

Markscheme

Specimen

History

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

Section 1: Military leaders

1. (a) What, according to Source C, were the factors that motivated the Mongol conquests? [3]

- Ideological motives: the expansion was motivated by the belief that it was destiny for the Mongols to rule. Another motive for expansion was the underlying “warrior culture” and ethos of the tribesmen;
- There were also economic motives for expansion, including the desire to control manufactured and agricultural goods in neighbouring areas;
- The consolidation of the leadership necessitated expansion. Expansion added legitimacy to the rule of the tribal leader.

*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 is the message conveyed by Source D? [2]

- The map highlights the huge geographic area that the Mongol empire covered, showing their ambitious expansion;
- The map shows that Mongol expansion occurred not only East into Asia, but also West into Europe and the Middle East;
- The map shows that the Silk Road ran through the centre of the Mongol Empire, highlighting the economic power of the Mongol Empire.

*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 B for an historian studying the Mongol Empire.

[4]

Value:

- The extract is from an academic book specifically on the Mongol Empire, so detailed analysis can be expected;
- The academic background of the author – it was written by a professor of history;
- The book was published in 2007, so the author was able to look at the Mongol Empire in hindsight.

Limitations:

- This is a secondary source that offers a particular/single perspective;
- Being written in 2007 it was written almost 800 years after the events it described, so it may have been more difficult to find primary source material while researching the book than it would for more recent events;
- The author may have been influenced by the image of Genghis Khan as an iconic leader, perhaps reflected in his use of language such as “astonishing” and “superb”.

*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 B and C reveal about the Mongol conquests under Genghis Khan.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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**.

Indicative content

Comparison:

- Both sources refer to the military capabilities of the tribes and their experience, and thus the success of the conquests. Source C points out the archery and riding skills of the tribesmen along with their endurance, which “made them excellent soldiers in the conquering armies”. Similarly, Source B refers to “a superb army, potentially invincible in the field in 13th-century conditions”.
- Both sources highlight the relation between expansion and the consolidation and preservation of the power of the ruler. Source C states that “expansion was also a crucial part of the role of the nomadic ruler” and Source B likewise states that “unless something decisive was done with the newly formed military machine, it would go back to its earlier state”.

Contrast:

- Source B particularly highlights the role of Genghis Khan and his individual leadership, referring to him as a “supreme ruler”. Source C highlights other factors that helped the rise of Genghis Khan, rather than focusing on his leadership.
- Source C discusses wider economic and social factors such as “the flexible nature” of the tribes and how this nature allowed for the creation of larger tribes and “absorption of foreign nomadic groups”, both of which supported the leader and gave him the power to launch the conquests. Source B in contrast focuses on the military factors.
- Source C suggests that “plain luck” was one factor in explaining the success of the Mongols conquests, whereas Source B suggests that the success was far more the result of deliberate and intentional decisions.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the role of Genghis Khan in the launch and success of the Mongol conquests.

[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: Genghis Khan identified the damage done by “endless internal warfare”. He understood the power of unity. He built an army that tried to destroy divisions rather than create/exacerbate them. He expanded the empire “quickly and efficiently”.
- Source B: Genghis Khan is referred to as the “supreme ruler”, showing his power.
- Source C: There were other reasons for the success of the Mongol conquests, including “plain luck” and the political relations within the region at the time. The success of the conquests was also helped by the “archery and riding skills” of the tribesmen.
- Source D: Shows that the empire continued successfully after Genghis Khan, as the map shows the region in 1260, showing the impact of Genghis Khan’s launch of the conquests.
- Own knowledge: Genghis Khan captured Western Xia in 1209, and in 1215 he captured the Jin capital of Zhongdu (Beijing). The name “Genghis Khan” is often interpreted as meaning “universal ruler”, showing his power.
- Own knowledge: Genghis Khan has a controversial reputation as a leader. Some emphasize the cruelty and destruction that occurred during his leadership. Others view him as an innovative leader who integrated rival tribes, improved economic stability and was tolerant of religious diversity.

Section 2: Conquest and its impact

5. (a) Why, according to Source H, did Moctezuma agree to remain a hostage of Cortés? [3]
- To try to “limit the rising anger” among his people;
 - Moctezuma thought Cortés could assist him if nearby city-states defected from the alliance with Tenochtitlán;
 - Cortés said he would depart whenever Moctezuma wished.

*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 is the message conveyed by Source G? [2]
- The encounter between the Spaniards and the Aztecs was a violent one. Supporting evidence includes the depiction of the Aztecs' fierce resistance and the dead and wounded in the painting;
 - The difference in weapons used / the superiority of the Spaniards' weapons and armours;
 - The conflict was also religious in nature. Supporting evidence includes the Aztec priest holding an infant offered in sacrifice (centre right of picture), and the Spanish priests giving the last rites to a dying Aztec (bottom left of picture).

*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 E for an historian studying the conquest of Mexico. [4]

Value:

- The source is a rich description of Aztec culture, providing insights from contemporary Aztec accounts;
- The author is an academic (an historian and anthropologist);
- The source provides suggested reasons for the conflict; for example, it describes the wealth of the Aztecs as a reason for conflict.

Limitations:

- It is based on accounts almost contemporary to the fall of Tenochtitlán, which may have been emotional responses;
- The title of the book suggests that the work aims to allow the voice of the Mexicans to be heard. It may challenge orthodox approaches to the study of the conquest of Mexico and may, as a result, be influenced by this aim.

*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 E and F reveal about the relationship between the Spaniards and the Aztecs.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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**.

Indicative content

Comparison:

- Both sources suggest that the Aztecs gave the Spaniards a warm welcome;
- Both sources describe the ceremonial aspects of Aztec culture;
- Both sources state that the Spanish depended on the Aztecs for their subsistence.

Contrast:

- Source F is critical of the way the Aztecs looked after the Spaniards by mentioning that food got worse each day, whereas Source E states that the Aztecs gave the Spaniards whatever they needed;
- Source E states the Aztecs were afraid of the Spaniards, whereas Source F indicates that it was the Spaniards who didn’t trust the Aztecs;
- Source E is more critical of the Spaniards’ attitude towards the Aztecs; Source F seems to want to justify their actions.

8. “Mutual suspicion and misunderstanding between the Aztecs and the Spaniards played a central role in the conquest of the Aztec Empire.” Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

[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 Spaniards looted the Aztec palaces showing no respect for the symbolic value of what they found. They used weapons to intimidate the Aztecs. Although the Aztecs feared them, they treated them as gods coming home and did not abandon them to hunger and thirst.
- Source F: The Aztec lords rarely came to speak with Cortés; the food got worse each day. The Aztecs outnumbered the Spaniards. Cortés betrayed the chiefs of the city and imprisoned them. The reception the Aztecs gave the Spaniards could either be interpreted as an act of intimidation or as a warm welcome.
- Source G: The painting shows the lack of understanding of the Spaniards towards the religious and cultural symbols of the Aztecs. The Spaniards are looting the Aztecs possessions. The superiority of the Spanish weaponry also played a role in the conquest of the Aztec Empire.
- Source H: Cortés felt trapped in Tenochtitlán and his men were outnumbered and anxious. Cortés betrayed his host and took him hostage. Moctezuma wrongly believed that Cortés might help him against his enemies and that he would leave when Moctezuma wished.
- Own knowledge in support of the statement: The Aztecs felt intimidated by many of the elements the Spaniards brought with them such as cannons, gunpowder, horses, attack dogs, steel blades, *etc.* The Spaniards feared the great number of Aztec soldiers; their horror at the evidence that Aztecs performed human sacrifices. The tension caused by Cortés demanding that Moctezuma destroy their idols and embrace Catholicism.
- Own knowledge of other contributing factors: further detail on the fact that the Aztecs had dominated some of their neighbours, which led to Cortés gaining them as his allies; the spread of diseases brought by the Spanish, such as smallpox, which depleted the Aztec population between 1519–21; the dispute between Cortés and Diego Velásquez; the role of Malinche (Doña Marina). Some candidates might argue that it was an excess of confidence towards the Spaniards, rather than suspicions, that brought destruction upon Tenochtitlán, referring to the legend of Quetzacoatl or the prophecies that claimed that the end of an era was coming.

Section 3: The move to global war

9. (a) What, according to Source J, were the effects for Britain of the signing of the Three Power/Tripartite Pact? [3]

- Britain was assured of continued American support, which would help to combat Japanese aggression in the Pacific;
- Ties between Britain and the US were strengthened globally;
- Britain, with US support, assisted China in its war with Japan.

*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 is the message conveyed by Source L? [2]

- Germany and Italy are already in an alliance, which Japan would now join in 1940 as it announces the creation of a new order in East Asia;
- The Pact is a military alliance as suggested by the three figures being dressed in military-style uniforms;
- Japan is expecting to benefit from the Pact. This is indicated by the bowl with Indochina written on it and the bone and steak already being enjoyed by Italy and Germany as a consequence of their aggressive foreign policies.

*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 the Three Power/Tripartite Pact (September 1940). [4]

Value:

- The source is contemporary with the events and is a statement of the official policies of the signatories. It is therefore a useful document in providing insight into the foreign policy objectives of Japan, Italy and Germany in Europe and in the Pacific in the 1940s;
- The source gives an insight into the relationship between the countries. It demonstrates the unity of the three powers in the pursuance of their mutual goals, and Article three expresses the level of cooperation of the signatories in mutual defence against third parties – aimed at the US and the USSR. The source also clearly identifies the respective spheres of influence of the signatories in Europe and Asia.

Limitations:

- The purpose of the source is to give a public declaration of mutual recognition and cooperation, and may be intended, for example, to send a warning to the US;
- The source gives useful information about the terms of the treaty, but on its own it provides a historian with limited information about the reasons behind its signing and no indication of the world reaction to the pact;
- Although the source mentions a “new order” being established in Europe and Asia it does not precisely define exactly what is explicitly meant by this expression.

*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 J and K reveal about the significance of the Three Power/Tripartite Pact.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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**.

Indicative content

Comparison:

- Both claimed that the Pact would act as a deterrent;
- Both identify Japan as being belligerent [warlike];
- Both indicate that the US is becoming more involved in Asia and the Pacific;
- Both sources indicate the importance of the role of the Anglo-American powers in Asia.

Contrast:

- Source J refers generally to already existing embargoes, whereas Source K suggests that Japanese oil supplies could be cut off in the future;
- Source K focuses more on the US involvement in Asia, whereas Source J sees the US influence as being more global.

12. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the consequences of the Three Power/Tripartite Pact for Japan, China and the US up to the end of 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: Indicates that Germany and Italy have agreed to recognize Japan's claims over territory in Asia and the establishment of a new order there. They also agree to take concerted action against any third party power not involved in either the European war or the Chinese–Japanese conflict, implying that this would either be the US or the Soviet Union.
- Source J: The US and Britain were strengthening their alliance and the US was becoming more involved in Asian-Pacific affairs, establishing itself as a global power. This meant that the US would support China in its conflict with Japan and become a clear threat to Japanese expansionist ambitions in Asia.
- Source K: It shows that the signing of the Pact did not deter the US from becoming involved in Asia. In fact the US saw Japan as aggressive and expansionist and was willing to intervene even to the extent of cutting off Japan's raw materials and oil supplies. It indicates that the US would support China against Japan and that the gamble to keep the US out of Asian affairs had failed.
- Source L: Indicates that Japan is ready and willing to join Germany and Italy in the Three Power Pact with the aim of establishing a new order in Asia. The source clearly indicates that this new order will be established by military force and that Japan expects to gain materially from it.
- Own knowledge: One immediate consequence of the signing of the Three Power Pact was that the United States slowly moved away from being a neutral country to a country preparing for war. The United States embargoed scrap metal shipments to Japan and closed the Panama Canal to Japanese shipping. In early 1941, Japan moved into southern Indochina threatening British interests there. Japan and the US took part in negotiations throughout 1941 and Japan considered withdrawal from most of China and Indochina and modifying the Three Power Pact. However, these proposals were rejected by War Minister Tojo. Responding to continuing Japanese aggression in China, the US froze Japanese assets in the US in July 1941, and on 1 August placed an embargo on oil and gasoline exports to Japan. Japan desperately needed raw materials of oil, rubber and tin and was not receiving sufficient supplies from the Dutch East Indies. In August 1941 Konoe proposed a summit with President Roosevelt to discuss the situation. However, Japanese military leaders such as Tojo again maintained that time had run out and that additional negotiations would be pointless. They urged swift military action against all American and European territories in Southeast Asia and Hawaii. In November, Japan offered to withdraw their forces from southern Indochina and not to launch any attacks in Southeast Asia if aid to China were to stop and if US sanctions against Japan were lifted. The Hull Note proposed instead that Japan should leave China and sign non-aggression pacts with Pacific powers. Japan had already prepared war plans to attack Pearl Harbor and, as a consequence of the failure of negotiations, attacked Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941.

Section 4: Rights and protest

13. (a) Why, according to Source M, was there resentment towards the civil rights workers? [3]

- They aimed to break up existing customs and social practices that had been in place for a long time;
- They were seen to be hippies and most people did not think they were good role models;
- They were arrogant because they wanted to reform the whole state and impose their beliefs on everyone.

*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 is the message conveyed by Source O? [2]

- The civil rights workers were unwelcome and seen as trespassers;
- The sheriff is shown as very large and he represents the power of the law enforcement agencies in Mississippi who menaced the civil rights workers; the status quo was hard to change due to the opposition they faced;
- The African-American people were oppressed and kept under control by the law;
- The cartoon implies criticism of the actions of the Mississippi authorities.

*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 N for an historian studying the civil rights movement in the United States.

[4]

Value:

- Because this text was not written until the 1990s it is able to take into account the results of the Freedom Summer; for example, where it refers to “the most dramatic result” of the Freedom Summer being the creation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party;
- The source is also able to place the events within the wider context of the civil rights movement in the US, which means that it can help provide insight into the significance of the Freedom Summer to the civil rights movement.

Limitations:

- Because the book was not written until the 1990s, thirty years after the events, it means that by the time it was written the political and social climate in the United States had changed and some of the goals of the civil rights movement had been achieved. This knowledge may have influenced the author’s view of the events;
- This extract is from a secondary source that offers a particular/single perspective.

*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 N and P reveal about the consequences of the Freedom Summer.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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**.

Indicative content

Comparison:

- Both sources mention that the Freedom Summer project brought many student volunteers to Mississippi;
- Both sources mention that three civil rights workers disappeared on the first day of the Freedom Summer project;
- Both sources mention that as a consequence of the disappearance of the three civil rights workers the others were terrified, but they continued to risk their lives and volunteer;
- Both comment that churches were burnt and that there was much violence against the civil rights volunteers and their African American supporters;
- Both discuss the formation of the MFDP and mention that it failed to achieve its original goal;
- Both sources imply that the Freedom Summer had long-term consequences.

Contrast:

- Source N identifies the range of community activities the civil rights volunteers set up, such as “freedom schools” for children and medical and legal help centres, whereas Source P only mentions schools;
- Source N is more positive in its assessment and mentions that 80 000 became members of the MFDP, and even though the challenge failed it had long term political repercussions, whereas Source P says that the Freedom Summer was in some ways a failure for the volunteers because they did not register as many voters as they hoped and the MFDP plans came to nothing;
- Source N discusses the impact on the civil rights movement itself and how the Freedom Summer changed its goals, whereas Source P states that the main outcome of the Freedom Summer was that it brought the plight of the African Americans in Mississippi to the nation’s attention.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the success of the Freedom Summer in furthering the cause of black civil rights in the United States.

[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 gives an indication of the opposition that the civil rights workers faced. It shows how they were resented and therefore how difficult it was for them to change the situation with regard to the African Americans in Mississippi.
- Source N is positive about the achievements of the Freedom Summer because it changed the goals of the civil rights movement. It was no longer about localized desegregation, but about full equality as American citizens and the achievement of political power by African Americans.
- Source O is a comment on the huge task that faced the civil rights movement. It illustrates the violence that they encountered, which limited the success of the project.
- Source P discusses the violence and opposition that the civil rights workers encountered and it states that the Freedom Summer was in some ways a failure for the volunteers because they did not register as many voters as they hoped and the MFDP plans came to nothing. But it also indicates the Freedom Summer changed the way the nation viewed the issue of civil rights and it laid the groundwork for future achievements.
- Own knowledge: The Freedom Summer was not an isolated incident – it built on earlier events such as the 1963 Freedom Vote. One way in which the Freedom Summer was successful in helping the progress of the civil rights movement was that it helped to gain more coverage and attention in the national media. An example of how the Freedom Summer was less successful was that it did not achieve its aim of getting large numbers of black voters registered in Mississippi.

Section 5: Conflict and intervention

17. (a) Why, according to Source R, did the UN not allow Lieutenant General Romeo Dallaire to act upon information provided by the secret informant? [3]

- He was force commander of a chapter-six peacekeeping operation, which limited his scope of action (*ie* he couldn't "conduct deterrent operations in support of UNAMIR");
- New York saw Dallaire as "unpredictable and uncontrollable", they feared his aggressive plan of action and believed Dallaire needed to be checked on;
- Many member nations were reluctant to expand UN involvement in Africa after the deaths and injuries suffered by the American Rangers in Somalia.

*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 is the message conveyed by Source T? [2]

- By suggesting that they will do nothing in memory of their role during the genocide it is suggesting that the UN did nothing during the genocide itself;
- There is nobody there, only the cleaning lady, which suggests that the representatives of the member countries have not even turned up, indicating a lack of interest and action on the part of member countries;
- It could be seen to suggest the UN has not accepted responsibility for, or learnt from, the lack of action in Rwanda as the picture suggests that even 20 years later there is still a lack of action.

*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 R for an historian studying the international community's response to the Rwandan genocide.

[4]

Value:

- The source is an extract from Lieutenant General Romeo Dallaire's memoirs, as Force Commander of UNAMIR, published in 2003. As Force Commander of UNAMIR, Dallaire is able to provide first-hand knowledge to explain the UN's lack of intervention in Rwanda in 1994. ("New York saw me as unpredictable and uncontrollable" "None of them appeared to be surprised, which led me conclude that our informant was merely confirming what they already knew");
- As this was written in 2003, Dallaire profited from analytical hindsight ("The deaths and injuries suffered by the American Rangers in Somalia must have had a huge impact on the DPKO [Department of Peacekeeping Operations] and many member nations").

Limitations:

- By criticizing the UN's lack of intervention in the Rwandan crisis in 1994 he could be trying to safeguard his reputation, after UNAMIR's failure. If Dallaire's purpose was to safeguard his reputation, this may have led him to exaggerate the UN's reluctance to intervene in the crisis. ("For the rest of the week, I made phone call after phone call to New York, arguing over the necessity of raiding the arms stores");
- Dallaire's memoirs were published nine years after the events described. Global condemnation for the lack of international intervention in Rwanda may have pushed him into a more critical evaluation of the international community's motives and actions. ("None of them appeared to be surprised, which led me conclude that our informant was merely confirming what they already knew");
- As Force Commander of UNAMIR, Dallaire's emotional proximity to the event may lead him to a biased evaluation. ("I got the feeling that New York saw me as unpredictable and uncontrollable").

*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 Q and S reveal about the “genocide fax”.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes clear and valid points of comparison and of contrast.
3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The response includes some valid points of comparison and/or of contrast, although these points may lack clarity.
1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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**.

Indicative content

Comparison:

- Both sources refer to Turatsinze’s ties to the Interhamwe-armed militia of MRND;
- Both sources imply that Turatsinze suspected a MRND plan for Tutsi extermination;
- Both sources imply that Turatsinze did not like the idea of Tutsi extermination;
- Both sources question the reliability of the information provided by Turatsinze.

Contrast:

- While Source Q suggests that Turatsinze was “a top-level trainer of the Interhamwe”; Source S describes him as an intermediary to the Interahamwe. Thus, as Source S suggests, Source Q exaggerates Turatsinze’s importance;
- While Source Q states that Turatsinze opposed the RPF, Source S questions his political loyalties: “Turatsinze operated on both sides of the political and ethnic divisions in pre-genocidal Rwanda”;
- Source S argues that Turatsinze “misled UN peacekeepers on key points”.

20. “The international community failed to effectively intervene in Rwanda because it lacked knowledge on the crisis.” Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree with this statement?

[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: As a piece of primary evidence, Source Q may empirically corroborate that a preconceived plan for the extermination of Tutsis existed before April 1994, and that UN officials had been informed of such a plan;
- Source R: In Source R, Dallaire asserts that on repeated occasions he warned the UN in New York about the need for immediate action and that he shared information provided by Turatsinze with government officials from the US, Belgium and France. Furthermore, he implies that such governments were already acquainted with the information provided;
- Source S: In questioning the reliability of Dallaire's "genocide fax", Source S supports the idea that the international community lacked reliable information on events in Rwanda. This was a result of UNAMIR's lack of a professional intelligence evaluation unit;
- Source T: Source T confirms the lack of action by the UN, confirming that the international community failed to effectively intervene.

Own knowledge:

- Domestic explanations for Belgian, French and American inaction;
 - Poor funding of UNAMIR;
 - Communication problems between UNAMIR and the DPKO;
 - Discussion on the restrictions of UNAMIR's limited mandate;
 - Discussion on the limits imposed by national sovereignty to humanitarian crisis.
-