

Markscheme

May 2019

History

Higher level and standard level

Paper 1

No part of this product may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the IB.

Additionally, the license tied with this product prohibits commercial use of any selected files or extracts from this product. Use by third parties, including but not limited to publishers, private teachers, tutoring or study services, preparatory schools, vendors operating curriculum mapping services or teacher resource digital platforms and app developers, is not permitted and is subject to the IB's prior written consent via a license. More information on how to request a license can be obtained from <http://www.ibo.org/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

Aucune partie de ce produit ne peut être reproduite sous quelque forme ni par quelque moyen que ce soit, électronique ou mécanique, y compris des systèmes de stockage et de récupération d'informations, sans l'autorisation écrite de l'IB.

De plus, la licence associée à ce produit interdit toute utilisation commerciale de tout fichier ou extrait sélectionné dans ce produit. L'utilisation par des tiers, y compris, sans toutefois s'y limiter, des éditeurs, des professeurs particuliers, des services de tutorat ou d'aide aux études, des établissements de préparation à l'enseignement supérieur, des fournisseurs de services de planification des programmes d'études, des gestionnaires de plateformes pédagogiques en ligne, et des développeurs d'applications, n'est pas autorisée et est soumise au consentement écrit préalable de l'IB par l'intermédiaire d'une licence. Pour plus d'informations sur la procédure à suivre pour demander une licence, rendez-vous à l'adresse <http://www.ibo.org/fr/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

No se podrá reproducir ninguna parte de este producto de ninguna forma ni por ningún medio electrónico o mecánico, incluidos los sistemas de almacenamiento y recuperación de información, sin que medie la autorización escrita del IB.

Además, la licencia vinculada a este producto prohíbe el uso con fines comerciales de todo archivo o fragmento seleccionado de este producto. El uso por parte de terceros —lo que incluye, a título enunciativo, editoriales, profesores particulares, servicios de apoyo académico o ayuda para el estudio, colegios preparatorios, desarrolladores de aplicaciones y entidades que presten servicios de planificación curricular u ofrezcan recursos para docentes mediante plataformas digitales— no está permitido y estará sujeto al otorgamiento previo de una licencia escrita por parte del IB. En este enlace encontrará más información sobre cómo solicitar una licencia: <http://www.ibo.org/es/contact-the-ib/media-inquiries/for-publishers/guidance-for-third-party-publishers-and-providers/how-to-apply-for-a-license>.

Prescribed subject 1: Military leaders

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

1. (a) What, according to Source A, were the consequences of the struggle between Temujin [Genghis] and Togrul? **[3]**
- Togrul was defeated in 1203.
 - Genghis seized control of Togrul's territory and people.
 - The Ongguts chose to side with Genghis Khan.
 - The Naiman were left isolated.

*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 power of Genghis Khan by 1207? **[2]**
- Genghis expanded his territorial power.
 - Genghis conquered several tribes.
 - Genghis's power had not yet reached its peak.

*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 rise to power of Genghis Khan. **[4]**

Value:

- It was written soon after the death of Genghis and is therefore virtually contemporary.
- It was probably written by an eyewitness to Genghis's rise to power.
- It provides details of Genghis's methods, for example his use of a council and/or his military strategies.

Limitations:

- As it is likely written by a fellow Borjigid, it may seek to magnify the achievements of the clan.
- The source reveals little of Genghis's actions.
- It is a general account of the Borjigids, as such information on Genghis's rise to power 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.*

3. Compare and contrast what Sources B and C reveal about Genghis Khan’s [Temujin’s] fight with the Naiman in 1204.

[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 the Naiman were a rival tribal group.
- Both sources agree that the Naiman had a numerically superior fighting force.
- Both sources reveal that the Mongols used deception as a strategy.

Contrasts:

- Source B suggests that Genghis’s attack on the Naiman was due to his ambition whereas Source C suggests that it was a response to the Naiman’s actions.
- From Source B it can be inferred that Genghis Khan alone decided to attack the Naiman whereas Source C suggests that he consulted a council that was divided on the decision to attack.
- Source C describes the role of Dodai-cherbi in developing the strategy for the battle whereas Source B suggests that Genghis planned the attack himself.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree that Genghis Khan rose to power because of his military strength? [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 Military strength was significant, as evidenced by the defeat of the Keraits, which facilitated Genghis’s expansion. However, the Naiman were defeated not because of military strength but by strategic cunning and the Onggut’s betrayal of the Naiman.

Source B Military factors may be argued to have been most significant. For example, tactics to defeat the Naiman/Merkit, as well as the surprise attack on the Keraits contributed to his rise. However, pre-existing Kerait weaknesses partially facilitated Genghis’s success against them.

Source C In addition to the military strength of Genghis, his willingness to strategize and listen to the views of his commander Dodai-cherbi facilitated his victory over the Naiman.

Source D It is evident that Genghis Khan expanded the empire substantially. Initially this was done by taking the lands of neighbouring tribes but after 1207, the expansion became more ambitious and led to the seizure of lands from dynasties, khanates and empires that were further afield. Candidates may infer from this that Genghis Khan's military abilities increased as he became more experienced.

Own knowledge When discussing the importance of military factors, the significance of the defeat of Togrul may be further developed. There may also be coverage of the significance of the defeat of the Tatars in 1202.

Other factors candidates consider may include the possible betrayal of Jamuka, the Mongol belief that a great leader would emerge at the end of the 11th/beginning of the 12th century and the willingness to support Genghis as he appeared to fulfil this role.

Also, the personality of Genghis and his reputation as a just and generous ruler may be considered. Events before 1200 may be referred to, as Genghis had already been made a khan. He was also able to win support from those who questioned the traditional tribal hierarchy or disliked the claims of clan.

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) What, according to Source F, were the consequences for the Moors of the war and conquest of Granada? **[3]**
- The Moors lost fortresses and weapons.
 - The Moors kept their religion, properties and other privileges.
 - Important Moorish citizens became hostages of the Christians.
 - The Moors lost the city of Granada.

*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 the conquest of Granada? **[2]**
- The conquest allowed for the expansion of Christianity.
 - The conquest involved a diverse group of people.
 - The monarchs played a leading role.

*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 Christian war against Granada. **[4]**

Value:

- It is a first-hand account of the Christian siege and conquering of Granada.
- It was written to provide an official record of events.
- It outlines the performance of the Christians against the Muslims and reveals the problems facing the people of Granada.

Limitations:

- It is a Christian perspective on the events in Granada.
- An official chronicle, it may offer a sympathetic account of the event.
- It is a chronicle of the Castilian kings and may not offer an in-depth account of the war against Granada.

*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 H reveal about the Christian war against Granada? [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 religion played a role in the war.
- Both sources state that there were economic motives to go to war.

Contrasts:

- Source E states that raids in search of booty enriched both sides (Christians and Muslims) whereas Source H focuses only on the benefits obtained by the Christians.
- Source E suggests that Christians and Muslims were enslaved as a consequence of the war whereas Source H considers the possibility of conversion to retain social standing and worth.
- Source E focuses on the struggle between Christian and Muslim societies whereas Source H suggests that the war led to internal rivalries between Old Christians and converted Jews and Muslims.
- Source E focuses on the attempts of rulers to bolster their wealth whereas Source H refers to the attempts of a new and ambitious class who wish to increase their own fortunes by war.

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree that the fall of Granada was caused by internal weaknesses in 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** Focuses on other motivations, discussing the political and economic significance of Granada, which suggests that there were strong motivations for the Christians to expand their interests into the region.
- Source F** Describes the internal difficulties faced by the king and the population of Granada who, after a long siege and without supplies, surrendered the city to the Christians. It suggests there were riots and different opinions within the Muslim side because of the king’s decision to capitulate.
- Source G** Suggests that there were weaknesses within Muslim society as there are Moors present in the Spaniards’ camp. However, it also shows that there were diverse elements of society, for example, religious and military groups, who were interested in the fall of Granada.
- Source H** States that the Castilian expansion over the south attracted aggressive elements from Christian society in search of wealth and prestige. It also considers that the desertion from Islam of former leaders increased the difficulties faced by Muslims.

Own knowledge

Considering the situation in Granada, candidates may offer further analysis on the internal struggles affecting the kingdom, for example the fight between Abu Abdallah and al-Zagal, the struggle for the succession to the throne, and the vassalage to Castile that weakened its economy. Candidates may also refer to the complex relationship between Granada and African rulers that made it difficult for Abu Abdallah to obtain military support.

To challenge the question, other factors may be considered, such as the importance of the Catholic kings' policies in achieving a united front against the Muslim rulers. Candidates may also consider the contributions of troops, funds, loans and artillery made by Castile and Aragon for the war, and the continuous seasonal campaigns that, between 1482 and 1492, allowed for the conquest of Ronda, Malaga, Baza and Almeria. Candidates may also discuss the pillaging carried out in frontier lands that debilitated Granada and reduced its supplies.

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 I, were the conclusions reported to the British government regarding the March 1935 meeting in Berlin? **[3]**
- Greater agreement with Germany had not been achieved.
 - Anglo-German relations were more complex and difficult than they seemed.
 - Germany was grateful for Britain's loyalty.
 - Cooperation with Germany was the best course 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 **[3]**.*

- (b) What does Source J suggest about Anglo-German relations in 1935? **[2]**
- Relations seem to be friendly.
 - Hitler is enthusiastic and/or in control.
 - Simon has reservations about allowing German rearmament.

*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 international response to German aggression. **[4]**

Value:

- It is an official record of the meeting, produced to inform the British Cabinet.
- It offers first-hand information about the discussions between British and German authorities during the meeting.
- It reveals that the British government was disappointed about the limited progress of negotiations with Germany.

Limitations:

- Focused on the 1935 meeting, it offers limited information on how Britain planned to respond to Germany's policy in the future.
- It is centred exclusively on Anglo-German relations.
- It offers only a British perspective on the events at the meeting.

*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 K and L reveal about the attitudes towards German foreign policy under Hitler. [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 state that Germany approached rearmament with some level of international consent.
- Both sources state that Britain was interested in reaching a naval agreement with Germany.
- Both sources consider that attitudes led to German foreign policy being successful / challenging Versailles.
- Both suggest a united response did not last and/or was weak.

Contrasts:

- Source K states that Britain and France accepted German rearmament whereas Source L states that Britain’s initial reaction was of displeasure.
- Source K suggests that the international response in 1935 was cohesive whereas Source L mentions the negative impact of German foreign policy on Anglo-French relations.

12. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the effectiveness of the international response to German aggression between 1933 and 1938.

[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 Although Anglo-German negotiations were held, agreement was limited since issues were complex. Hitler states he had received British support in some foreign policy issues, which indicates an ambiguous British reaction to German aggression.

Source J The British response to German rearmament was hesitant.

Source K Conciliatory approaches to Hitler contributed to further acts of aggression. The Stresa Front was a short-lived attempt to contain Hitler that ends with Britain’s decision to enter the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. The reaction of Italy, France and Britain towards German foreign policy is seen as “meek”.

Source L The deterioration of Anglo-French relations is attributed to Britain’s response to German aggression. The signing of the Anglo-German Naval Agreement launched German naval expansion.

Own knowledge Candidates may discuss the failure of British negotiations to return Germany to the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference and the international response to Germany's reintroduction of conscription, rearmament and the development of the Luftwaffe. They may offer further analysis on how the Anglo- German Naval Agreement, by allowing Germany to break the Treaty of Versailles on the rearmament question, encouraged Hitler to further challenge it. They may offer further details on the international response to events in Austria in 1934 and argue there was some initial attempt to check German expansion at the time. Candidates may assess the impact of the collapse of Stresa and the changing nature of relations between Italy and Germany to assess their effects on German foreign policy up to 1938. They may also assess the effects of the lack of international response to the invasion of the Rhineland (1936). They may discuss the role of international powers in the Anschluss (1938), the Czech crisis leading to the Munich Conference and the occupation of the Sudetenland (1938) to, for example, gauge the effectiveness of the policy of Appeasement up to 1938.

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) Why, according to Source M, did Robert Sobukwe oppose working against apartheid with European (white) people? **[3]**

- The Europeans were a foreign and/or minority group in control.
- The Europeans exploited Africans and/or took their land.
- Africans should organize themselves.
- Multi-racialism would facilitate European “prejudice and arrogance” and/or Europeans perceived Africans as “backward and savage”.

*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 group of opponents to the government’s apartheid policy? **[2]**

- It is a large group.
- The group is diverse.
- The group does not appear to be fearful or intimidated.

*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 the anti-apartheid movement?

[4]

Value:

- The source was written by someone who had lived in South Africa and who had direct experience of working with the anti-apartheid movement.
- The source explains Bernstein’s role in the struggle against apartheid and fosters an understanding of how the anti-apartheid movement operated.
- This source outlines the nature and/or challenges of the anti-apartheid struggle.
- Written in 2002, the source can examine Bernstein’s role in a broader context.

Limitations:

- Sampson’s support for the anti-apartheid movement may affect his views.
- As an obituary, the source may provide a sympathetic portrait of Bernstein and/or may overemphasize Bernstein’s contribution.

*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 anti-apartheid movement in the 1950s.

[6]

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

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

Comparisons:

- Both sources recognize the important role of Lionel Bernstein.
- Both sources refer to multi-racial support.
- Both sources indicate that some black leaders welcomed co-operation with non-Africans in the struggle against apartheid.
- Both sources recognize the important role of white supporters in drafting the Freedom Charter.

Contrasts:

- Source O gives the impression of untroubled co-operation between white revolutionaries and the black liberation movement whereas Source P indicates that some black leaders resented and opposed such multi-racialism.
- Source O suggests Bernstein’s role fostered democracy whereas Source P views his role as controlling and manipulative.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree that, during the 1950s, the struggle against apartheid represented a clash between black and white South Africans. [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 There was clear hostility towards any white participation in the anti-apartheid struggle. The source identifies white South Africans as enemies of the black people. Thus, Sobukwe is totally opposed to any cooperation with the whites whom he regards as responsible for the doctrine of white supremacy.

Source N The number of white faces in the photograph suggests that it is too simplistic to see the struggle against apartheid as a clash between black and white South Africans.

Source O Some white revolutionaries played a central role in the anti-apartheid struggle. This source, in particular, emphasizes the contribution of Lionel Bernstein. For example, his crucial role in drafting the ANC Freedom Charter, his co-operation with black leaders, and his resignation from a well-paid professional career so as to devote himself fully to the fight to end apartheid.

Source P

While some black members of the ANC Youth League saw no place for whites or coloureds or Indians in the anti-apartheid struggle, others, like Mandela, valued co-operation with white South Africans. Consequently, opposition to apartheid was multi-racial. Further, the source refers to the contribution of a group of white left-wingers, including Lionel Bernstein, to the writing of the Freedom Charter.

Own knowledge

Candidates may discuss the role of significant non-black individuals, such as Father Trevor Huddleston, an English priest who opposed the Group Areas Act, 1950 and later published the book “Naught for Your Comfort”, which told of his experiences in Sophiatown. This book did much to encourage anti-apartheid activism in Britain. Candidates may also discuss the role of Yusuf Dadoo, an Indian participant in the anti-apartheid struggle. Some white women also played an important role; in 1955, a group of white women founded the Black Sash organization to fight against the South African government’s plans to withdraw voting rights from coloureds. In 1956 the Federation of South African Women held a huge demonstration in Pretoria against apartheid in general and against the Pass Laws in particular. The president of this organization was a black woman Lilian Ngoyi, and its secretary was a white woman Helen Joseph.

On the other hand, in 1959 the Pan-African Congress led by Robert Sobukwe broke away from the ANC partly because it objected to the ANC’s multi-racial composition.

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, did the Hutu masses respond to Hutu propaganda? **[3]**
- The Hutu masses feared that the RPF would return power to the Tutsis.
 - Hutu farmers were afraid of losing their land to the Tutsis if the RPF prevailed.
 - Radios spread a message of fear across Rwanda.
 - Hutus feared the return of feudalism and/or increased oppression.

*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 T suggest about the role of radio in the Rwandan genocide? **[2]**
- Radio was an important means of communication.
 - Radio broadcasts reinforced ethnic hatred and/or incited murder.
 - Radio broadcasts influenced young people.

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

18. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source S for an historian studying the role of the media in the Rwandan genocide. **[4]**

Value:

- The source is an academic essay and/or the author is an anthropologist.
- Produced in 2007, the source is the result of an interview with a confessed perpetrator.
- The source offers a first-hand account of the role of the radio in inciting the genocide.

Limitations:

- The information provided by the perpetrator is not always consistent and/or detailed.
- The perpetrator is trying to justify his actions.
- The source provides only a single person's perspective on the role of the radio.

*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 R and S reveal about the role of radio in inciting genocide. [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 reveal that radio transmitted messages of violence.
- Both suggest that radio was a means to communicate to the masses.

Contrasts:

- Source R argues that radio called for violence whereas the perpetrator in Source S states that radio merely reported killings.
- Source R suggests that the masses responded to radio callings for Tutsi extermination whereas Source S proposes that mass involvement in genocide also resulted from submission to soldiers’ authority.
- Source R claims that radio had a broad reach in Rwanda whereas the perpetrator in Source S first claims that peasants did not own radios.
- Source S suggests the role of the leadership was important whereas Source R highlights the fear of armed insurrection in inciting genocide.

20. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the role of the media in the Rwandan genocide.

[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 RTLM had a role in inciting violence against Tutsis, which promoted fear of a return of feudalism and oppression for the Hutus. Radio was able to reach peasants across Rwanda. Candidates may argue that illiteracy contributed to the effectiveness of the media message.

Source R Radio was a mass communication tool that was used to promote ethnic stereotyping and incite killings during the genocide. Radio was also the medium with the broadest reach in Rwanda.

Source S The author implies that radio had a significant role in inducing ordinary Rwandans into genocidal action. The perpetrator denies that masses could have been mobilized by messages proposed by media, and instead suggests that ordinary Hutu Rwandans were bound to follow orders that came from the leadership.

- Source T** Radio broadcasts incited violence against the Tutsis. However, whether the message transmitted was carried out cannot be inferred from the source.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may discuss the contribution of long term factors, for example the role of the colonial legacy in inspiring ethnic divisions and rivalries; demographic growth leading to competition for resources and other economic reasons; unequal opportunities for social mobility and illiteracy. Candidates may also refer to further reinforcement and manipulation of ethnic divisions by Hutu administrations, including the drafting of the Hutu Ten Commandments and the issuing of identity cards. The effects of the Rwandan Civil War could also be considered, including the formation of the RPF. Finally, candidates could refer to the use of other strategies that helped implement the genocide, including the effectiveness of the Interahamwe in organizing Rwandan Hutus; or the role of other media sources, for example Kangura magazine and Radio Rwanda.
-