

Markscheme

November 2018

History

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

This markscheme 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.

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 actions taken by Richard I against Henry II? **[3]**
- Richard joined the insurrection of the younger Henry against their father.
 - Richard participated in the alliance that was formed with Louis VII.
 - As Henry II began to reassert control, Richard commanded a force to repel him.
 - Richard rejected Henry II's offer of reconciliation.

*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 the nature of medieval leadership? **[2]**
- Royal authority was important.
 - Religion was important.
 - There could be rival contenders for leadership.

*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 revolt of Richard I and his brothers against Henry II between 1173 and 1174. [4]

Value:

- The source was written by an historian who was contextualizing the revolt as part of a chronicle.
- It is a near contemporary account of the revolt against Henry II.
- It provides information about the performance of European leaders and their alliances.

Limitations:

- It relies on the accounts of (unknown) others.
- The tone of the source is critical of the actions of the king's sons and it may be inferred from this that the author is loyal to Henry II.
- Given the broad nature of the source (it is a book on English history), the information regarding the revolt may be limited in scope and detail.

*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]. Origins, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the values and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either** the values **or the** limitations.*

3. Compare and contrast what Sources A and D reveal about the revolt against Henry II. [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.

Comparisons:

- Both sources suggest that Henry II’s reluctance to share power with his sons led to conflict.
- Both sources refer to the role of Eleanor.
- Both sources refer to the role of Louis VII.

Contrasts:

- Source D states that Louis VII encouraged the revolt against Henry II and mismanaged the risings whereas Source A suggests a more limited role for the French monarch in the rebellion.
- Source A claims Henry II’s main support was the army whereas Source D suggests support was more widespread and included the Church, great officials, and much of the population.
- Source A states that Richard agreed to make peace with his father, accepting a reduced financial settlement, whereas Source D claims Henry II increased the revenues for his sons after the rebellion.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the view that Henry II's insistence on retaining power was the main reason for the revolt of 1173 to 1174. [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 The source states that Henry II's reluctance to relinquish sovereignty to his heirs was the cause of the rebellion. Another reason for revolt was that the brothers had the support of powerful allies such as Eleanor and Louis VII.

Source B The crowns indicate they all had royal status and this could lead to political tensions. It may be inferred that Henry the Young King (Henry Junior) was marginalized.

- Source C** The source apportions great responsibility for the revolt to the French, whose advice provoked the brothers' revolt. It states that many powerful and noble men joined the ranks of the younger Henry encouraged by promises made by Louis VII.
- Source D** The source indicates that Henry's refusal to share power contributed to the revolt. However, it also refers to the influence of both Eleanor of Aquitaine and the king of France.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may support the statement by referring to the grievances caused by the reluctance of Henry II to give up the throne and/or the difficult position of the younger Henry, who was crowned king but had no real power. They may also offer material on the discontent within the Angevin Commonwealth regarding Henry II's new legislation on landholdings. Candidates may also refer to the impact of Thomas Becket's death on the royal image. Candidates may challenge the statement and focus on other factors. These may include the fact that Henry II's sons lacked financial resources and/or the difficulties faced by Geoffrey, who was unmarried and without clear right to lands. Further details on the alliances between the younger Henry and William I of Scotland, as well as with other counts, may be offered. Candidates may refer to the younger Henry's anger at some of his castles being transferred to John. Ultimately, candidates may argue that competition for power was a continuous factor in medieval politics.

Prescribed subject 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) Why, according to Source H, was Atahualpa executed? **[3]**
- To guarantee the lives of the conquistadors and their seizure of Peru.
 - Because the followers of Almagro wanted to ensure they received their share of the spoils of conquest.
 - Pizarro wanted to free himself of the responsibilities that came with Atahualpa’s imprisonment and/or resume his conquests.
 - Because Atahualpa was “proven” to be responsible for the murder of Huascar and/or it was claimed that Atahualpa had wanted to kill the Spaniards.

*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 G suggest about Francisco Pizarro’s initial attack on the Incas? **[2]**
- The Spaniards were a better equipped fighting force.
 - The Church was involved.
 - The campaign led to tumult.

*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 H for an historian studying Pizarro’s campaign against the Incas. [4]

Value:

- It is a detailed account that is based on the testimonies of witnesses.
- It suggests reasons for the execution of Atahualpa.
- It offers the perspective of someone with understanding of both Inca and Spanish culture.

Limitations:

- The information on the internal disputes among the conquistadors is limited.
- The views of the author, born to an Inca princess and a Spanish conquistador, may include emotional responses to the events.
- Given the broad nature of the book, the information about Pizarro’s campaign against the Incas may be limited.

*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]. Origins, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the values and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either** the values **or** the limitations.*

7. Compare and contrast what Sources E and F reveal about the Spanish campaign against the Incas.

[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**.*

Comparisons:

- Both sources affirm that Pizarro landed in northern Peru and headed towards Cajamarca, the seat of Inca power at the time.
- Both sources place the Spanish campaign in the context of the Inca civil war.
- Both sources claim the Spanish fought boldly.
- Both sources consider that depriving the Incas of their leader played an important role in the Spanish victory.

Contrasts:

- Source F claims the Incas were attacked by surprise and were consequently defeated whereas Source E claims Atahualpa missed an opportunity to attack the Spanish as they marched to Cajamarca.
- Source F suggests that the internal strife of the Incas was a political situation that encouraged Pizarro to capture Atahualpa whereas Source E suggests that the civil war became more relevant to the Spanish campaign once Atahualpa was a prisoner of the Spanish.

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the view that it was Inca weakness, rather than Spanish strength that led to the defeat of the Incas by Pizarro. [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 Atahualpa missed the opportunity to defeat Pizarro and his men before their arrival in Cajamarca because he did not understand Pizarro was a threat. The Incas offered little resistance after the imprisonment of Atahualpa, who further weakened the empire by ordering the execution of Huascar. The Spaniards exploited the internal strife between Atahualpa’s armies and the towns that had supported Huascar.

Source F The political instability resulting from the succession war between Atahualpa and Huascar encouraged Pizarro to march to Cajamarca. His surprise attack on Atahualpa contributed to the defeat of the Incas. With Atahualpa imprisoned, the Incas were unable to resist the Spanish advance.

Source G The painting shows Pizarro’s forces were equipped with horses and steel swords, indicating military superiority. It shows the Incas unprepared and unequipped for battle.

Source H

The source suggests that the war between Atahualpa and Huascar was the indirect cause of the fall of the Inca empire. Pizarro's decision to have Atahualpa executed for the death of Huascar left the Incas leaderless and unable to confront the Spanish successfully.

Own knowledge

Candidates may offer further details on the weapons and cavalry that made the Spanish, though numerically inferior, stronger in battle. The Spanish use of alliances with Atahualpa's enemies contributed to their victory. Candidates may offer information on the role of the Church, which believed that colonizing and converting the Inca state was a religious as well as a political aim. They may claim that the Incas misinterpreted the Spaniards when they thought they had only come for their gold and may argue that giving Pizarro and his men gold only increased their ambition. They may also argue the Spanish wanted land and that this became the driving force behind their success. Candidates may refer to Atahualpa's commanders who refused to leave Cuzco unprotected to rescue him in Cajamarca. They may discuss the role of Inca religion and prophecies that initially led the Incas to believe Pizarro and his men were emissaries of the gods. Their interpretation of some natural phenomena of the time led the Incas to believe in the arrival of the end of times.

Prescribed subject 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 J, was Japan's attitude toward Manchuria/Manchukuo and China? **[3]**
- Japan had no territorial ambition and/or recognized Manchuria/Manchukuo as an independent state.
 - Manchuria/Manchukuo needed to be saved from the ravages of China's internal disorders.
 - Manchuria/Manchukuo should be afforded the chance to develop freely and/or become an important market in the Far East.
 - China should be supported to unify and rebuild, thus fostering peace in the region.

*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 the position of Japan and the League of Nations regarding the Manchurian crisis? **[2]**
- Japan is stubbornly refusing to relinquish control of Manchuria.
 - The League, recognizing the findings of the Lytton Report, wants Japan to relinquish control of Manchuria.
 - The League is not commanding the situation.

*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 J for an historian studying Japan's response to the Lytton Report in the early 1930s. [4]

Value:

- It is a contemporary source that offers the perspective of a leading Japanese businessman of the events in Manchuria.
- The source offers information on the justifications of the Japanese for their actions in Manchuria.
- The writer is familiar with the region and is basing his views on his knowledge of it.

Limitations:

- Many Japanese people believed the Lytton Report harmed their national interests. The author is Japanese, and therefore he may have shared these views.
- As a leading businessman with significant interests in the area his view may be partial.
- The source is from 1932 when events were still unfolding, and the writer may not be aware of the ongoing developments.

*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]. Origins, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the values and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either** the values **or the** limitations.*

11. Compare and contrast what Sources I and K reveal about Japanese actions in China. [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.

Comparisons:

- Both sources maintain that Japan forcibly took over large areas of Chinese territory.
- Both sources maintain that Japan justified the military action by claiming that it was acting purely in self-defence.
- Both sources state that a new administration was established in Manchuria.
- Both sources state that Japan claimed that the Manchurian independence movement was spontaneous

Contrasts:

- While Source K states that the Japanese placed emperor Puyi as head of Manchuria, Source I states the administration of Manchuria was established by the local population.
- In Source I, Japan claims that its actions were consistent with the Covenant of the League of Nations whereas Source K did not view them as being consistent with League policy.

12. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the view that the ineffectual response of the League of Nations was the main factor in encouraging Japanese expansion 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 I The date of the Lytton Report (4 September 1932), almost a year after the Incident, shows that the League was taking a long time to take any meaningful action, which encouraged Japan to expand. As a counterclaim, candidates may argue the local population spontaneously asserted independence.

Source J The League of Nations, through the Lytton Report, underestimated the economic importance of Manchuria and misunderstood Japan’s actions. It indicates that the main factor behind Japan’s actions was Japan’s intention to rescue Manchukuo from the destruction to it caused by China’s internal disorders.

Source K The League of Nations was ineffectual and unable to stop the Guangdong army’s incursions into Chinese territory and the installation of Puyi as leader of Manchukuo. Although the League was suspicious of Japan the resolution ordering the withdrawal of Japanese troops from Manchuria was vetoed by Japan in the League Council. The Lytton Report did not recognize Japanese actions as self-defence but was unable to prevent further Japanese expansion into China.

Source L The League of Nations is shown as being ineffectual in its attempts to get Japan to relinquish its ownership of Manchuria. The League is merely shaking its finger and asking Japan politely to let go of the bone (Manchuria).

Own knowledge Evidence of the ineffectual nature of League actions could include further details about the time it took the League of Nations to finally present the Lytton Report to Japan in 1933. The League was ineffective in its attempts to impose sanctions on Japan and candidates could include details about the lengthy debates, discussions and disagreements that took place in the League between September 1931 and January 1933. Other contributory factors could include details about the impact of the Great Depression, Japanese militarism and further acts of aggression, such as the invasion of Shanghai. The League did not have a standing army and could not take immediate military action. There was also political instability in China due to the Guomindang/Chinese Communist Party civil war and Jiang Jieshi's deliberate policy of non-resistance to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. There was also a lack of support for China by the western powers – particularly the US, which feared for its own interests in the area. Mention could be made of the Tanggu Truce (1933) between China and Japan that implied a tacit Chinese acceptance of the state of Manchukuo.

Prescribed subject 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) What, according to Source M, were the reactions to the bus boycott? [3]

- Martin Luther King was immediately attacked by opponents of desegregation.
- The mayor of Montgomery joined the White Citizens' Councils and appealed for others to do the same.
- White Citizens' Council membership doubled.
- The White Citizens' Councils deployed a range of strategies to halt the boycott.

*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 struggle for civil rights in 1956? [2]

- African Americans were making headway in their challenge to racial discrimination.
- There was continued resistance to ending discrimination and/or resistance to ending discrimination was increasingly difficult.
- The struggle was developing in the South.

*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 P for an historian studying the Montgomery bus boycott (1955–1956). [4]

Value:

- It is a contemporary account of the impact of the bus boycott on one community.
- As the Lutheran minister of many of those involved in the protest, Graetz may espouse the views of those within his congregation.
- Graetz's letter to *Time* magazine demonstrates that some white people were opposed to discrimination against African Americans and/or offers information on the boycott.

Limitations:

- Graetz's sympathy with his African–American congregation's struggle against discrimination may make him an unreliable witness.
- The imagery offered by Graetz in the penultimate paragraph is emotive and may be exaggerated to achieve a purpose.
- The source is from 1955, while events were still unfolding, and Graetz may not be aware of the ongoing developments.

*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]. Origins, purpose and content should be used as supporting evidence to make relevant comments on the values and limitations. For [4] there must be at least one reference to each of them in **either** the values **or** the limitations.*

15. Compare and contrast what Sources O and P reveal about the Montgomery bus boycott. [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.

Comparisons:

- Both sources indicate the involvement of members of the Church in support of the boycott.
- Both sources indicate that there was white opposition to the boycott and/or the use of the police to intimidate the boycotters.
- Both sources indicate that the boycott was having a significant impact in Montgomery during the time in question.

Contrasts:

- Source P demonstrates that there was some white support for the bus boycott whereas Source O asserts that African Americans “could organize themselves to abolish a system that had oppressed them for decades”, which could be inferred to mean that it was an exclusively black protest.
- Source O suggests that segregation was ordained by God whereas Source P demonstrates that some religious leaders supported desegregation.
- Source O focuses on the intimidation of blacks by whites whereas Source P indicates that white anti-segregationists were also subject to intimidation.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the claim that the success of the Montgomery bus boycott represented a turning point in the struggle for African–American civil rights in the period from 1954 to 1965. [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 The source indicates the burgeoning power of the White Citizens’ Councils and refers to federal indifference towards the struggle for civil rights. This suggests that the bus boycott was not a turning point.

Source N The cartoon’s depiction of a giant African–American man beginning to break the bonds of discrimination in defiance of the puny efforts of the white supremacists to keep him held down could suggest that the Montgomery bus boycott represented a very important stage in the struggle for African–American civil rights during this period. The caption may suggest that the bus boycott was part of a pre-existing struggle, and therefore it was not necessarily a turning point.

- Source O** The source refers to the ultimate success of the bus boycott, claiming that its success represented a key moment in the civil rights struggle and inspiring African–American protesters in other southern cities. Also, this source refers to Martin Luther King Jr’s emergence in Montgomery as someone who went on to play a pivotal role as leader of the civil rights movement. However, the account of the opposition to the boycotters could suggest that there was a long way to go.
- Source P** The bus boycott inspired Graetz to take the initiative in contacting *Time* magazine and thus increased national awareness of the struggle for civil rights. It could be argued that this was evidence of a shift in how civil rights were perceived.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may provide further details on the impact of the Montgomery bus boycott to argue that the boycott represented a turning point in as far as it inspired subsequent actions such as Little Rock (1957) and the Greensboro sit-ins (1960). Candidates may also argue that the March on Washington (August 1963) and Martin Luther King’s subsequent “I have a dream ...” speech was the turning point as it led to the government’s support of civil rights legislation as seen in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Other turning points could be focused on, for example, the Mississippi Freedom Summer (1964) and the Selma Campaign (1965), which led to the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The rationale for choosing these must be given. Alternatively, it could be argued that the 1954 *Brown v Board of Education* decision was the key event in the struggle for civil rights. Candidates could suggest that subsequent events show that the Montgomery bus boycott on its own was not a turning point, and that other events could be deemed more significant.

Prescribed subject 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) Why, according to Source Q, was Habyarimana assassinated? **[3]**

- Opponents of the Arusha Accords did not accept Habyarimana’s power-sharing agreement.
- Extremists and others were concerned about losing their privilege.
- Habyarimana’s opponents believed that someone more reliable needed to be put in power.
- Some figures in the Belgian security services believed that the French were concerned about Habyarimana’s intentions.

*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 situation in Rwanda following the assassination of Habyarimana? **[2]**

- The likelihood of violence is high.
- The situation in Rwanda has an international dimension.
- Many Europeans fled Rwanda.

*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 investigating the assassination of Habyarimana. [4]

Value:

- Keane may have based his book on contemporary accounts of the assassination as he was in Rwanda in 1994.
- As an award-winning journalist, writing after the conflict, he may have been able to give a more objective view on the impact of the assassination and/or may have benefitted from a degree of hindsight.
- The content seems to attempt to offer a balanced account of the assassination and suggests various theories.

Limitations:

- Keane's account may have been influenced by his personal experience of the genocide.
- He may not have had access to Rwandan or French government sources by the time the book was published in 1996.
- The vivid title of the book, *Season of Blood*, and the tone of the content, suggest that the book is aimed at a popular audience and the language used is emotive and may tend to journalistic exaggeration.

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

19. Compare and contrast what Sources S and T reveal about the events that followed the assassination of Habyarimana in 1994.

[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**.*

Comparisons:

- Both suggest that Habyarimana’s death led to violence.
- Both suggest that the attacks were pre-planned and/or both suggest “lists” had been drawn up and were used to target individuals.
- Both suggest that UN peacekeepers had tried to protect the prime minister, and that the Belgian peacekeepers had been killed.

Contrasts:

- Source T suggests that Dallaire understood that the violence was targeted whereas Source S suggests that the international community initially construed the violence as a spontaneous popular reaction to the death of the president.
- Source S suggests that, initially, the attacks were mainly limited to Kigali whereas Source T suggests that from 7 April there were attacks on all Rwandan Tutsis.
- Source S focuses only on the attacks by Hutu extremists and/or groups whereas Source T suggests that the RPF responded to the initial violence by renewing the civil.

20. Using the sources and your own knowledge, examine the causes of conflict in Rwanda between 1990 and 1994. [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** The source indicates that the signing of the Arusha Accords was a cause of tension and conflict in Rwanda. It is termed the “death warrant” for President Habyarimana, and a trigger for the extremists, who wanted to protect their wealth and opposed the power-sharing agreement. Some may argue that the French may have been involved in causing conflict as they turned against Habyarimana.
- Source R** The source indicates that the assassination raised tensions in Rwanda and the potential for violence, as shown by the French army’s evacuation of Europeans under armed guard on 12 April.
- Source S** The source indicates that Habyarimana’s assassination served as the trigger for further conflict and set the “plans for genocide in motion”. The source implies that the international community’s inaction may have played a role in the escalation of violence because they misunderstood events in Rwanda.

Source T The source suggests that the escalating violence was co-ordinated and planned with the support of the media. The role of the RPF as a further cause of conflict is indicated as it claims RPF forces stationed in Kigali “surged out of their barracks” and “renewed the civil war against the Hutu regime”.

Own knowledge Candidates may refer to the interrelationship between the long- and short-term causes of conflict such as the colonial legacy, ethnic tensions and socio-economic factors, for example, population growth, competition for land, and the fall in global coffee prices. The development of a civil war in Rwanda after 1990 and invasion by the Rwandan Patriotic Front in October 1990 could be discussed. Tensions were heightened by the emergence of Hutu power groups, including the formation of the Interahamwe in December 1991. Hutu extremist groups were often armed by the government. Candidates may offer further information on the role of the media. The inaction of UNAMIR from October 1993, and the alleged role of the French in its backing of Hutu extremists, may be developed as a cause of conflict. Candidates may refer to the failure of the UN to respond to the “genocide cable” sent by Dallaire on 11 January 1994.
