Cambridge International AS & A Level

INTERNATIONAL HISTORY   **9982/04**

Paper 4 Depth Study   **For examination from 2027**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

This document has **10** pages.

          [Turn over

v1

Generic Marking Principles

All examiners must apply these general marking principles when marking candidate responses. Examiners must apply them alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme must also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1: Marks must be awarded in line with: • the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptions for the question • the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptions for the question • the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2: Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3: Marks must be awarded **positively**: • marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate • marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do • marks are not deducted for errors • marks are not deducted for omissions • answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4: Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptions.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5: Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6: Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

Guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more levels.

Once a best-fit level has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range (where middle marks are available).
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level, award the lowest mark.

Table A:

AO2 Historical explanation, analysis and judgement
Candidates should be able to:
- Identify, explain and analyse the past using historical concepts:
    - cause and consequence
    - change and continuity
    - significance.
- Explain and analyse connections between different aspects of the past.
- Reach a judgement.

Use this table to give marks for candidate response for Questions 1–3.

Level	Description	Marks
Level 5	**Responses demonstrate a full understanding of the question, are balanced and analytical** Responses: • Establish valid and wide-ranging criteria for assessing the question. • Are consistently analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period. • Provide a focused, balanced argument with a sustained line of reasoning throughout • Reach a clear, sustained and supported judgement.	13–15
Level 4	**Responses demonstrate a good understanding of the question, and are mostly analytical** Responses: • Establish valid criteria for assessing the question. • Are analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period, but treatment of points may be uneven. • Attempt to provide a balanced argument but may lack coherence and precision in some places. • Reach a supported judgement, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated.	10–12
Level 3	**Responses demonstrate an understanding of the question and contain some analysis. Argument lacks balance** Responses: • Show attempts at establishing criteria for assessing the question. • Show some analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period but may also contain descriptive passages. • Provide an argument but lacks balance, coherence and precision. • Begin to form a judgement although with weak substantiation.	7–9
Level 2	**Responses demonstrate some understanding of the question and are descriptive** Responses: • Attempt to establish criteria for assessing the question but these may be implicit. • Show limited analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period and contain descriptive passages that are not always clearly related to the focus of the question. • Make an attempt at proving an argument, but this is done inconsistently and/or may be unrelated to the focus of the question. • Make an assertion rather than a judgement.	4–6

Level	Description	Marks
Level 1	**Responses address the topic, but not the question** Responses: • Focus on the topic rather than the question. • Are descriptive and lack analysis or an argument. • Lack a relevant judgement.	1–3
Level 0	**No creditable response**	0

Table B:

AO1 Historical knowledge
Candidates should be able to:
•   Recall, select and use appropriate historical knowledge.

Use this table to give marks for candidate response for Questions 1–3.

Level	Description	Marks
Level 5	**Responses demonstrate a high level of relevant detail** Supporting material: • Is carefully selected • Is fully focused on supporting the argument • Is wide-ranging • Is consistently precise and accurate.	13–15
Level 4	**Responses demonstrate a good level of relevant supporting detail** Supporting material: • Is selected appropriately. • Is mostly focused on supporting the argument. • Covers a range of points but the depth may be uneven. • Is mostly precise and accurate.	10–12
Level 3	**Responses demonstrate an adequate level of supporting detail** Supporting material: • Is mostly appropriately selected. • May not fully support the points being made, may be descriptive in places. • Covers a narrow range of points. • Occasionally lacks precision and accuracy in places.	7–9
Level 2	**Responses demonstrate some relevant supporting detail** Supporting material: • Is presented as a narrative. • Is not directly linked to the argument. • Is limited in range and depth. • Frequently lacks precision and accuracy.	4–6
Level 1	**Responses demonstrate limited knowledge of the topic** Supporting material: • Has limited relevance to the argument. • Is inaccurate or vague.	1–3
Level 0	**No creditable response**	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**'The Soviet Union formed the Warsaw Pact to keep control of the satellite states.'** **Assess this view.** Indicative content Responses should assess the relative importance of the reasons for the formation of the Warsaw Pact to reach a clear judgement. The satellite states regarded the Soviet Union as an oppressive rather than an emancipating force and were opposed to the communist regimes imposed on them when they were overrun by the Soviet Army during or after the Second World War. Soviet political and military dominance in the region enabled it to indirectly control most of the seven satellite nations. For example, the Soviets used massive repression against the East German uprising in 1953. Soviet leaders hoped a unified, multilateral political and military alliance would help them halt the growing civil unrest in Eastern European countries by strengthening the ties between the Eastern European capitals and Moscow. The Soviet Union also wanted to maintain control over military forces in Central and Eastern Europe. Ideologically, the Soviet Union assumed the right to define socialism and communism and act as the leader of the global socialist movement. However, it can be argued that the threat from the West prompted the formation of the Warsaw Pact. NATO was established in 1949, the year the Federal Republic of Germany was created, becoming the front line of the Cold War in Europe and hosting NATO troops to deter aggression from the East. At the Berlin Conference in 1954 Molotov proposed that Germany be reunified, demilitarised and allowed to select its own economic system. The West, however, demanded Germany be allowed to rearm and join a European defence organisation. The Soviets rejected this proposing a pan-European security apparatus, excluding the USA, which the West rejected. In March 1954, the Soviets proposed joining NATO. This would undermine the planned rearmament of West Germany and force the bulk of US forces and bases to leave Europe. NATO rejected the proposal as Soviet membership would not be compatible with democracy. West Germany was admitted to NATO on 9 May 1955. The danger of a new war was increased with its remilitarisation. The Warsaw Pact was a direct response to this threat. Along with the Soviet Union seven of its European satellites joined the pact. It called on the member states to come to the defence of any member attacked by an outside force and set up a unified military command. The Soviets hoped that the Warsaw Treaty Organisation could both contain West Germany and negotiate with NATO as an equal partner. It was a mutual defence organisation and relations were based upon mutual non-intervention in the internal affairs of the member countries, respect for national sovereignty and political independence. Accept any other valid responses.	30

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Evaluate the reasons for the failure of Botha's Total Strategy in South Africa.**	30
	Indicative content	
	Responses should evaluate the reasons for the failure of Botha's Total Strategy to reach a clear judgement on their relative significance. They are likely to consider the ineffectiveness of his reforms, the increasing resistance to apartheid and the severe repression used by the government.	
	PK Botha served as the last prime minister of South Africa from 1978–84 and the first executive state president from 1984–89. His Total Strategy was intended to ensure the survival of apartheid. He believed that white South Africa was under threat from communist forces both within and outside South Africa. He called this threat the Total Onslaught and Total Strategy was his response. His approach in South Africa was to introduce reform while increasing repression.	
	The promise of reforms, regarded by the government as major concessions, created expectations but they did not satisfy the Africans and served as a trigger for demands for more sweeping changes. Botha hoped that the creation of a black middle class as a buffer against the African National Congress (ANC) could stem internal unrest and external opposition. Other reforms included the recognition of African trade unions, the granting of independence to some homelands and the recognition of a permanent urban African population.	
	The new tricameral constitution introduced in 1983 provided for three central houses of parliament, the House of Assembly for Whites, the House of Representatives for Coloureds and the House of Delegates for Indians, each house to be elected by its own register of voters. Power remained firmly in the hands of the white parliament and the president. The new constitutional arrangements were approved by about 66 per cent of voters in a referendum of whites only. Blacks were excluded from participation in the central government.	
	The reforms had the opposite effect to what the apartheid regime intended; they gave renewed impetus to the resistance movements and the 1980s became a turning point in South African history. In 1983 hundreds of anti-apartheid groups joined together to form the United Democratic Front (UDF) which successfully called for a boycott of the elections for the new parliament and for Africans to boycott elections for the local community councils. Mass action campaigns swept through the country which included strikes, protests and rent boycotts. Harsh measures were used to quell the growing resistance.	
	A partial State of Emergency was declared on 20 July 1985 and was the catalyst for more aggressive resistance against the state. International condemnation revived grass-roots resistance. Botha's Rubicon speech in August 1985, predicted to introduce new policies to end the political conflict, failed to deliver. The government declared a full emergency between June 1986 and 1990. The police were given wide powers making South Africa seem like a police state. The army occupied the townships which intensified the people's anger. By the end of the 1980s, the government had failed to crush the resistance. FW De Klerk would later enter into negotiations with	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	the ANC and other groups, to discuss transitioning towards a non-racial and democratic South Africa. Ultimately, reform failed, and repression and resistance destroyed the Total Strategy. Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Assess the extent of the growth of nationalism in Malaya under Japanese occupation.**	**30**
	Indicative content	
	Responses should assess the extent to which the nature of the occupation encouraged the growth of nationalism as well as how far the Japanese promoted nationalism to make a clear judgement.	
	Nationalism was slow in developing in Malaya primarily because the Malays were loyal to their feudal rulers who showed little interest in political change. However, the Japanese contributed to the growth of Malay nationalism as they destroyed the myth of European superiority by promoting the anti-colonial theme of 'Asia for the Asians'. The nature of Japanese occupation with its harsh rule also encouraged the growth of nationalism; politically, it marked a turning point in Malaya's history. Malays were given some administrative posts by the Japanese which encouraged their political awareness. They sought to assert their rights and identity in the face of foreign rule. The Malay-educated intelligentsia sought to use the Japanese to achieve their social and political goals. This surge in nationalism played a key role in the eventual push for independence from colonial rule.	
	The Japanese occupation was the first break in the continuity of colonial rule leading to an awakening of Malayan politics. In 1938, Kesatuan Melayu Muda (KMM) had been formed by Ibrahim Yaacob aiming to achieve independence from Britain. KMM was funded by the Japanese; it advocated Melayu Raya (Greater Indonesia). It collaborated with the occupiers on the understanding that Japan would unite the Dutch East Indies, Malaya and Borneo and grant them independence. It did not have widespread support.	
	However, in January 1942, the KMM were refused independence by the Japanese and disbanded. In 1943 the Japanese transferred the four northern states, Terengganu, Kedah, Perlis, and Kelantan, to Thailand. They only encouraged Malay nationalism when the tide began to turn against them in mid-1943. The Malayan branch of the Pembela Tanah Air (PETA) with Ibrahim Yaacob as its Lieutenant-Colonel was set up. Yaacob hoped to use the Japanese to gain independence and sought alliances with the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army (MPAJA). His role in PETA deepened his exposure to the Indonesian anti-colonial struggle and the Japanese finally agreed to promote a Malay national movement in July 1945. Yaacob formed the Kesatuan Rakyat Indonesia Semenanjung (KRIS) promoting a political union of independent Malaya and Indonesia but the surrender of Japan on 15 August 1945 brought it to an end.	
	In reality, the Japanese promoted a limited form of nationalism only to gain some degree of collaboration from the Malay civil service and intellectuals. They sought to foster an Asian nationalism, mobilise support for the war, promote discipline, secure obedience and cooperation, and instil the Japanese spirit in the population through the school system and propaganda spread through newspapers and radio broadcasts. People in Malaya saw much of this activity as specifically Japanese rather than Asian.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Under Japanese occupation, ethnic tensions between Malays and Chinese grew because Malays filled many administrative positions while the Chinese were treated harshly for their resistance activities. They widened the gap between Malays, Chinese and Indians and created racial tension which further complicated the process of national unity. By 1945, although nationalism had taken a greater hold in Malaya, it was not as advanced as other countries in the region and it was difficult to form a united anti-colonial front because of the divisions. Accept any other valid responses.	