

Markscheme

May 2023

History

Higher and Standard level

Paper 1

© International Baccalaureate Organization 2023

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

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

© Organisation du Baccalauréat International 2023

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

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

© Organización del Bachillerato Internacional, 2023

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

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

Prescribed subject 1: Military leaders

1. (a) What, according to Source A, were the consequences of the Mongol invasion of Khwarezmia? [3]

- The Mongol invasion devastated the region.
- Important cities such as Bukhara and Samarkand were sacked.
- The underground irrigation system was destroyed.
- The Mongols killed up to three quarters of the population.

*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 invasion of the region? [2]

- Mongols employed weapons such as catapults, as well as bowmen.
- Mongols besieged important urban centres, as depicted by the image of the walled city.
- Mongols faced resistance when they invaded.

*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 Mongol invasion of Khwarezmia.

[4]

Value:

- It provides a 13th century perspective from a Persian historian.
- It offers an historical record of the Muhammadan (Muslim) dynasties.
- It provides information on how the conflict began between Genghis Khan and Muhammad Shah II.

Limitations:

- Since it was written in the late 13th century, it lacks the benefit of hindsight.
- The purpose of the book is to record a general history of the Muslim dynasties and so the focus on the Mongol invasion may be limited.
- The source provides information on the reasons for the invasion but does not give any detail on the events or outcome of the invasion.

*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 B reveal about the Mongol invasion of Khwarezmia (1219-1221).

[6]

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

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

Comparison:

- Both sources suggest that the Mongol invasion had a devastating impact on the local population.
- Both sources state that the invasion led to the decline of agriculture.
- Both sources mention that the city of Samarkand was sacked.

Contrast:

- While Source B suggests that the invasion of Khwarezmia was part of the larger Mongol expansion, Source A states that Muhammad Shah II was directly responsible for the invasion.
- While Source B suggests the success of the Mongols was due to their strategy of generating fear and terror, Source A argues that their superior discipline and coordination were significant factors.
- Source A indicates that Mongol violence was the cause of depopulation whereas Source B states there were other causes such as epidemics and famines.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the factors that led to the Mongol invasion of Khwarezmia.

[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 Khwarezmian ruler Muhammad Shah II provoked Genghis Khan by killing Mongol merchants and diplomats. In response, Genghis Khan declared war and sent well-equipped and numerous forces.

Source B After conquering most of Central Asia, Genghis Khan wanted to expand further into Persia and Armenia. The source mentions that there were economic factors that led to the invasion.

- Source C** Genghis Khan was interested in keeping a continuous trade between his territories and Khwarezmia, and sent envoys to Muhammad Shah II. The plot between Muhammad and the governor of Utrar to kill Genghis Khan's envoys and seize their property led to Genghis Khan seeking revenge.
- Source D** The successful military methods of the Mongols were a factor in their ability to invade Khwarezmian cities. Their use of complex devices like catapults also contributed to their successful invasions.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may discuss that the conquest of Khwarezmia was not the original goal of Genghis Khan, who was more interested in establishing a trade route between Khwarezmia and his territories. Candidates may offer further details on the killing of the Mongol envoy, merchants and diplomats sent to Muhammad Shah II as a factor that started the war. Candidates may also consider that Muhammad had only recently taken some of the territory under his control, and he was engaged in a dispute with the caliph in Baghdad.
- Candidates may also state that Genghis Khan took advantage of the support of small local communities who were enemies of the Khwarezmian empire. They may offer further details on the resourcefulness of the army that contributed to Genghis Khan's success, such as the way in which the essential role played by the intelligence network organized by the Mongols allowed them to prepare better for their invasion of Khwarezmia.

Prescribed subject 2: Conquest and its impact

5. (a) What, according to Source E, were the problems that Moctezuma II faced with the arrival of the Spanish? [3]
- Moctezuma II did not have the support necessary to rule a diverse population.
 - He was engaged in constant warfare.
 - His rule relied on terror which led to numerous revolts.
 - When the Spaniards arrived, many indigenous people viewed them as liberators and joined the Spanish.

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

- (b) What does Source F suggest about the arrival of the Spanish in the region? [2]
- The Spanish used force.
 - Some indigenous populations fought for the Spanish.
 - There were some negotiations at Texcoco.

*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 the conflict between Moctezuma II and the Spanish. [4]

Value:

- It is a contemporary letter by Hernán Cortés about Moctezuma II.
- The source offers the official report by Cortés to the Emperor about an encounter with the Aztecs.
- The writer provides detailed information of the Cholula episode and Moctezuma's reaction.

Limitations:

- In the report written by Cortés to the Emperor, the purpose is to explain and justify his actions.
- The source is from 1520 when the conquest was still ongoing and lacks hindsight.
- The source only gives a Spanish version of events.

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

7. Compare and contrast what Sources G and H reveal about the events at Cholula.

[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**.

Comparison:

- Both sources state that Cortés was ambushed at Cholula.
- Both sources mention that Moctezuma II’s troops were involved in the attack.
- Both sources show that events in Cholula were extremely violent.

Contrast:

- Source G argues that Moctezuma had prepared plans to attack Cholula whereas Source H refers to the people of Cholula carrying out the attack without his orders.
- Source H depicts Cortés as a victim of treachery, whereas Source G argues that he was responsible for excessive slaughter.
- While Source H refers to Moctezuma as a weak leader, Source G argues that he was a strong ruler.

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the reasons why Moctezuma II was defeated by the Spanish.

[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 Moctezuma II’s methods of ruling his empire led to a lack of support when the Spanish arrived. He faced opposition to his rule and some indigenous people turned against him and joined the Spanish.

Source F The source depicts the alliance between the Spanish and indigenous populations as a way to challenge Moctezuma’s authority. The Spanish were better armed and supplied.

Source G Moctezuma's plan to ambush the Spanish failed and the Spanish retaliated with excessive force and slaughtered many Aztecs. Moctezuma's various attempts to defeat the Spanish were ultimately ineffective.

Source H An alliance of indigenous communities worked against Moctezuma. He is presented as a weak leader, who is also willing to appease and support his Spanish enemies.

Own knowledge Candidates may offer further detail on Moctezuma II's weak leadership of his empire. There were some indigenous leaders who wanted to challenge his power and were ready to commit treason—such as Ixtlilxochitl, the Texcocan dissident prince who allowed the Spanish passage to advance. The ruthlessness of Moctezuma's rule, his centralized political project and excessive demands for tribute led to deep resentment among the indigenous populations and greatly hindered support for him.

Candidates may also refer to Aztec prophecies, omens [signs] and other superstitious beliefs and how they contributed to the reaction of indigenous people to the arrival of the Spanish. This led to many indigenous people actually welcoming the Spanish as opposed to resisting them. Cortés was able to rely on military superiority and support and was able to besiege major Aztec cities such as Tenochtitlán. Candidates may also discuss the effects of diseases, brought from Europe by the Spaniards, on the indigenous population.

Prescribed subject 3: The move to global war

9. (a) What, according to Source I, were Churchill's criticisms of the British government policy of appeasement? [3]

- It was a total and absolute defeat for Britain and France.
- The government missed opportunities to slow the growth of Nazi power.
- The government did not rearm Britain in time.
- The government discredited the League of Nations.

*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 reveal about British defence spending in the 1930s? [2]

- In the early 1930s defence spending was relatively low
- *From mid 1930s spending on defence rose rapidly
- The Air Force received the largest amount of funding by 1939.

*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 appeasement.

[4]

Value:

- It is contemporary to events and is by a well-known politician.
- It aims to offer a critical overview of the policy of appeasing Hitler and the Nazis.
- The speech details the consequences for Britain of adopting the policy of appeasement.

Limitations:

- Churchill was a strong critic of appeasement and so would not be impartial.
- The speech aims to discredit the British government's policy of appeasement.
- The speech is from October 1938, when events were still unfolding.

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

11. Compare and contrast what Sources K and L reveal about the policy of appeasement.

[6]

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

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

Comparison:

- Both sources refer to the fact that Britain faced threats from Japan and Italy, as well as from Germany.
- Both sources argue that negotiations and appeasement were an alternative to war.
- Both sources state that memories of the First World War were a key factor in determining government policy.
- Both sources recognize that Britain needed to appease Hitler in order to have time to rearm.

Contrast:

- Source K argues that appeasement was a sensible strategy at the time, whereas Source L states clearly that the policy became absurd.
- While Source L maintains that the political parties were divided in their support for action, Source K argues that both public and parliamentary opinion would not support the measures against Hitler.

12. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the effectiveness of the British government’s policy of appeasement.

[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** Appeasement was a total defeat for Britain. Hitler should have been stopped earlier. The policy did not prevent Germany from rearming, nor did Britain rearm in time; it neglected British security.

- Source J** Between 1938 and 1939 appeasement was successful in buying time for Britain to build up its armed forces; military spending increased dramatically in the late 1930s.

- Source K** Britain needed two or three years to increase its armament levels to be ready for war with Hitler’s Germany. Appeasement was a sensible strategy at the time. Appeasement attempted to limit German expansion at a time when Britain was overstretched, but ultimately it was ineffective.

- Source L** Britain knew that it needed appeasement to gain time to rearm and to prepare for war, whilst trying to avoid it. But by March 1939 the policy had become ineffective with the invasion of Czechoslovakia.
- Own knowledge** Candidates may refer to the 1935 Anglo-German Naval Treaty as an act of appeasement that contributed to the breakup of the Stresa Front. The appeasement of Mussolini's actions in Abyssinia also reassured Hitler that his actions would not be challenged. He reintroduced conscription in the German army in 1935. Germany was also able to carry out the *Anschluss* with Austria in March 1938 with no effective opposition. Candidates may offer further detail on the Czech crisis and Munich Conference to show how ineffective the policy of appeasement was. Candidates may argue that Italy's realignment meant that appeasement was the only realistic policy for Britain and France. Given the effects of the Great Depression, appeasement was also effective whilst Britain and France prepared to face a possible war with both Germany and Italy. More detail on how neither France nor Britain were militarily strong enough to resist Hitler at this point might be offered. However, some may argue that the outbreak of a European war in September 1939 clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of appeasement.

Prescribed subject 4: Rights and protest

13. (a) What, according to Source M, were the signs of hope seen by Martin Luther King after the events at Little Rock? [3]

- The determined actions of the police in handling the mob and keeping events peaceful.
- The majority of white citizens did not support Governor Faubus.
- People were choosing to support public schools rather than segregation.
- Support for integration was promoted nationally as a consequence of Governor Faubus's actions.

*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 reveal about the problems facing the Little Rock School Board? [2]

- The court orders were difficult for the School Board to implement.
- The School Board was pulled in different directions by the NAACP and the segregationists.
- The Board had to uphold the law on public education.

*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 events at Little Rock in 1957.

[4]

Value:

- The interviewee is a professor of political science and so can offer his expertise on events.
- As it was a documentary on Eisenhower's administration, its purpose is to inform.
- It provides an analysis of the response of Eisenhower to the Little Rock crisis.

Limitations:

- The documentary is specifically on Eisenhower, and lacks focus on the causes and events at Little Rock.
- It is only a contemporary political perspective.
- The content of the interview seems to be very critical of Eisenhower's actions at Little Rock.

*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 O and P reveal about the role played by President Eisenhower at Little Rock.

[6]

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

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

Comparison:

- Both sources say that Eisenhower failed to take a moral stance on civil rights in relation to the crisis at Little Rock.
- Both sources suggest that upholding law and order was very important to Eisenhower.
- Both sources suggest that Eisenhower did not want rapid change in relation to civil rights.

Contrast:

- Source O claims that Eisenhower left it too late to act whereas Source P suggests that he acted decisively in Little Rock.
- Source O details Eisenhower’s reaction was to deliver a speech from the White House whereas Source P states he ordered troops to take command of the school.
- Source O suggests that Eisenhower’s leadership was lacking in relation to civil rights whereas Source P is more positive about Eisenhower’s actions.

16. Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the reasons why the crisis in Little Rock in 1957 was resolved.

[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** Martin Luther King praised the local police and their actions in maintaining the peace and stopping the crisis escalating. The actions of Governor Faubus turned the majority of the white population against segregation in schools.

- Source N** The Little Rock School Board tried to follow court orders to end segregation at Central High School, despite the challenges they faced.

- Source O** Eisenhower failed to take a moral stand on civil rights, but the source suggests that he acted impressively by returning to the White House to deliver his address to the nation, emphasizing the need to defend law and order.

Source P

The source praises Eisenhower’s actions in sending in troops to prevent “anarchy”, suggesting that the role played by the president was crucial. Eisenhower was determined to uphold the rulings of the Supreme Court and found a middle way through a difficult situation.

Own knowledge

Candidates may offer further details on how Eisenhower used federal troops to enforce integration. He had worked patiently with Governor Faubus and believed that he had reached an agreement with him that the African American students would be enrolled.

Candidates may argue that the role of the media was significant in resolving the crisis. Events unfolding in front of television cameras meant that the violence and hostility of the white population was beamed into the homes of millions, giving widespread support to Eisenhower’s actions. Candidates may further argue that the overall strategy and specific role of the NAACP was important to the success at Little Rock. They may also refer to key individuals who took on the task of selecting and mentoring the nine students, to test the ruling of the 1954 Brown case. The peaceful persistence of the students, such as Elizabeth Eckford, was a factor in resolving the crisis, as their actions led to them gaining acceptance for their right to education.

Prescribed subject 5: Conflict and intervention

17. (a) Why, according to Source Q, did the US join NATO's bombing campaign against Serbian forces?

[3]

- To protect innocent people of Kosovo.
- To prevent a wider war by defusing a dangerous situation in Europe.
- To stand united with its allies.
- To uphold its values.

*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 effects of NATO's bombing campaign?

[2]

- The bombing campaign caused death and destruction.
- It forced Kosovars to flee from their homes
- It led to Kosovars resenting NATO intervention.

*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 T for an historian studying NATO's bombing campaign against Serbian forces.

[4]

Value:

- The author is a specialist in international security studies.
- The purpose is to provide an academic review of NATO's intervention in Kosovo.
- It offers an overview of events leading up to the bombing campaign and an analysis of its success.

Limitations:

- Written in 2003, some long-term effects of the campaign may not be considered.
- The title of the article suggests that the evaluation may be one-sided.
- The author draws no clear conclusions on the outcome of the intervention.

*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 NATO’s bombing campaign against Serbian forces.

[6]

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

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

Comparison:

- Both sources suggest that a cause of the bombing campaign was the displacement of 300 000 Kosovar Albanians in 1998.
- Both sources state that Milošević and the Yugoslav delegation refused to sign the Rambouillet Accords.

Contrast:

- Source S maintains that the bombing campaign avoided a humanitarian disaster whereas Source T states that NATO was not successful in stopping the killing.
- While Source S suggests that NATO allies had common aims, Source T suggests that NATO members were not unanimous regarding the goals of the campaign.
- While Source S states that the bombing campaign ended due to terms presented by NATO, Source T indicates that such terms were presented by the EU and Russia.
- Source S argues that NATO achieved every one of its goals whereas Source T suggests that the outcome of the bombing campaign was not clear.

20. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree with the view that NATO’s bombing campaign in Kosovo was successful?

[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 lists some of the aims of NATO’s campaign, such as the protection of Kosovars against a Serbian military offensive and the preservation of regional stability. Candidates may assess if such aims were achieved successfully or not.

Source R The source suggests that NATO failed to avoid a humanitarian crisis as the effects of the campaign resulted death and destruction and gave rise to a refugee crisis.

Source S The NATO bombing campaign was successful, as it achieved all of its goals without the loss of NATO soldiers. Indeed, a humanitarian disaster was prevented as Serbian forces were forced to withdraw from Kosovo and refugees could return in safety. Furthermore, NATO could establish a stronger peacekeeping force in Kosovo.

Source T The outcome of NATO's bombing campaign was not clear. There were some failures, including the increasing exodus of Albanian refugees as well as an intensified ethnic cleansing campaign by Serbian forces during the bombing campaign. Serbia withdrew its troops in response to terms from the European Union and Russia, as opposed to NATO terms.

Own knowledge Candidates may argue that NATO's bombing campaign was a military success. They may refer to the effectiveness of the air war, which was directed at specific targets, with minimal collateral damage and with the loss of only two aircraft and no servicemen. During the campaign NATO worked to protect the lives of Kosovar Albanians through Operation Allied Harbour. Some candidates may suggest that the bombing campaign confirmed NATO's international role in a post-Cold War world.

Candidates may challenge the view by arguing that NATO did not achieve its humanitarian aims, as an estimated 10 000 people died and 1.4 million people were displaced. The bombardment gave Milošević the opportunity to implement ethnic cleansing plans that may have long been devised, including possible evidence on Operation Horseshoe. NATO intervention failed to protect the precarious political stability of countries of the region, including Albania and Macedonia. Furthermore, candidates may refer to collateral damage in the air war, which affected civilians, infrastructure and even refugee columns, and the bombing of the Chinese embassy.

End of Paper 1
