

TMJC

[PRELIMS 2021] H2 HISTORY PAPER 1 MARKING GUIDE

SECTION A

Question 1 – Part A (10 marks)

| LVL | MARKS | DESCRIPTOR |
|-----|--------|--|
| L0 | 0 | No evidence submitted or answer does not address the question. |
| L1 | 1 – 3 | <p>The answer is likely to be characterised by paraphrasing or quotation and will be largely uncritical. Very simple comparisons may be made and these are not developed (e.g. that one source is a letter and the other is a speech). Answers that are simply based on contextual knowledge, with no source use, should be credited at this level.</p> <p>At the <i>upper end</i> of the level, there may be some attempt to explain how far the sources corroborate and/or differ (i.e. supported with source details), but any explanation will be confused or impartial.</p> |
| L2 | 4 – 6 | <p>The answer will use both sources. There will be clear explanation on how far the sources corroborate and/or differ (i.e. supported with source details), though insights into why are less likely or are less successful.</p> <p>At the <i>lower end</i> of the level, there may be a tendency to treat the sources separately with most or all the comparison implicit.</p> |
| L3 | 7 – 8 | <p>The answer will make good use of both sources. There will be clear explanation on how far the sources corroborate and/or differ. The answer will demonstrate a sense of critical evaluation of the sources and provide some insights into why they are similar/and or different.</p> <p>Answers which argue that the sources entirely agree or disagree with each other (i.e. one sided) but demonstrate critical insight, may also be found in this level. Answers which are uneven (e.g. extracting information from a source at face value, and showing more critical insight in the analysis of the other source) may also be found at this level.</p> |
| L4 | 9 - 10 | <p>The answer will make full comprehensive use of both sources. There will be clear explanation on how far the sources corroborate and differ. The answer will demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation of the sources throughout and provide insights into why they are similar or different.</p> |

- (a) Compare and contrast the evidence provided in Sources A and C regarding Soviet involvement in Cuba.
[10]

| | |
|------------|--|
| Similarity | Soviet involvement in Cuba was on the side of Cuba. |
| Difference | Difference – motivation for soviet involvement |
| Insights | <p><u>Possible reason for similarity –</u> Source A: Khrushchev to Kennedy, and thus likely purpose is -> bring in CK. Source C, as published by an American newspaper, thus has the likely purpose of -> bring in CK</p> <p><u>Possible reason for difference –</u> Source A: Khrushchev to Kennedy, and thus likely purpose is -> bring in CK. Source C, as published by an American newspaper, thus has the likely purpose of -> bring in CK</p> <p>Source A - Khrushchev to Kennedy, and thus likely to have the purpose to paint the US as the one who forced USSR's hand to come to the defense of Cuba. ->bring in CK Source B – written by an American newspaper, and thus has the likely purpose to portray Soviet Union as the manipulator, with Castro in Khrushchev's pocket. -> bring in CK</p> |

Question 1 – Part B (30 marks)

| LVL | MARKS | DESCRIPTOR |
|-----|---------|---|
| L0 | 0 | No evidence submitted or answer does not address the question. |
| L2 | 1 - 4 | The answer will make limited use of the sources . The sources may be paraphrased or described. Some relevant information from the sources will be extracted at face value to support and/or challenge the hypothesis, but the answer may be confused or undeveloped . |
| L3 | 5 - 10 | The answer will use relevant information from sources at face value to support and/or challenge the hypothesis. Sources may be used in isolation . The answer may demonstrate some awareness of provenance of the sources but evaluation of the sources is unlikely . |
| L4 | 11 - 15 | The answer will begin to treat sources as a set , although one or two sources may be neglected at the lower level. It will demonstrate some understanding of the question . Some sources may be cross-referenced to support and/or challenge the hypothesis. There will be an attempt to evaluate sources , but the sources will not be placed in context . |
| L5 | 16 - 20 | The answer will treat sources as a set and make good use of the sources . It will demonstrate a clear understanding of the question . Sources may be cross-referenced to support and/or challenge the hypothesis. There will be an attempt to evaluate the sources in context but there will be gaps, unevenness and a lack of balance . |
| L6 | 21 - 25 | The answer will treat sources as a set and make very good use of the sources . It will demonstrate a good understanding of the question . Sources may be cross-referenced to support and/or challenge the hypothesis. The answer will demonstrate a critical evaluation of the sources in context to support and challenge the hypothesis (that is, balanced). |
| L7 | 26 - 30 | <p>The answer will treat sources as a set and make excellent use of the sources. It will demonstrate a very good understanding of the question. The answer will demonstrate a critical evaluation of the sources in context to support and challenge the hypothesis (that is, balanced).</p> <p>It may question how far a conclusion can be reached using the evidence in the sources.</p> <p>It will EITHER explain fully why evidence to challenge or to support the hypothesis is better / preferred, OR justify an amended/alternative historical interpretation where appropriate.</p> <p>For L6, the L5 answer must also be secure.</p> |

- (b) How far do Sources A-F support the argument that the spread of the Cold War rivalry beyond Europe was due to Soviet expansionism? [30]

| Support | Challenge | Nuanced |
|---------|-----------|---------|
| B, C | A, D | E, F |

SECTION B

| Band | Marks | Quality of the Answer |
|------|-------|---|
| 0 | 0 | No evidence submitted or the answer does not address the question. |
| 1 | 1-8 | The essay will be characterised by significant irrelevance or argument that does not begin to make significant points . The essay may mention historical concepts but these will not be understood. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent . |
| 2 | 9-12 | The essay will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question . There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The essay may include references to historical concepts but these may not be fully understood. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations but this may not be explained. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question . |
| 3 | 13-15 | The essay will offer some appropriate factual material but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question . The approach will lack analysis . The essay will include some references to historical concepts but these may not be used to develop the analysis. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations, though this may be implicit. The quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument . The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the essay will be unbalanced . The writing may show some accuracy but there will also be frequent errors . |
| 4 | 16-18 | The essay will indicate attempts to argue relevantly , although often implicitly . The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions . The essay will show evidence of knowledge of historical concepts and attempts may be made to use historical concepts to aid analysis. Where appropriate, the essay may mention the existence of other historical interpretations but the nature of these interpretations may not be fully understood. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively . The writing will usually be accurate . |
| 5 | 19-21 | The essay will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages . The essay will show evidence of understanding of relevant historical concepts, and some use of historical concepts will be made in analysis. Where appropriate, the essay mentions the existence of other historical interpretations and offers some relevant knowledge of, or evidence for, these interpretations. The essay will be largely relevant . Most of the argument will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence . The essay will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge . The writing will be generally accurate . |
| 6 | 22-25 | The essay will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness . The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative, demonstrating secure understanding of historical concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic. Where appropriate, the essay will discuss competing historical interpretations and offers good knowledge of or evidence for these interpretations. The essay will be mostly relevant . Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material . The writing will be mostly accurate . |
| 7 | 26-30 | The overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument . The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative, demonstrating clear and accurate understanding of historical concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic . The essay will be fully relevant . It will be supported by carefully selected factual material and ideas closely focused on the topic and argument made . Where appropriate, the essay will effectively assess the strengths and limitations of competing historical interpretations . The argument will be structured coherently . The writing will be accurate . |

Question 2

Qn. How far do you agree that the Nixon Devaluation of 1971 was a watershed event in the development of the international economy? [30]

Turning point (end point) - significant change when **(continuation of trends or shift in trends)**
 1) drastic, permanent change
 2) widespread - across internationally, multiple forms of instability
 3) long-term impact
 Possible features of Crisis Years: Low growth rates, Unemployment, Trade deficits, Low standard of living
 Discuss before and after
 Possible other factors
 - Oil Crisis of 1970s
 - Protectionism
 - Third World Debt Crisis

Question 3

“It was the government more than external actors who played a pivotal role in the rise of Taiwan as an Asian Tiger.” How far do you agree? [30]

Possible criteria for comparison
 - Timeframe
 - Economic indicator
 By the 1970s, Taiwan experienced an economic transformation that solidified their status as an Asian Tiger. This asserted to be a result of various actors, of which the government and external ones such as the US and Japanese viewed as important. It is assumed that the government was more pivotal than external actors in explaining Taiwan as an Asian Tiger. In this consideration, I posit that the claim is true, given that the government had proved to be more pivotal than external actors in explaining Taiwan as an Asian Tiger in terms of laying the foundations for growth, while also sustaining the growth. Nonetheless, the importance of external actors more than the government explained Taiwan as an Asian Tiger in terms of kickstarting the growth in Taiwan would also be discussed.

Question 4

Assess the role of structural weaknesses in undermining the ability of the General Assembly to fulfil its responsibilities. [30]

UNGA
 Factors leading to the ineffectiveness of UNGA
 UNGA structure undermined its ability to fulfil its responsibilities
 Possible Responsibilities of the GA:
 • Represent all the UN members' interests internationally as stated in Chapter 4, Article 9
 • Managed to implement constructive suggestions through proposals put forward by the General Assembly that were adopted by external agents, as stated in Chapter 4, Article 10
 • Resolved conflicts when they were given the opportunity to do so as stated in Chapter 4, Article 14
 • Ensure that the UN members will bear expenses for UN peacekeeping as stated in Chapter 4, Article 17

Question 5

To what extent United Nations peace-keeping efforts more ineffective during the Cold War than after the Cold War? [30]

| |
|---|
| UN political ineffectiveness |
| Extent of UN's effectiveness |
| UN has been MORE ineffective during Cold War period than post CW |
| UN more ineffective during CW than post CW period – possible criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none">• sustainable peace• garner cooperation of member states• able to maintain impartiality• overcome big power politics to intervene in timely manner |