

# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2001**

**HISTORY**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 1**

**SECTION A**

**Prescribed Subject 1 The Russian Revolutions and the New Soviet State 1917–1929**

1. (a) **According to Document E what can be inferred about the economic situation in the new Soviet state between 1918 and 1923?** [2 marks]

For [1 mark] candidates need to point out that statistics in Document E infer that the economic situation was bad as it had deteriorated sharply since the earlier figures, those of 1913. For the second mark they should develop this, e.g. no figures are available for the years between 1913 and 1920, suggesting problems; the First World War and the Civil War might be named, or they might comment on some of the items in the table, and assess the variations.

- (b) **According to Document C what message is Trotsky intending to convey?** [2 marks]

Trotsky's message is clear and brutal. For [2 marks] candidates could either say that any person who urges another to retreat, desert or disobey a military order and anyone who does desert voluntarily will be shot, or they could write something like: Trotsky was trying to stop desertion from, and sabotage in, the Red Army, therefore he was imposing the death penalty for these offences.

**N.B.** *Do not enter half marks or + and - but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [4 marks].*

2. **Analyse and account for Lenin's defensive self-justifying attitude in Documents A and B.** [5 marks]

Both documents refer to controversial actions by Lenin which he is seeking to justify. In Document A he defends his dissolution of the Constituent Assembly by claiming that the Soviets were truer revolutionary organisations than the Constituent Assembly, therefore by its dissolution the Bolsheviks were giving more power to the people. The second or Bolshevik Revolution aimed to defeat the bourgeois and landed gentry, and Lenin claimed he was doing this.

Candidates can account for Lenin's defensive attitude by pointing out that Document A clearly suggests that Lenin is being criticised for the dissolution, ('those who point out') especially as he originally supported the Assembly, therefore he is writing his reply.

In Document B Lenin is urging his own party to accept the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. He has to do this because some Bolsheviks think that this harsh treaty is unnecessary because there will soon be a Communist revolution in Germany. Lenin argues that this is unlikely. He also points out the danger from Germany's strong army - 'armed to the teeth', when Russia's army had been demobilised. Again to account for the defensive attitude candidates need to point out that Lenin's policy, peace with Germany, is being attacked. Lenin also tries to lay the blame for the harsh terms on his opponents, for not accepting the earlier negotiations.

Marks could be allocated 2/3 either way for each document, or 2/3 either way for analysis and accounting.

- 3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents C and D for historians studying Lenin's rule of USSR. [5 marks]**

Document C is an order by Trotsky, the Bolshevik Red Army commander, to his troops. It is an official contemporary document, so it has value as an official order, and its instructions to punish 'enemy agents' and defaulting soldiers, should be understood as part of Trotsky's policy and military discipline. Its limitations could be in the preamble. Was this a local problem, and was he using reports of enemy agents to frighten his troops?

Document D is a secondary work, written by a former Soviet army officer, and first published in Russia in 1994. It is a critical biography of Lenin, so its purpose would be to inform its readers about Lenin's rule. Its value is that as a former high-ranking Soviet officer he would have inside knowledge, and understand how the Soviet system worked. Its date of publication, after the collapse of communism and the opening of the Soviet archives should suggest that he had been able to research and write about material that had previously been concealed. Its limitations could be the time factor - he was not there, and readers would need to check his references, sources *etc.*

Divide marks 2/3 between the two documents whichever is more favourable to the candidate.

4. **‘For Lenin the Revolution was everything, the people nothing.’ Using these documents and your own knowledge explain to what extent you agree with this assertion.**

**[6 marks]**

Documentary material used to agree could include:

**Document A**

The dissolution of the Constituent Assembly; the Bolsheviks failed to obtain a majority so to further the revolution Lenin dissolved it, using force, thus depriving the people of a democratic institution.

**Document B**

Brest-Litvosk was a humiliating treaty which deprived the people of agricultural and industrial resources, but for Lenin it was necessary to secure the revolution.

**Document C**

The success of the Red Army was necessary to win the war against the Whites. It did not matter how many people were shot in order to maintain discipline.

**Document D**

The Russian Church opposed the revolution, so it must be suppressed. It was also rich and Lenin wanted its wealth to fund world wide revolutionary movements. The people lost the comfort and support of the Church. This document also describes the terrible famine caused by the Civil War and War Communism.

**Document E**

Records the low level of food and energy production.

Own knowledge could include details of War Communism, the cheka, purges, concentration camps, and Lenin’s style, a personal dictatorship not a dictatorship of the proletariat. Some candidates might comment that the people were subordinate not only to the revolution, but to Lenin’s personal ambition.

Do not expect or demand all the above, but for full marks demand exact references for the documentary material.

If only documentary material **or** own knowledge is used, the maximum mark that can be awarded is **[4]**.

**SECTION B**

**Prescribed Subject 2 Origins of the Second World War in Asia 1931–1941**

5. (a) **According to Document E, what can be inferred about the Lytton Commission’s attitude to the Manchurian Incident?** [2 marks]

For [1 mark] candidates need to point out that the Commission firmly places blame for the Incident on the Japanese forces and states that the Chinese had no plan of attack. For the full [2 marks] they should develop this, e.g. an explosion did occur, but it was minimal and the actions of the Japanese forces cannot be regarded as justified (although it does mitigate the Japanese action by saying that the Japanese might have thought that they were being attacked).

- (b) **What political message is intended by Document D?** [2 marks]

The Japanese soldier is using the League of Nations as a doormat, and is walking over it. John Simon (not required) is applying make-up to the League of Nations’ face to improve its image. Geneva was the headquarters of the League of Nations and the person welcoming the soldier is bowing extremely in a very low manner. The message is that the League has been trampled on by the Japanese and is doing its best to save face. Award [1 mark] if there is mere description without any sense of the political message itself.

**N.B.** *Do not enter half marks or + and - but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [4 marks].*

6. **How consistent are Documents A, B and C in their view of the Manchurian Incident?** [5 marks]

Document A deplores the Incident and is warning China and Japan that United States citizens need to be protected. It is also indicating to the Japanese that Chinese sovereignty must be retained and supports the work of the Lytton Commission. Document B sees Manchuria as essential to Japanese defence and indicates that further occupation is necessary. It ends by saying that this will attempt to conflict with law or international treaties. Document C argues that the Incident is intolerable and that China has been invaded by Japan who has ignored all treaties and the Kellogg Pact. It states that Japan has ignored the League of Nations. The documents are consistent that an Incident has occurred but are not consistent in their view of that Incident. Two Documents, A and C oppose it while Document B considers it justified. If only two documents are included, or if all three are included without any analysis award up to [3 marks]. For an answer which evaluates the consistency of all three documents award up to [5 marks].

7. **With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Documents A and C for historians studying the Manchurian Incident.** **[5 marks]**

Document A is a public statement by a member of the United States Government and it is intended to portray the United States Government's policy on the Manchurian Incident. Its purpose is to make its stand clear and to warn Japan about further encroachments into Manchuria. It must however be read in context of United States foreign Policy and the Washington/London Naval Treaties which were intended to create a balance of Naval power in the Pacific and the United States' commitment to free trade and national self-determination. The origins of Document C should be questioned by candidates. It is a report of an interview which is then published in a United States magazine. Is the content accurate? Do we know? Its purpose is to express outrage at the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and its language indicates that the speaker is very anti-Japanese. Candidates should question its intention. Is it to create sympathy for the Chinese and opposition against the Japanese or is it merely an expression of anger? Ensure that candidates have included all four parts of the question and used both documents. If only one document is used, or if two of the directions in the question are omitted award up to **[3 marks]**.

8. **Using the documents and your own knowledge comment on the statement in Document B that the Japanese Government made, 'efforts to avoid conflicts with international law or international treaties', in its foreign policy between September 1931 and December 1937.** **[6 marks]**

Documents A and C clearly express concern about Japanese actions. Document D implies that Japan has walked all over the League of Nations and Document E expressly places the blame for the Incident at the feet of the Japanese. Candidates should make direct reference to the documents in explaining these points. Japanese foreign policy after 1931 indicates that there was little attempt to avoid conflict. Document C refers specifically to the Shanghai massacre. Candidates should then examine Japan's policy after 1932. It left the League of Nations in 1933, carried out further encroachments into Manchuria, renaming it Manchukuo under Pu Yi. Between 1935 to 1936 Japanese announced its abrogation of the London and Washington Naval Treaties after the dispute between the Imperial Way and Control factions domestically. Further aggression was seen in 1937 with the Marco Polo Bridge Incident and the attack upon China which also resulted in the Nanking massacre. Japanese policy towards Russia was similarly aggressive.

Do not expect or demand reference to all the above, but for full marks demand exact references from the documentary material.

If only documentary material or own knowledge is used, the maximum that can be awarded is **[4 marks]**.

**SECTION C**

**Prescribed Subject 3 The Cold War 1945–1964**

9. (a) **According to Document A what can be inferred about the author’s perception of Nasser?** **[2 marks]**

For **[1 mark]** candidates need to point out that the document shows the author’s positive attitude towards Nasser. For the full **[2 marks]** candidates should develop this. For instance, the words ‘reformer’, ‘moderniser’, and ‘nationalist’ convey this positive perception.

- (b) **What political message is intended in Document B?** **[2 marks]**

The cartoon is suggesting that Nasser, in his pursuit of Egypt’s future policy, is willing to accept aid either from the East or from the West. It also suggests that for both the United States and the Soviet Union, the Middle East is very significant. To obtain the **[2 marks]** available here both these points, or any two relevant implications, must be stated.

**N.B.** *Do not enter half marks or + and - but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [4 marks].*

10. **Compare the views offered by Documents A, B, and E. How far do they support similar views?** **[5 marks]**

The three documents portray Nasser as a nationalist leader concerned with the development of his own Middle East policy. However, Document A offers a positive view of the leader, while Documents B and E perceive his actions in a negative way. Full marks can be awarded if elaboration of these different views is present. Answers without supporting examples taken from the documents should not receive more than **[2 marks]**.

11. **For historians studying the Suez crisis, how reliable are Documents C and D?** **[5 marks]**

Candidates should identify the kind of source that each extract is and discuss whose point of view they are portraying as well as their particular weakness. The fact that each provides a different perspective should be assessed as helpful for understanding the conflicting elements of the crisis. Document C is a primary source reflecting United States perceptions about Nasser and the Crisis. Document D is also a primary source and reflects the views of Nasser. The characteristics and messages of the two documents should be analysed to obtain **[5 marks]**. If only one document is considered then no more than **[2 marks]** can be awarded.

**12. Using these documents and your own knowledge, discuss the causes of the Suez Crisis.**

***[6 marks]***

The Middle East had been growing in importance as a Cold War theatre throughout the 1950s. Oil made the area strategically, important since about two-thirds of the oil available to the west was there. The establishing of Israel in 1948 and the nationalistic aspirations of the Arab countries increased the tensions in the area. This was particularly clear in the case of Nasser's Egypt, Document A.

The British and the French had dominated the region in the inter-war years. After 1945, France's importance in the area had diminished but Britain's remained strong. The United States were seeking ways to create an alliance system in the Middle East to prevent Russian expansion but always ran up against the problem of Israel. In 1955 the United States and Britain were planning a grant for a high dam at Aswan, Document C, a project which would help the economic development of Egypt, Document A and C. But Nasser was also flirting with the Communists, Document B: he recognised the People's Republic of China, signed an arms agreement with Czechoslovakia, denounced the state of Israel, gave aid to the Algerian rebels fighting against France, and accepted substantial aid from both Washington and Moscow.

Irritated by Nasser's conduct, the United States on July 19th announced the cancellation of the financial and technical aid for the dam, Document C. Nasser responded by nationalising the Suez Canal, Document D, and the Soviet Union declared that it would provide financial and technical aid for the project in place of the United States. The United States attempted to achieve a diplomatic solution to the problem, instead of the British demand of force, Document E. In response to these events, Britain, France and Israel conspired to launch an attack on Egypt.

Do not expect or demand reference to all the above, but for full marks demand exact references from the documentary material.

If only documentary material or own knowledge is used, the maximum that can be awarded is ***[4 marks]***.

---