
HISTORY**9389/42**

Paper 4 Depth Study

October/November 2017**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
Level 5	<p>Responses show a very good understanding of the question and contain a relevant, focused and balanced argument, fully supported by appropriate factual material and based on a consistently analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses may be expected to be analytical, focused and balanced throughout. The candidate will be in full control of the argument and will reach a supported judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might typically be analytical, consistent and balanced but the argument might not be fully convincing.</p>	25–30
Level 4	<p>Responses show a good understanding of the question and contain a relevant argument based on a largely analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses are likely to be analytical, balanced and effectively supported. There may be some attempt to reach a judgement but this may be partial or unsupported.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain detailed and accurate factual material with some focused analysis but the argument is inconsistent or unbalanced.</p>	19–24
Level 3	<p>Responses show understanding of the question and contain appropriate factual material. The material may lack depth. Some analytical points may be made but these may not be highly developed or consistently supported.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses contain detailed and accurate factual material. However, attempts to argue relevantly are implicit or confined to introductions or conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical approach which contains some supporting material.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might offer narrative or description relating to the topic but are less likely to address the terms of the question.</p>	13–18
Level 2	<p>Responses show some understanding of the demands of the question. They may be descriptive with few links to the question or may be analytical with limited relevant factual support.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses might contain relevant commentaries which lack adequate factual support. The responses may contain some unsupported assertions.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain some information which is relevant to the topic but may only offer partial coverage.</p>	7–12

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
Level 1	<p>Responses show limited understanding of the question. They may contain some description which is linked to the topic or only address part of the question.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses show some awareness of relevant material but this may be presented as a list.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, answers may provide a little relevant material but are likely to be characterised by irrelevance.</p>	1–6
Level 0	No relevant creditworthy content.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Assess Trotsky's contribution to the establishment of the Bolshevik regime in Russia in the period from 1918 to 1924.</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>It could well be argued that without Trotsky there would have been no Bolshevik rule in Russia by 1924; his contribution to its still being there was in many ways as important as Lenin's. While the focus should be on events after January 1918, credit can be given for mention of his vital role in the events of 1917. Would the October Revolution have happened without his work? Were the Red Guards not critical?</p> <p>He gave essential support to Lenin when dealing with the Constituent Assembly issue in 1918 and there is ample evidence of his important co-operation with Lenin over the various decrees – such as the Decree on Land. He was a key player on the Central Committee, both as an originator of ideas and in ensuring the execution of policy. He assisted in taking the broad ideas of Lenin and making them into a practical policy. His role at Brest-Litovsk, where, in spite of his inexperience, he proved equal to the Germans in many ways, was essential to the regime's survival.</p> <p>Clearly his creation of the Red Army and ensuring victory for the Bolsheviks in the Civil War should form a major part of an answer. He was a great inspirer, a ruthless leader and had an excellent strategy as well as the right sort of tactics to ensure victory. He strongly supported the use of terror and fully endorsed Lenin's approach in this respect. He was important in backing War Communism and then Lenin's move to the NEP. He could be divisive and he aroused mistrust, but his willingness to put aside past theoretical disagreements in the interests of establishing the regime was critical.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p data-bbox="268 248 1358 282">How successful were Mussolini's economic policies between 1922 and 1941?</p> <p data-bbox="268 320 504 349"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 349 1358 685">The better responses will reflect on what might be the criteria for 'successful' economic policies in a country like Italy in this period. Given the turmoil that he inherited, with inflation, unemployment, massive debt, bitter antagonism between employers and unions and appalling rural poverty in the South, then simple survival could be seen as a real success story. Italy also did not seem to suffer the economic crises and mass unemployment that affected countries like Germany after 1929. Some might argue that the economy was in such a poor state that there was not much to depress. The inheritance of 1922 could be contrasted with the situation in 1941, when Italy embarked, totally unprepared, for a war which nearly destroyed it.</p> <p data-bbox="268 723 1353 1088">The various policies need to be considered, such as the Corporate State and the various 'Battles' and their impact. The 'Battles' for grain and the lira are considered to have done more harm than good, while the industrial potential of many of the northern cities was not realised. The Corporate State might be seen as an interesting idea, but there was never any push to make it work from above. While the draining of the Pontine Marshes was given lots of publicity, whether the actual investment was worth it was open to question. Much of the South remained seriously deprived and poverty levels in some regions rose. There was some spending on infrastructure, but the focus tended to be on prestige projects like the railway network. The rich remained entrenched in their landholdings and with their factories, while real wages declined and much of Italy continued to stagnate.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>'The main aim of all Stalin's policies was to gain maximum power for himself.' How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>This is, of course, a much debated topic and few experts agree. There should be a good survey of both his rise to power in the 1920s as well as an examination of the policies that he was directly responsible for in the 1930s.</p> <p>It could be argued that some of the policies he put forward in the 1920s, such as those on nationalities, were to the benefit of the USSR and the revolution, but he was largely following the broad direction of Lenin. There is a real debate on quite what he believed in when it came to the War Communism vs. the NEP debate, but it is generally accepted that he was totally pragmatic and simply used the Politburo debate to further his own rise to power.</p> <p>The issue gets more complex in the 1930s. While the purges and the terror can be easily viewed as a means of getting rid of all those who both might and did oppose him, as well as creating an atmosphere of total obedience, it could also be seen as a step forward in bringing about a genuinely communist society.</p> <p>The cult of the personality certainly lends support to the initial thesis, but issues like collectivisation and the Five Year Plans could be seen as part of a desire to bring about communism and strengthen the USSR against potential threats. It could be argued that the collectivisation programme was primarily an attempt to remove the dreaded 'Kulaks' as class enemies, but it could also be seen as a genuine attempt to improve agricultural output to enable much needed industrialisation to follow.</p> <p>Even if the response largely accepts the hypothesis, there should be a genuine attempt at balance for the higher levels. Those aware of the current thinking of major Russian historians should be credited.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p data-bbox="268 248 1027 282">To what extent did the Nazis change German society?</p> <p data-bbox="268 315 504 349"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 349 1331 450">The focus of the response should be the nature and extent of the changes in German society between 1933 and the outbreak of war. Ideally there should be a contrast between the two dates and not just a list of the things that the Nazis did.</p> <p data-bbox="268 483 1355 584">In some respects, there was vast change. A new elite emerged, the status of the family changed, minorities were persecuted or eliminated and the state assumed far greater control over individuals and groups than had ever been the case before.</p> <p data-bbox="268 618 1366 786">Some attitudes did not change. It remained a hierarchical and conformist society, with a religious base and a dislike of those who did not conform to what was seen as the 'norm'. Education changed in some ways, but the vast majority of teachers at all levels seemed happy to accept Goebbels' dictates as to what should happen in the classroom or the lecture theatre.</p> <p data-bbox="268 819 1355 987">The role of women became an issue, but ultimately there was little change. Control of youth became a feature and there were changes there, as was the case with the use of all forms of communication by the state. The old military aristocracy remained in its key positions; the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht (OKW) was dominated by 'vons' and the churches were left largely alone until 1939.</p> <p data-bbox="268 1021 1366 1155">Anti-Semitism became a terrifying force in society and this could well be seen as one of the major changes. However, it was not a new phenomenon in Germany, but its extent was. Perhaps the biggest change was the way in which the State tried to both influence and change social behaviour.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>How important was CORE to the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Evidence that CORE was important to the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s includes the following.</p> <p>While the first half of the 1950s witnessed a decline in CORE activity, this was a contrast to the 1940s that saw more local chapters created than disintegrate. The first part of the early 1950s witnessed only one successful chapter, Baltimore, open while nearly half of CORE's local chapters shut down. At the 1952 Convention, it was admitted that 'CORE is stronger as a principle than as an organisation', and at the 1954 convention some claimed CORE was weaker than ever before.</p> <p>CORE did not see the same reenergising that other civil rights organisations did from the Brown vs. Board ruling due to CORE's inability to build a relationship with the black community. The majority of local chapters' memberships were predominantly white and many blacks viewed CORE as a primarily white Northern organisation. With this perception working against CORE, African Americans who supported civil rights chose to participate in organisations they believed would benefit African Americans – mainly the NAACP. Consequently, an effort to increase black membership and leadership was made a priority for the organisation in the early 1950s.</p> <p>In December of 1955, Martin Luther King Jr. led the Montgomery bus boycott and drew daily national headlines. National CORE leaders quickly realised their opportunity to reinvigorate CORE rested within the South; not only did the region provide potential for direct action protests, but CORE could attract national attention to revive membership and expand the organisation's influence. With the improbability of attracting white involvement in the South, CORE lifted from the CORE constitution the requirement that all CORE chapters had to have both white and black members. This decision had a profound impact upon the organisation, creating an even greater imbalance of races in the majority of chapters.</p> <p>The last few years of the 1950s witnessed a rise in the popularity of the civil rights movement. As King motivated blacks to fight for their rights, whites also responded to the call against oppression. While all white civil rights activists believed it was the right thing to do, many were also motivated by other factors. Some white Americans looked for a means to rebel against the infringement upon their civil liberties in the 1950s that was aided by McCarthyism; the civil rights movement provided the perfect outlet. With Americans united under a cause, CORE witnessed a resurgence in membership and funding; and a change in leadership stabilised the organisation.</p> <p>By 1958, under the leadership of Finance Secretary, James Robinson, the organisation's funds more than doubled. As Robinson excelled at fundraising for the organisation, Marvin Rich, the newly appointed Community Relations Director, made CORE a household name. Through the work of Robinson and Rich, CORE expanded from 4500 to more than 9000 contributors in 1959 and 12 000 in 1960. As the 1950s drew to an end, the organisation was poised to become a major player in the civil rights movement.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>‘Although brief, Ford’s presidency was important.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> At 895 days, some 2.5 years, Gerald Ford’s presidency was certainly brief, if not the briefest.</p> <p>Arguments why Ford’s presidency was important include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He provided a period of calm after the upheavals of the previous two years and more. He himself was a calm, unexcitable, even dull man. At least he kept to the rules of the constitution. His pardon of Nixon, though very controversial at the time, probably helped people to forget the past. • He provided some continuity and thus some stability. He was a Republican. He did keep Kissinger, with his experience of foreign affairs, in power. Nixon’s Treasury Secretary was also retained. • He continued the policy of Détente. The Helsinki treaties of 1975 marked the formal end of the war in Europe. • He announced a conditional amnesty for draft dodgers in an attempt to reduce the divisions caused by the Vietnam War. • He appointed one US Supreme Court judge, always an important power of the President. His nominee, John Paul Stevens, served for 35 years. <p>Arguments against Ford’s presidency being important include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His period in office was too brief for him to have any important impact. • He lacked the democratic legitimacy of being elected, which further restricted his ability to act. • He lacked a distinctive policy agenda. With Kissinger still in power, it meant that his foreign policy was Nixon’s in all but name. 	30

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p data-bbox="268 248 1315 282">Was the US economy stronger or weaker in 1990 than it had been in 1980?</p> <p data-bbox="268 315 504 344"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 349 1315 416">Arguments that the American economy was stronger in 1990 than it had been in 1980 include the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="272 454 1358 864" style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite a brief and mild recession in late 1990-early 1991 and federal government deficits, the economy was growing in the late '80s and early '90s. • The federal government was attempting to control the federal government deficit which had expanded threefold under Reagan. President George H W Bush even agreed to break his pledge of 'no new taxes' in order to do so. • The economy in 1980, the last year of the Carter presidency, was experiencing stagflation following the second oil price hike in 1979. • Also in 1979, the Federal Reserve Board had raised interest rates to reduce inflation, causing a worsening recession during 1980–82. • The election of Reagan in 1980 showed dissatisfaction with existing economic trends. The election of Clinton in 1992 was more dissatisfaction with Bush's 'watch my lips, no new taxes', a less existential crisis. <p data-bbox="268 898 1241 931">Arguments that the American economy was stronger in 1980 than in 1990:</p> <ul data-bbox="272 969 1358 1171" style="list-style-type: none"> • A decade of Reaganomics had only made economic problems greater, e.g. the twin deficits of budget and trade. • Foreign competition, especially from Japan, was greater around 1990. • Deregulation of financial organisations led to the Savings and Loans crisis of 1987. The US people, by 1990, were more debt-dependent than they had been. <p data-bbox="268 1205 1323 1272">The US economy was not as strong as it had been in either year; it is a matter of choosing the less worse option.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>How far did the USA's willingness, in the 1960s and 1970s, to sign international treaties to limit the threat of nuclear warfare, mark a significant shift in its foreign policy?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> The relevant treaties are the Limited Test Ban Treaty, 1963, SALT 1 and the ABM Treaty, both 1972, and SALT 2, 1979.</p> <p>Arguments that these treaties did mark a significant shift in US foreign policy include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The treaties were signed in an era of Cold War relations known as détente. • This era was significantly different from the ones which preceded and followed it; both were times of greater confrontation. Both saw accelerations in the nuclear arms race. • The treaties followed and to some extent resulted from the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, which had shown the great risks of nuclear conflict. <p>Arguments that these treaties did not mark a significant shift in US foreign policy include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nuclear arms race continued during this era. The treaties were intended to impose some controls on the arms race, not to stop it – and especially not to reverse it. • The treaties were agreed only to reduce the dangers of nuclear war and not as part of a significant change in foreign policy. <p>Détente was not that significant a shift in US foreign policy anyway.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>How far do you agree that Khrushchev's gamble in placing nuclear weapons in Cuba ended successfully?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Although the Soviet missiles in Cuba posed a threat to major cities in central and eastern USA (e.g. New York, Washington, Chicago, Boston), it was never Khrushchev's intention to use them as anything other than a bargaining tool. Having lost the lead in ICBMs, Khrushchev was seeking to restore balance by threatening the USA in the same way that American missiles in Turkey and Europe threatened the USSR. He may also have intended to use the Cuban missiles as a means of achieving the withdrawal of the West from Berlin. With a new, young and inexperienced president, 1962 seemed the perfect time to seek concessions from the USA.</p> <p>Although Khrushchev was publicly perceived as the first one to back down, in reality he achieved four significant objectives. Firstly, in return for the removal of Soviet missiles in Cuba, the USA agreed to remove its missiles from Turkey. Secondly, and most significantly, Kennedy agreed that the USA would not attack Cuba; given the threat which the USA had posed to Castro's Cuba prior to the missile crisis, this was no mean achievement. Thirdly, the USSR had gained a communist ally located within the Americas; although Castro was initially angered by Khrushchev's decision to remove the Soviet missiles from Cuba, good Soviet-Cuban relations were soon restored. Fourthly, the USSR could be seen supporting a new and vulnerable communist state from the imperialistic actions of the USA; this was important in terms of the USSR's international prestige during the Cold War, particularly at a time of decolonisation, when the superpowers were competing for influence in newly independent states.</p> <p>Placing Soviet nuclear missile bases in Cuba was both provocative and extremely risky. In reality, the Cuban missiles posed no new threat to the USA (long-range missiles could already reach the USA from the USSR itself), yet the decision inevitably led to a hostile reaction from the USA, which could have led to nuclear war. There was no guarantee that the Soviet missiles would protect Cuba; there was pressure on Kennedy at the time to call Khrushchev's bluff by attacking Cuba and deposing Castro (and some criticism of him subsequently for not having done so).</p> <p>When Kennedy imposed a blockade to prevent Russian ships bringing missiles to Cuba, Khrushchev was forced to back down, ordering the ships to turn back. Kennedy's strategy was highly praised by many Americans at the time, while Khrushchev faced heavy criticism both in the USSR and from China. Castro himself was critical of Khrushchev's decision to remove the missiles; he had urged Khrushchev to launch a nuclear attack on the USA in the event of an American invasion of Cuba.</p> <p>Although Kennedy agreed to remove American Thor and Jupiter missiles from Turkey, he insisted that this should not be made public; in reality, this was no real victory for Khrushchev anyway since the missiles had already been scheduled for removal. Khrushchev's decision to back down in the Cuban crisis was part of the reason for his removal from office in 1964.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p>To what extent did détente in the 1970s reduce superpower tensions?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Both the USA and the USSR had political and economic reasons for seeking a reduction in Cold War tension, while instability on both sides of the iron curtain in Europe highlighted the need for better East-West relations. There was, therefore, a mutual desire to move away from confrontation. This new spirit of cooperation and compromise led to a series of significant agreements. The SALT negotiations, despite their limitations, were symbolic of this new accord between the superpowers; they established the principle of negotiation which was to lead to more effective subsequent agreements (e.g. START).</p> <p>The Helsinki agreements brought concessions from both sides, not least the USA's recognition of the European borders as they had existed since 1945, together with closer trade and technology ties between the superpowers and across the iron curtain. Willy Brandt's policy of 'Ostpolitik' led to greater stability in Europe. Under the Basic Treaty of 1972, West Germany accepted the existence of East Germany as a separate state and agreed to increase trade links. US-Soviet trade increased; for example, the USSR came to rely on American wheat imports.</p> <p>Détente was merely a change in the tactics of superpower conflict, as a result of changed political and economic circumstances, rather than a move towards ending the Cold War. Little of any substance was achieved. Armaments increased during the period of détente despite the SALT treaties, and SALT II was never ratified. Many of the signed agreements were ignored (for example, the USSR did not keep to the promises it made in the Helsinki Accords regarding human rights). Tensions between the USSR and China remained high, with both competing for American support and for leadership of the communist world while in dispute over Vietnam.</p> <p>Conflict in the Third World intensified; events in Iran, Angola and Afghanistan showed that the USSR had continued to extend its influence during the period of détente. The frailties of détente quickly became evident with the rise of neo-conservatism in the USA, leading to Reagan's hardline approach towards 'the evil empire'.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p data-bbox="268 248 1171 282">Assess the reasons why the Great Leap Forward was a disaster.</p> <p data-bbox="268 320 504 349"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 351 1356 483">While some historians have suggested that, in the long term, the Great Leap Forward did benefit the Chinese economy, there is no doubt that, at the time, it had a devastating impact on the people of China. Estimates of the number of deaths attributable to the Great Leap Forward vary between 18–45 million.</p> <p data-bbox="268 521 1345 786">The main aims were to increase food production and develop small-scale industry ('backyard furnaces') which would enable the use of domestic cheap labour rather than purchasing expensive machinery from abroad. Private farming was abolished and peasants were forced into collectives through coercion, terror and violence. Compulsory state purchase of grain at fixed prices, together with high taxation, meant that peasants had insufficient food for themselves. Many peasants were forced into industrial jobs; this increased the urban population and added a further strain on the food supply.</p> <p data-bbox="268 824 1350 987">Following the good harvest of 1958, many of the crops were simply left to rot in the fields for want of sufficient labour. While China continued to be a net exporter of grain 1958–60, many of its people were starving. Poor harvests of 1959–60 exacerbated the problem. Local officials, under pressure to attain impossible targets, exaggerated output figures; this added to food shortages for the peasants.</p> <p data-bbox="268 1025 1362 1220">Wood needed to fuel local steel furnaces led to the destruction of local forests; once local supplies ran out, doors and furniture were taken from people's houses. Local customs, including religious ceremonies, were banned and replaced by political/propaganda meetings. People were forced to work long hours; for example, working on irrigation projects led to large numbers of deaths from exhaustion, lack of food or violence.</p> <p data-bbox="268 1258 1362 1630">Critics of the system were labelled as 'dangerous' and were sent to labour camps. Quota-based executions were commonplace. The Party Cadres, charged with organising the masses both politically and economically through communes, were inexperienced, inefficient and unpopular. Mao's insistence on a strict Marxist-Leninist approach to economic development meant that he was totally opposed to allowing the type of incentives (e.g. piecework and greater wage differentials) which had appeared in the Soviet Union. Mao's criticisms of the Soviet system as 'revisionism' and adopting 'capitalist' methods played no small part in the creation of the Sino-Soviet split, which led to the ending of Soviet aid to China. Moreover, it led to serious splits in the CCP, many right-wing members (e.g. Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shao-qi) arguing against Mao's rigid interpretation of communism.</p> <p data-bbox="268 1668 1358 1863">The failure of the Great Leap Forward severely hit Mao's prestige; although he remained Chairman of the Communist Party, he was forced to resign as Chairman of the People's Congress (replaced by Liu Shao-qi). It was Mao's determination to fight back against his right-wing opponents which led to his introduction of the Cultural Revolution (1966–69), which brought China to the verge of civil war and retarded its economic development by ten years.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p>'The Camp David Agreements achieved little of significance.' How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>The agreements between Egypt (Sadat) and Israel (Begin) were condemned by the PLO and most Arab states (the only exceptions being Sudan and Morocco). Syria and Jordan, in particular, remained extremely hostile towards Israel. In 1980, the Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, announced that Israel would never return the Golan Heights to Syria and would never allow the West Bank to become part of an independent Palestinian state, which would pose a threat to Israel's existence. Moreover, Begin's government followed a policy of establishing Jewish settlements on Arab-owned land on the West Bank, causing increasing anger and resentment amongst Arabs.</p> <p>Israel also refused the USA's attempts to bring Israel and the PLO to the negotiating table. Already undermined by Israel's uncompromising and provocative actions, the agreements were further threatened when Sadat was assassinated by extremist Muslim soldiers in 1981. Sadat was seen by many as a traitor to the Arab/Muslim cause for negotiating with the Israelis. Therefore tensions remained high. In 1987, there were large-scale demonstrations by Palestinians living in refugee camps on the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Israel deployed repressive measures, which were condemned by the UN.</p> <p>The ending of the Yom Kippur War (1973) genuinely seemed to offer hope of peace between the Arabs and the Israelis. The USA and the USSR were agreed that it was necessary to develop a lasting peace settlement in the region and, working with the UN, a ceasefire was negotiated. Sadat realised that Israel could not be defeated by force and was therefore prepared to negotiate. This in itself meant accepting the existence of the state of Israel. Israel, too, had reasons to negotiate; suffering economic problems due to high defence expenditure, and being pressured by its ally, the USA, to reach a negotiated settlement. Agreement between Israel and Egypt was seen as a beginning to a more all-embracing negotiated peace between Israel and the Arabs.</p> <p>With US President Carter acting as mediator, Begin and Sadat signed a peace treaty in Washington (March 1979). They agreed, for the first time, that the state of war which had existed between Egypt and Israel since 1948 was ended. Israel promised to withdraw its troops from Sinai, in exchange for which Egypt promised not to attack Israel again. Egypt also agreed to supply Israel with oil from the recently opened wells in southern Sinai and allowed Israel to use the Suez Canal.</p> <p>These were major concessions on both sides. Although Sadat was assassinated, this did not threaten the Treaty – his successor, Hosni Mubarak, announced that he would continue the Camp David agreements. Given the protracted dispute between Israel and the Arab states, it would have been impossible to make agreements which would completely end the tension. However, the Camp David Agreements were a major stepping stone to a more all-embracing peace.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
13	<p data-bbox="268 248 1358 315">How far was it the personal appeal of African nationalist leaders that brought them to power?</p> <p data-bbox="268 349 504 383"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 387 1347 618">When African nationalism developed after WWII, a new type of mass party emerged needing a new type of leadership. With detailed reference to at least two countries studied, candidates could explore the charisma and personality of leaders, how they provided a focus for unity and an expression of the frustrations, hopes and aspirations of Africans. Many new leaders had spent time abroad, were educated, showed courage and were willing to challenge the colonial powers and even to spend time in jail.</p> <p data-bbox="268 651 1347 987">In contrast to their image, the importance of their ideas needs to be considered. Some ideas like Pan-Africanism or Negritude and variations of socialism proved attractive. A contrast could be made between the leaders of British and French colonies, with some leaders of French colonies seeing cooperation with France as part of their future. Few leaders had much political experience, although some had been involved in trade unions and legislative councils. However, their political skill should be considered in developing a support base, using media and propaganda, organising rallies and protests and overcoming ethnic, social and economic divisions. Leaders in Zimbabwe, Angola and Mozambique faced armed struggle and needed military skills to succeed.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
14	<p>'There were more similarities than differences between military dictatorships in post-independence Africa.' Assess this view.</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>There have been over 200 military coups in Africa since independence. About half of these have been successful. With the development of one-party states and the suppression of opposition, coups were the main way to remove unpopular and unsuccessful leaders. The establishment of the dictatorships can be compared considering the reasons for the removal of the previous leader, the relationship between the previous leader and the organisers of the coup, the ease with which the dictatorship was established and the justification given. Was it intended to end corruption and injustice (reformist) or was it to provide government in time of collapse or transition (caretaker)? Were tribal/ethnic differences significant?</p> <p>Some states such as the Congo and Nigeria have had more military dictatorships than others. Candidates might suggest reasons for this. The political structures put in place by dictators and the extent to which they were tyrannical can be compared. How did they treat minorities? Some dictators, such as Amin in Uganda, abused their power. Their impact on the economic development of the country and the extent to which they were corrupt or followed a lavish life style can be considered. Did life become better or worse for ordinary Africans? The Cold War was a factor in the duration and nature of some dictatorships. Mobutu in the Congo was supported by the USA, but Mengistu in Ethiopia was supported by the USSR. Discussion on civil war or involvement in regional conflict can be relevant to some dictatorships. The ease and method by which the dictatorships ended might be compared.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
15	<p data-bbox="268 248 1246 313">How effectively did post-independence African governments promote industrial development?</p> <p data-bbox="268 349 504 380"><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p data-bbox="268 383 1358 616">Candidates should apply their criteria for 'effective' to the aims, policies, problems and results of industrialisation. Newly independent leaders all agreed speedy industrialisation was essential for economic growth. Colonial governments had been primarily interested in the export of raw materials and minerals. Any infrastructure developed had aimed to facilitate this. This colonial heritage, together with a discussion of natural resources available, should be considered in any judgement.</p> <p data-bbox="268 651 1358 784">The policies used to achieve industrialisation need to be analysed. Were they more socialist or capitalist? How were they implemented? Some policies were more realistic than others and all were influenced by factors like transport, educated administrators, capital available and the extent of corruption.</p> <p data-bbox="268 819 1358 1086">Many leaders were most concerned with maintaining power. This was often done through extensive patronage which led to inefficiency. Aid and profits such as those from Nigerian oil were not invested wisely. Political stability is important. Military coups, civil war and regional conflict undermined industrialisation. New problems arose in the 1970s due to extensive drought, the rise in oil prices in 1974 and a fall in the price of commodities. More capitalist policies replaced earlier socialist ones and by the 1980s many states were in crisis and had to agree to economic restructuring.</p> <p data-bbox="268 1122 1358 1220">The situation by 1991 needs to be examined to reach a judgement. Industrialisation in Africa was far behind Asia and South America. The use of statistics could be useful in this question.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
16	<p>'The OAU's achievements in the period 1963 to 1991 were limited to resolving minor conflicts.' How valid is this judgement?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>The OAU grew out of Pan-Africanism and the Non-Aligned movement. It was founded in 1963 in Addis Ababa. It involved a search for African identity and independence from colonial influence. It aimed to resolve conflicts in Africa through peaceful negotiation, increase cooperation between African states to solve economic and social problems and improve living standards, to end any remaining colonialism and follow a policy of Non-Alignment internationally.</p> <p>However, there were tensions from the start. Disagreements between different groups over policy in the Congo and Algeria led to two years of argument before the organisation could be formed. Some leaders like Nkrumah were much more radical than others and saw themselves as leaders of the group, but Nigerian leaders like Azikiwe challenged this. Haile Selassie's leadership could be considered.</p> <p>Weaknesses within the organisation are relevant to this question. It had no army to implement decisions. Also it agreed to defend state boundaries established at independence, but some states like Somalia intended to change these. Most importantly, the agreement not to intervene in the internal affairs of member states meant it could not act in cases of major human rights abuse such as those of Amin in Uganda or Bokassa in the Central African Republic, nor respond to civil wars in the Congo, Biafra or Rwanda. It failed in the Western Sahara because members could not agree. Cooperation was limited on economic and social issues. Non-Alignment was compromised by the Cold War and the desire for aid. Apart from minor conflicts, its greatest success was in supporting the armed struggle in Portuguese and southern Africa with aid and pressure in the United Nations.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
17	<p>How important were internal divisions within occupied territories in limiting the success of resistance to Japan in Southeast Asia from 1942 to 1945?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u> Issues might focus on divisions between regions, religions and tribes, different political ideologies; uneven support for different groups from the allies; lack of sufficient heavy weapons and the suppression by Japanese and collaborationist forces. Possible examples are given below.</p> <p>In Vietnam the propaganda of Asia for the Asians led to divisions with Cao Dai and Hoa Hao being two collaborationist groups. Later the French established Bao Dai as emperor, dividing potential opposition. The Viet Minh resistance was strong but limited to the North. Hopes that the USA might grant independence kept Ho Chi Minh from all-out attacks on the Japanese and Japanese treatment of Vietnam was less harsh. There were racial divisions, too, which restricted support for united action.</p> <p>In the Philippines, a 10 000 strong resistance movement was established by Ramon Magsaysay, but there were rival forces such as the Chinese Wai Chai and also collaborators such as Marcos' father. The Huk Communist-led resistance did not get as much US assistance as other groups and ended by attacking non-Huk fighters. Some resistance was regionally based such as the Moros rebels and had no cooperation with either the US undercover forces or the Filipinos.</p> <p>These divisions have to be set against the ruthless repression of the Japanese, the lack of heavy weapons and the police activities of the Kempetei and the secret police of the collaborationist Second Republic.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
18	<p>'Malaysia lost more than it gained from the split with Singapore in 1965.' How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Malaysia was founded in 1963 by uniting Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore. Singapore exited in 1965 after a period when relations had been strained. Malaysia lost the link with a very high achieving financial centre which brought in large amounts of foreign investment and western contacts. However, it gained from resolving the problem of imbalance between the Chinese dominated and trade rich Singapore and the largely Malay federation.</p> <p>Ending the formal union did not mean ending economic relations or political ties, and some of the fears of 1965 did not prove to be realities, so it could be argued that the split was unnecessary, but the economic development of Malaysia indicates that there was no significant loss. No set answer is expected here.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
19	<p>How far was Sihanouk personally responsible for his fall from power in Cambodia in 1970?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Sihanouk had been placed on the Cambodian throne as a French puppet ruler. He collaborated with the Japanese when they established nominal Khmer independence in 1945 and he accepted French rule again after the war with a democratic constitution. He collaborated with middle-class political leaders in campaigning for and winning independence, but abdicated in 1955 and undermined the democratic constitution as 'Monseigneur' dominating the regime and establishing a one-party dictatorship, building up a strong personal following among the peasantry and building schemes.</p> <p>He played different political groups off against one another and also played off the peasantry against urban interests. He also tried to keep power by bidding for both Communist and western support. Rejecting US military and economic aid in 1963, he faced growing opposition at home from both right and left, especially from the Khmer Communist movement supported by North Vietnam. He was overthrown by a coup in 1970. He tried to regain power by courting support in China and North Korea and by allying with the Khmer Rouge but found himself a virtual prisoner of Pol Pot in 1975.</p> <p>Answers might see the fault with a self-centred politician without real scruple or concern for his people, or they might see the relentless build-up of opposition, particularly the Khmer Rouge, as the key.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
20	<p>'Urbanisation did more harm than good to social development in Southeast Asia from 1945 to the 1990s.' How far do you agree?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>Urban population by the 1990s varied considerably from Singapore at 100%, Malaysia at 62%, the Philippines at 48%, Indonesia was 42%, Thailand stood at 31%, Vietnam at 25%, Myanmar at 28%, Cambodia at 16% and East Timor at 8%. The cities with the greatest growth rate since the 1960s were Kuala Lumpur (800%), Bangkok (358%), Manila (379%), Jakarta (300%), and Bandung, Surabaya, Hanoi more than doubled. Bangkok, Jakarta and Manila with more than 10 million inhabitants became mega cities.</p> <p>Answers may draw a distinction between 'true' urban growth, fuelled by the growth of job opportunities, and 'urban involution' where swollen cities bring underemployment, poorly rewarded labour intensive jobs, overcrowding and crime. On one hand, the cities have become symbols of progress and high urbanisation is associated with the 'Tiger Economies' of Malaysia and Singapore. On the other hand, cities have been associated with cultural and economic disparities between regions or given capital cities excessive prominence.</p> <p>Answers should not merely offer general points about urban growth but be rooted in the experience of Southeast Asia. Social development could involve employment opportunity and mobility, education and greater awareness of the wider world, more developed communication, greater social mobility, less distinction between rural and urban culture.</p>	30