

- He persuaded Albert Luthuli to agree to its formation.
- He suggested the name for the new organization.
- He appointed his own staff.
- He went abroad to get help with weapons and training.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[3]***

(b) What does Source N suggest about support for Nelson Mandela? **[2]**

- Mandela's support was diverse.
- The large crowd suggests a degree of popular support.
- Mandela's supporters were optimistic about the future.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award **[1]** for each relevant point up to a maximum of **[2]***

14. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source O for an historian studying Nelson Mandela's role in the struggle against apartheid.

[4]

Value:

- Published nearly 50 years later, this source has the advantage of hindsight.
- It provides an expert legal account of the Rivonia Trial.
- The source quotes Mandela's reasons for adopting violent methods.

Limitations:

- As it was written by a law professor, it only offers a legal approach to the trial and struggle.
- The book's title suggests that it will be a sympathetic account of Mandela's role.
- The source is focused only on Mandela's trial.

*The focus of the question is on the value and limitations of the source. If **only value or limitations** are discussed, award a maximum of [2]. Origin, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the value and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either the value or the limitations**.*

15. Compare and contrast what Sources M and P reveal about Mandela’s role in the struggle against apartheid.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	• The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	• The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	• The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.

Comparison:

- Both sources show Mandela as a leading member of the ANC.
- Both sources refer to Mandela’s decision to switch to violence.
- Both sources highlight Mandela’s role in the establishment of the MK.
- Both sources refer to Mandela travelling abroad to get help from other African countries.

Contrast:

- Source M suggests that Mandela had a significant role in convincing a reluctant ANC to adopt violence, whereas Source P states that the ANC had already embraced the idea of armed struggle.
- Source M suggests that Mandela acted independently in the organization of the MK, whereas Source P states that he did so in collaboration with the Communist Party.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the significance of Nelson Mandela to the struggle against apartheid up to 1964.

[9]

Marks	Level descriptors		
	Focus	Use of sources	Own knowledge
7-9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4-6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1-3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. While it is expected that there will be coverage of **at least two** of the sources, candidates are not required to refer to all four sources in their responses.

Indicative content

Source M Mandela was significant in persuading the President of the ANC to agree to the establishment of the MK. Mandela was instrumental in naming the new organization and appointed his own staff. Mandela was sent abroad to persuade African governments to help with weapons and training.

Source N Mandela and his colleagues enlisted some multi-racial support within South Africa. The Rivonia Trial became a focus for protests against apartheid.

- Source O** Mandela was involved in planning sabotage. Due to the failure of nonviolent protest, Mandela supported embarking on violent struggle and the formation of the MK.
- Source P** Mandela worked with other individuals and groups outside of the ANC in the struggle against apartheid. Mandela and others formed the High Command of the MK.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may refer to the widespread international support that Mandela gained, especially after his speech from the dock in the Rivonia Trial. All over the world anti-apartheid organizations were set up, and another measure of Mandela's significance was the Commonwealth's vilification of the South African regime which in turn led to South Africa leaving the Commonwealth in 1961. Candidates may also mention Mandela's inclusion of South African Communist Party members in the leadership of the MK opened the way for military support from the communist bloc. Candidates may evaluate also the significance of actions by Mandela such his involvement in the Defiance Campaign. On the other hand, candidates may refer to the fact that key anti-apartheid figures were either imprisoned or exiled in the aftermath of the Treason Trials of 1956. Thus, they may argue that Mandela's methods had achieved little. Moreover, answers may refer to the fact that there were other key actors in the anti-apartheid struggle. Candidates may argue that by 1964 the South African Government had successfully repressed both the ANC and the MK, organisations in which Mandela played a leading role.

Prescribed subject 5: Conflict and intervention

Read sources Q to T in the source booklet and answer questions 17 to 20. The sources and questions relate to case study 2: Kosovo (1989–2002) — Causes of the conflict: Role and significance of Slobodan Milosevic and Ibrahim Rugova.

17. (a) What, according to Source Q, were the aims of Ibrahim Rugova’s Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK)? [3]

- To establish democracy in Kosovo.
- To attain republic status for Kosovo within the former Yugoslav Federation.
- To build an independent Kosovo.
- To defend the endangered Kosovar people.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award [1] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3].*

(b) What does Source R suggest about Ibrahim Rugova’s relationship with western powers? [2]

- Rugova was supported by Great Britain and the United States.
- Rugova was pleased to receive the support of western powers.
- Relations seem to be friendly.

*The above material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. Award [1] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [2].*

18. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source Q for an historian studying the aims and methods of Rugova's LDK.

[4]

Value:

- It offers first-hand information about the LDK's methods and aims from Rugova himself.
- It shows how Rugova justified the aims and methods of the LDK.
- It offers detailed information about the peaceful and democratic actions of the LDK.

Limitations:

- It is a sympathetic account by Rugova of the LDK's aims and methods.
- As a statement to an international court, it may omit any reference to LDK actions that contributed to the origin of conflict.
- It does not offer any information on the impact of the LDK's methods.

*The focus of the question is on the value and limitations of the source. If **only value or limitations** are discussed, award a maximum of [2]. Origin, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the value and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either the value or the limitations**.*

19. Compare and contrast what Sources S and T reveal about Ibrahim Rugova’s methods to achieve Kosovar independence.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	• The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	• The response consists of description of the content of the source(s), and/or general comments about the source(s), rather than valid points of comparison or of contrast.
0	• The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

*Apply the markbands that provide the “best fit” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**.*

Comparison:

- Both sources suggest that Rugova’s methods were nonviolent.
- Both sources suggest that Rugova aimed at internationalizing the conflict.
- Both sources refer to failures in Rugova’s international strategy.
- Both sources suggest that, in time, many Kosovo Albanians lost faith in Rugova’s methods and became radicalized.

Contrast:

- Source S suggests that Rugova’s internationalization strategy was a failure, whereas Source T points to some success, with the announcement of plans to set up the U.S. Information Center in Pristina in 1996.
- Source S suggests that the situation worsened as a result of Rugova’s failure to secure international support, whereas Source T also highlights the importance of other contributing factors.

20. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the view that Ibrahim Rugova’s methods contributed to the origin of war in Kosovo. [9]

Marks	Level descriptors		
	Focus	Use of sources	Own knowledge
7–9	The response is focused on the question.	Clear references are made to the sources, and these references are used effectively as evidence to support the analysis.	Accurate and relevant own knowledge is demonstrated. There is effective synthesis of own knowledge and source material.
4–6	The response is generally focused on the question.	References are made to the sources, and these references are used as evidence to support the analysis.	Where own knowledge is demonstrated, this lacks relevance or accuracy. There is little or no attempt to synthesize own knowledge and source material.
1–3	The response lacks focus on the question.	References to the sources are made, but at this level these references are likely to consist of descriptions of the content of the sources rather than the sources being used as evidence to support the analysis.	No own knowledge is demonstrated or, where it is demonstrated, it is inaccurate or irrelevant.
0	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.	The response does not reach a standard described by the descriptors above.

Apply the markbands that provide the “**best fit**” to the responses given by candidates and award credit **wherever it is possible to do so**. The following material is an indication of what candidates **may** elect to write about in their responses. It is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and **no set answer is required**. While it is expected that there will be coverage of **at least two** of the sources, candidates are not required to refer to all four sources in their responses.

Indicative content

Source Q Suggests Serbian responsibility for the origin of conflict as Rugova and the LDK proposed peaceful, diplomatic, and democratic methods, which sought to avoid conflict.

Source R Rugova’s methods to oppose Serbian oppression were diplomatic and nonviolent. Nonetheless, his policy of having western powers involved may be considered a cause of conflict.

- Source S** Rugova’s strategy of internationalizing the conflict failed, leading to the radicalization of Kosovo Albanians, who took arms after years of oppression.
- Source T** Although describing Rugova’s methods as nonviolent, the source suggests that Rugova’s lack of progress was responsible for the radicalization of Kosovo Albanians. Still, it also acknowledges other factors that contributed to radicalization including deteriorating economic and human rights conditions.
- Own knowledge** Candidates can argue that Rugova’s definition of the conflict as a humanitarian crisis (rather than an intra-state conflict over borders and minority rights) justified NATO intervention. Candidates may also propose that Rugova’s stubbornness and intransigence pushed former LDK members into the KLA ranks, and that a lack of progress during 1990–1998 led many in the Albanian diaspora to channel funds to the guerrilla group. Candidates can challenge the question, arguing that Rugova’s actions were not significant catalysts of war: candidates can discuss his policy of passive resistance in further detail, claiming that Rugova expected to attain independence through peaceful means. Candidates can argue that the causes for war actually lay elsewhere. They may analyse the effects of Milosevic's oppressive policies and systematization of violence, fueled by his nationalism and need to maintain power in a context of economic deterioration after the UN imposed economic sanctions. Candidates can also refer to Albania's economic breakdown; the KLA’s guerrilla campaign through 1998; or diplomatic failures at Rambouillet as significant factors that contributed to the origin of war.
-