

# Markscheme

**May 2017**

**History**

**Higher and standard level**

**Paper 1**

This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.

It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Global Centre, Cardiff.

The following are the annotations available to use when marking responses.

Annotation	Explanation	Associated shortcut
BaEv	Basic Evaluation	
	Clear Knowledge Shown	
	Incorrect point	
	Descriptive	
	Development	
	Ellipse tool	
	Evaluation	
	Excellent Point	
	Good Analysis	
GEN	Generalisation	
GP	Good Point	
	Underline tool	
	Wavy underline tool	
	Highlight tool	
	Irrelevant	
	Not Answered Question	
	Lengthy narrative	
	Not Relevant	
	On page comment tool	
	Unclear	

	Repetition	
	Seen	
	Tick Colourable	
UA	Unfinished answer	
Unsp	Assertion Unsupported	
	Vertical wavy line	
	Vague	
	Very limited	
	Well argued	
	Weak argument	

You **must** make sure you have looked at all pages. Please put the  annotation on any blank page, to indicate that you have seen it.

## Section 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 B, were the problems facing the Mongols in launching an attack against the Jin? [3]
- The Jin Emperor had sufficient manpower to assemble a large army.
  - Jin cities were well fortified.
  - The attack was logistically complex.
  - A substantial distance had to be traversed.

*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 D suggest about the Mongol battles with the Jin? [2]
- The Mongols used a range of weapons in combat.
  - The Mongols used cavalry.
  - Battles took place in difficult terrain.

*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 invasion of north China. [4]

**Value:**

- The author is a professional historian so the book is likely to have been well researched; as a specialist in Chinese and Mongolian history he is likely to have detailed knowledge of the topic.
- The source is from a book on Genghis Khan, one of the key actors in the Mongol invasion of north China.
- The source discusses, and provides information on, the actions of the Mongols and the actions of the Chinese Jin army.

**Limitations:**

- The source was written almost 800 years after the event it describes, so it may have been more difficult to find source material.
- The book is on Genghis Khan rather than specifically on the Mongol invasion of China, so the material offered on the invasion itself may be limited.
- The mention of the word “resurrection” in the title of the book, a biography, may suggest that the author has placed too much emphasis on the achievements of Genghis Khan.

*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**. 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 A and C reveal about the Jin defeats in 1211. [6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison <b>and</b> 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**.*

**Indicative content**

**Comparisons:**

- Both sources highlight that the Jin were defeated despite having strong fortifications/defences.
- Both sources comment on the army pretending to retreat in order to draw out the defenders and then to attack them.
- Both sources highlight Genghis Khan’s role in sending Jebe to attack the Jin and in leading the main section of the Mongol army.

**Contrasts:**

- Source C blames Chih-Chung for Jin defeats whereas Source A indicates that the strengths of Genghis Khan and the Mongols are the reason for the outcome.
- Source C comments on Genghis Khan “accepting the surrender” of other fortresses whereas Source A presents him as having a more active fighting role in additional attacks after Jebe’s victory.
- Source A comments on the Jin army retreating whereas Source C comments on the Jin army surrendering.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, examine the view that Jin mistakes were the main reason for Genghis Khan’s success in China. [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** Highlights the skills and tactics of Jebe, his use of the pretended retreat, which drew the Jin from well-fortified positions he could not attack. It also comments on the role of Genghis in the follow up.
- Source B** Argues that Mongol planning was essential to their success, overcoming water shortages by spreading out and their use of messengers. However, it also comments on Jin weakness, their failure to launch a surprise attack and the betrayal by the Jin envoy.
- Source C** Suggests that the timidity of the Jin emperor was to blame and that his tactics were a contributing factor as he delayed his response for too long. It also mentions the use of the pretended retreat by the Mongols.
- Source D** The picture suggests the skill of the Mongol cavalry as they deal with the harsh terrain. It also highlights the Mongols’ abilities with weapons such as swords and bows.

**Own knowledge**

Candidates may consider the fierce reputation of the Mongols, which caused some to change sides. There may be some discussion of the “alliances” that the Mongols had built up with other groups, such as the Ongud, which weakened the position of the Jin. There may be discussion of the other attacks that the Jin were facing, such as the attack on the Song in 1216 that weakened their forces. Some candidates may consider the leadership skills of Genghis or the military ability of his commanders (in addition to Jebe).

## Section 2: Conquest and its impact

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

5. (a) How, according to Source F, did the treaty of Granada affect the relationship between the Granadans and the queen and king of Castile and Aragon? **[3]**
- Muslims would become vassals.
  - Muslims would be able to retain their property.
  - The Catholic monarchs would protect Muslims from harm.
  - Muslims would be subject to taxation.

*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 H suggest about the political relations between Muslim and Christian rulers? **[2]**
- Muslim rulers were subservient to Christian rulers.
  - There was an economic aspect to the political relationship.
  - The nature of this relationship had existed for several hundred years.

*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 F for an historian studying the final years of the Muslim kingdom of Granada. [4]

**Value:**

- This is an official source that shows some of the terms of the Treaty of Granada signed in 1491 between Abu Abdallah, sultan of Granada, and Isabella and Ferdinand, Queen and King of Castile and Aragon.
- It clearly outlines the relationship between Granada, Castile and Aragon. Its purpose was to state and ensure the rights reserved to the Muslim population of Granada.
- It demonstrates the subservient position of the Muslim population in relation to the Christian queen and king.

**Limitations:**

- As the Muslims had surrendered to the Christians, the source may lack the Muslim perspective of the treaty.
- It does not outline the extent to which the terms were respected. It lacks historical hindsight.
- Because it is an official document issued by the royal family, it is not possible to determine how it was received by other sectors of society such as the Church.

*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**. 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 G reveal about the obligations of the Muslims to the Christian kings.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison <b>and</b> 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**.

**Indicative content**

**Comparisons:**

- Both sources reveal there were vassal relationships between the rulers of Granada and Castile.
- Both sources focus on the parias the Muslim rulers must pay to Christian kings and consider them counterproductive.
- Both sources mention other obligations due by Muslim rulers to Christian kings like the attendance at Christian courts and the sending of military contingents.

**Contrasts:**

- Source G indicates the payment and vassalage had a negative impact in Granada because they spoke of its inferiority regarding Castile whereas Source E ascribes the negative impact of payment and vassalage to the contradiction they posed to the principles of Islamic law.
- Source G is more focused on the problems caused by the vassalage and the payments whereas Source E mentions that the vassalage at least enabled Granada to survive.
- Source E states that the obligations led Muslims fighting against fellow Muslims, whereas Source G suggests that obligations only generated conflicts between Castile and Granada.

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, examine the contribution of financial issues to the fall of Granada. [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** Indicates that different pacts were signed (from truces to treaties of vassalage) that allowed the Kingdom of Granada to survive. It also suggests the role of other contributing factors in the fall of Granada, such as the demand for military contingents to fight against fellow Muslims.
- Source F** The source demonstrates the undermining of the kingdom of Granada as an independent state. It refers to, for example, the ongoing financial burden and the vassalage of Granadans. It also states the taxes they must pay.
- Source G** Mentions the conflicts arising by the payment of tributes. The source indicates that these payments led to a vassal relation between a Muslim ruler and a Christian king.
- Source H** Depicts the submission of Muslim rulers to Christian authorities when paying the parias and the goods delivered.

**Own knowledge**

Candidates may offer additional details on the system of parias and vassalage, which forced Muslims to collaborate with forces and money. These duties were onerous and, in the end, Muslim rulers had to levy new taxes on their own people. Strictly speaking, this policy was in contradiction with the Qur'an, according to which a Muslim had only to pay the *zakat* tax. However, Muslim states had always raised more taxes than simply the *zakat*. More important was the un-Islamic principle that Muslims should pay tribute to any ruler who was not a Muslim. Any rise in the amount of taxes was regarded as a policy out of the norm and the ruler, seen as unworthy. The rise in the parias was especially hard for the Granadan economy, since enemies surrounded the territory. They also faced an internal split (*fitna*) within the Nasrid camp: Abu al-Hasan had his capital in Malaga, while Abu Abdallah established his in Granada. The changes in the Christian context also affected Granada. The marriage between Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon resulted in the union of two powerful kingdoms with an aim of unifying the entire Iberian Peninsula. From 1483 until the capitulation of Granada they launched several campaigns to gain fortresses, combining this with a strategy of burning and destroying the lands. In the end, the isolation of Abu Abdallah, who had no support (neither internally nor from the Marinid dynasty in North Africa), led to his capitulation.

### Section 3: The move to global war

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

9. (a) What, according to Source K, were the factors contributing to tensions between Japan and the US? [3]
- The Tripartite Pact worsened relations between the US and Japan.
  - Japan demanded permission to move troops to Indochina.
  - The US oil embargo and freezing of Japanese assets increased tensions.
  - Officers in the Japanese army resolved to go to war because of the oil embargo.

*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 L suggest about Japanese expansion? [2]
- Japan was motivated by its declining oil reserves.
  - Japan had identified the Dutch East Indies as a target for accessing oil.
  - Japan was prepared to use force.

*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 K for an historian studying the tensions between the US and Japan. [4]

**Value:**

- The source was written in 1968 and therefore offers a retrospective view within a generation of the actual events.
- It offers detailed analysis of US-Japanese relations between 1938 and 1941 with focus on the reasons for the escalation of tensions.
- The purpose is to analyse in depth the growth of tensions between Japan and the US. Because it is an article written by a Japanese academic, it is likely to offer a well-informed Japanese perspective of events.

**Limitations:**

- Because it discusses a very narrow period of time, it does not consider the tensions between the US and Japan between 1931 and 1937.
- Focused on the deterrent policy, it doesn't place US-Japanese relations in the broader context of the Second World War.
- The author's nationality may have influenced his perspective of events.

*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**. 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 I and J reveal about the increasing tensions between the US and Japan.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison <b>and</b> 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**.

**Indicative content**

**Comparisons:**

- Both sources show Japan was dependent on foreign oil supplies.
- Both sources suggest that the Japanese military was prepared to go to war against the US.
- Both sources show that a diplomatic solution was unlikely, for example, because of forceful US responses such as imposing the oil embargo.

**Contrasts:**

- Source I claims that in 1941 the Japanese were still deciding between agreeing to US conditions in China or using force whereas Source J claims war might be difficult to avoid by then.
- Source I suggests Japan was acting aggressively to obtain resources whereas Source J claims it was also responding to the military preparations and strengthening of the defences of Britain and the US in the Far East.
- Source I states the Japanese diplomats and the Japanese military had opposing views as to how to address relations with the US whereas Source J does not suggest the existence of conflicting views among the Japanese authorities.

12. “Mutual fear led to increasing tensions between the US and Japan.” 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 I** The fact that Japanese diplomats were considering a partial withdrawal from China could indicate their fear of the US. Japan's plans for a pre-emptive strike against the US and its allies may be interpreted by some candidates as evidence that the Japanese did not fear to provoke war against the US. Roosevelt's decision to impose an oil embargo on Japan may be interpreted as a response to US fear of Japanese hegemony in Asia.

**Source J** The Japanese military interpreted US and British defence of their military installations as a threat to Japanese security. It also feared the strengthening of US and British military preparations if war was postponed. Japan feared the depletion of its own resources.

- Source K** The source suggests that the US did not fear Japan as Roosevelt claimed he would not be intimidated by Japan. This is supported by the reference to US citizens increasingly supporting strong action against Japan. Also, the signing of the Tripartite Pact did not deter the US. Japanese officers feared that the embargo could turn the Japanese navy into a “paper navy”. This implies it could cease to be seen as a threat by the US and its allies.
- Source L** It depicts the Japanese, ready to use military force because they were worried about the oil reserves.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may argue that the US became increasingly fearful of Japan with the invasion of Manchuria (1931) and the withdrawal of Japan from the League of Nations. Although at the time US response was limited to moral denunciation, the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937 increased fears for US national security. Additionally, the Japanese naval expansion and the sinking of the American gunboat USS Panay (1937) contributed to the escalation of tensions. Japan's intention to implement the “Southern advance” and to mobilize bombers to attack Burma, Malaya and possibly the Philippines raised alarm in the US. Also, Japan feared the increasing involvement of the US in the Sino-Japanese War, such as financial and military aid to the Guomindang (GMD) was prolonging the war and pushing the Japanese economy to the limit. Candidates may offer additional material on economic factors, such as the negative impact on Japan's economy of the US protective tariffs or Roosevelt's decision in 1939 not to renew the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation. These contributed to a negative perception of the US and to the rise of Japanese nationalism. Candidates may also argue that it was not only mutual fear that increased tensions between the US and Japan and refer to the fear of Soviet influence in China. The US began to move away from its isolationist policy more openly after 1938 and by late 1941 some perceived the war against Japan as inevitable. Candidates may also refer to the failure of diplomatic negotiations (such as the US rejection of a partial Japanese withdrawal from China; the Hull note), the rise of Japanese militarism, Japanese alliances with Germany and Italy and the influence on Japan of Nazi victories in Europe.

## Section 4: Rights and protest

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

13. (a) Why, according to Source P, was the Supreme Court's decision in Brown II (1955) a victory for white southerners but a disappointment for black leaders? **[3]**

- The Supreme Court approved gradualism.
- There were fears that desegregation may be applied inconsistently.
- It was believed by some law-makers that desegregation may be delayed for a substantial period.
- Black leaders believed that it indicated the Supreme Court's willingness to engage with the wishes of southern segregationists.

*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 the characteristics of opposition to desegregation? **[2]**

- There was peaceful opposition to desegregation.
- Some opponents of desegregation felt isolated.
- Women were involved in protests against desegregation.

*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 Brown v Board of Education (1954). [4]

**Value:**

- It is the expression of a contemporary opinion and therefore can give an insight into feelings at the time.
- To persuade people to oppose the Brown v Board of Education decision by the Supreme Court, his intention demonstrates the strength of feeling in favour of the retention of segregation.
- The source reveals the arguments deployed by a leading supporter of segregation.

**Limitations:**

- The author was a leader of the pro-segregation White Citizens' Council movement and therefore the pamphlet is intended to sway public opinion and whip up opposition to the Supreme Court's judgment.
- The extract's inclusion of emotive language suggests the need for caution in interpreting this source.
- Because the source was written shortly after the decision was taken, it cannot show its long-term impact.

*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**. 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 O reveal about attitudes to the desegregation of US schools.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison <b>and</b> 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**.

**Indicative content**

**Comparisons:**

- Both sources reveal the existence of diverse attitudes among the members of the judicial system regarding the question of desegregation of schooling in the US.
- Both sources demonstrate the existence of strong views on the issue of segregation in schools.
- Both sources claim that the proposals therein would achieve the best possible educational outcome for students in public schools.
- Both sources claim that their attitudes are derived from moral principles.

**Contrasts:**

- Source M is completely in favour of desegregation in schools whereas Source O is strongly opposed to racial mixing.
- Source M’s views are based on an assumption that whites and blacks are fundamentally equal and therefore schools should be integrated whereas Source O’s argument is based on a belief that it is unnatural and ungodly to mix the races.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the impact of the Brown v Board of Education decision on desegregation in US schools up to the end of 1957.

[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** This source seeks to justify the federal policy of desegregation by asserting the principle of “separate but equal” is wrong and unequal. However, it can provide no indication of compliance.

**Source N** This source suggests that opposition to desegregation was limited and peaceful.

**Source O** This source expresses opposition to the Supreme Court ruling. It is seeking to whip up opposition to desegregation in schools. The source shows that there was likely to be resistance to desegregation in the south.

**Source P** This source shows that the 1954 Brown v Board of Education was likely to be ineffective in the southern states because in Brown II 1955 the Supreme Court ruled that school desegregation need not be applied immediately, and it gave local judges the power to decide when it would be feasible to do so.

**Own knowledge**

By 1956 250,000 people had joined the White Citizens' Councils to demand continued segregation, and the Southern Manifesto 1956—signed by southern Congressmen—denounced the Brown ruling and asserted the right of southern states to maintain segregation in accordance with the doctrine of “separate but equal”. Southern state governments, southern judges and southern police used their powers to intimidate campaigners who sought to bring segregation to an end. The equation by segregationists of the demand for civil rights with “communism” (at a time during the Cold War of particularly acute fears of communist intentions), the association of the Brown ruling with the imposition of overweening federal power at the expense of states' rights may also be mentioned. Answers may also refer to the events at Little Rock, Arkansas in 1957.

## Section 5: Conflict and intervention

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

17. (a) How, according to Source Q, were Albanians portrayed by Serbian propaganda? [3]

- As a danger to the Serbs in Kosovo.
- Albanian men were portrayed as being violent to women.
- Albanian women were portrayed as “baby factories.”
- Albanians were portrayed as being inferior to Serbs.

*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 the perceptions some Serbian high school students had of Albanians in 1986? [2]

- Most perceptions were negative.
- Many of the attributes given aligned with stereotypes.
- Not all the suggested attributes were accepted equally by students.

*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 S for an historian studying the rise of ethnic tensions between Serbs and Kosovar Albanians during the 1990s. [4]

**Value:**

- It is a testimony from a Serb who cited hostility between Serbs and Albanians for the reason for his emigration.
- The source offers insight into Serbian perspectives on the causes of the rise of ethnic nationalism.
- In an interview with an outsider, in this case an American researcher, Bosko may have felt able to reveal his true feelings.

**Limitations:**

- As a testimony offered in 1995, his views were an immediate response to an environment of ethnic tensions and nationalist propaganda and cannot help an historian's understanding of the subsequent escalation of tensions.
- As a testimony offered by a Serb who left Kosovo, his views may be influenced by a desire to victimize Serbs.
- As a testimony offered to an American, his views may be exaggerated to attract foreign support and cannot help an historian's understanding of the subsequent escalation of ethnic tensions.

*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**. 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 relations between Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo.

[6]

Marks	Level descriptor
5–6	• The response includes clear and valid points of comparison <b>and</b> 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**.

**Comparisons:**

- Both sources suggest that Serbs felt insecure living side by side with Albanians, which contributed to Serbian emigration from Kosovo.
- Both sources suggest that Serbs may have left Kosovo in search of better opportunities.
- Both sources imply that the demographics of the Albanian population meant that the Serbs feared that they would be outnumbered.

**Contrasts:**

- Source S exclusively describes Albanian hostility to Serbs whereas Source T offers a more balanced account outlining Albanian fears.
- Source S suggests that economic problems were restricted to Serbs living in Kosovo (for example, they were never given promotions while government was buying properties for Albanians in Kosovo) whereas Source T suggests that poverty and economic crisis were generalized in Kosovo and Yugoslavia.
- Source T suggests that problems stemmed from poverty whereas Source S suggests that they also stemmed from an Albanian desire for ethnic cleansing.

20. Using the sources and your own knowledge, examine the reasons for the rise of ethnic nationalism in Kosovo during the early 1990s.

[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** Explains the rise of Serbian nationalism as promoted by political elites, in an atmosphere of political and economic insecurity.
- Source R** Suggests that longstanding ethnic stereotypes held by the Serbs may have contributed to the rise of ethnic nationalism. Thus, this source may be seen to suggest that ethnic nationalism among the Serbs was on the rise from the 1980s.
- Source S** Suggests that Albanian violence against the Serbian population living in Kosovo may have contributed to the rise of Serbian nationalism and may have allowed for the “victimization ideology” to catch on. Kosovar governmental policies and Albanian immigration into Kosovo may have encouraged the rise of Serbian nationalism.

<b>Source T</b>	Explains the rise in ethnic tensions as a consequence of economic difficulties, coupled with the Albanian population explosion in Kosovo. Suggests that ethnic violence (perpetuated by both Albanians and Serbs) contributed to the rise of mutually exclusive nationalisms.
<b>Own knowledge</b>	Candidates may discuss the impact of the 1990 constitutional reform (which abolished Kosovo's autonomy) in pushing Kosovar Albanians into a more radical national spirit. Candidates may discuss the impact of legislation passed through 1990-1992 to “Serbianize” Kosovo (restrictions over property of the land; dismissal of Albanians in the public sector, civil service and managerial jobs; purges of Albanians in the police force) in promoting Albanian nationalism within Kosovo. Candidates may also discuss the impact of the imposition of a Serbian curriculum in Kosovo's educational institutions (including the Pristina University) in promoting Serbian nationalism among Kosovo's youth and further radicalising nationalistic Kosovar Albanians. Candidates may discuss the role of the parallel educational system, funded by Rugova's government-in-exile and international donations in promoting Albanian nationalism within Kosovo. Candidates may refer to the activities of the KLA as a provocation for Serbian retaliation (in an effort to garner foreign intervention). Candidates may also discuss the impact of the Yugoslav wars on the rise of ethnic nationalism.

---