



## History

### Higher level and standard level

### Paper 1 – source booklet

Tuesday 9 May 2017 (afternoon)

1 hour

#### Instructions to candidates

- Do not open this source booklet until instructed to do so.
- This source booklet contains the sources required for history higher level and standard level paper 1.
- Read all the sources from one prescribed subject.
- The sources in this paper may have been edited and/or abridged: word additions or explanations are shown in square brackets [ ]; substantive deletions of text are indicated by ellipses ... ; minor changes are not indicated.

Prescribed subject 1: Military leaders	Sources A – D
Prescribed subject 2: Conquest and its impact	Sources E – H
Prescribed subject 3: The move to global war	Sources I – L
Prescribed subject 4: Rights and protest	Sources M – P
Prescribed subject 5: Conflict and intervention	Sources Q – T

**Prescribed subject 1: Military leaders**

Read sources A to D and answer questions 1 to 4.

The sources and questions relate to Case study 1: Genghis Khan c1200–1227 – Campaigns: Mongol invasion of China: attacks on the Jin dynasty; capture of Beijing (1215).

**Source A** An anonymous author, writing for the Mongol royal family after Genghis Khan's death, in *The Secret history of the Mongols* (c14th century).

Genghis Khan set out to fight the people of north China. First he took the city of Fuzhou then marching through the Wild Fox Pass he took the city of Xuandefu. From here he sent out an army under Jebe's command to take the fortress of Zhuyongguan.

When Jebe arrived there he saw that it was well defended, so he said "I'll trick them and make them come out in the open. I'll pretend to retreat and when they come out, I'll attack them." So Jebe retreated and the north Chinese army cried "Let's go after them!" They poured out of their fortifications until the valleys and mountainsides were full of their soldiers. Jebe retreated to Sondi-i-wu Ridge and there he turned his army round to attack as the enemy rushed towards him in waves.

The north Chinese army was beaten. Close behind Jebe's forces came Genghis Khan, commanding the great Middle Army. They too attacked, forcing the north Chinese army to retreat.

**Source B** John Man, an historian specializing in Chinese and Mongolian history, writing in the biography *Genghis Khan, Life, Death and Resurrection* (2004).

The attack would not be easy. From a population ten times that of the Mongols, the Jin Emperor could draw cavalry and infantry numbering several hundred thousand, and his cities were well fortified.

Genghis's invasion was carefully planned. In spring 1211 the Mongols advanced across the Gobi, well spread out and in several waves in order not to drain the scattered wells and pools. This was a huge operation: imagine something like 100 000 warriors with 300 000 horses, strung out in perhaps 10–20 groups of 5 000 to 10 000 each, each with camel-drawn carts, and all linked by fast-moving messengers as the army travelled 800 kilometres.

As the Mongol army spilled into northern China and approached the pass that led to Beijing, the Jin commander seems to have made a fatal mistake. He had a chance of launching a surprise attack when the Mongols were looting. Instead, perhaps to win time, he sent an officer to discuss peace terms. The officer promptly defected [joined the opposing side] with the information that the Jin were waiting at the far end of the pass. There the Jin cavalry, packed between ridges, was overwhelmed by arrows and a Mongol charge. Horsemen turned and trampled their own infantry.

**Source C**

Frank McLynn, a military historian, writing in an academic biography, *Genghis Khan: His conquests, His empire, His legacy* (2015).

The three pitched battles fought in September 1211 destroyed the Jin as a credible battlefield force. It is difficult to convey the extent of the Chinese losses at battles such as Badger Mouth, but nine years later travellers reported the fields of carnage still covered with bones. At the imperial court Chih-Chung was widely blamed for the disaster. It was said that he was too timid, that he should have attacked the Mongols with cavalry alone, and much earlier while they were still pillaging, but that he insisted on fighting with both cavalry and infantry on the field ...

Genghis ordered Jebe to take Chu-yung chuan, a fortified pass. Jebe found Nankou, the town at the end of the pass, too strong to be taken by assault so he pretended to retreat. All along the fifteen-mile pass were fortresses perched on steep slopes. At news of Jebe's retreat the soldiers all rushed out, eager to be in at the kill. Jebe led them on a chase for thirty-five miles, stretching them out so that the various groups of pursuers lost touch with each other. Then he turned and demolished them one group at a time, spreading panic that in the end led the defenders of Chu-yung chuan to surrender to the Mongols.

Early in November Genghis and the main army marched down the pass and pitched camp twenty miles from Peking [Beijing], accepting the surrender of three other important fortresses.

**Source D**

An unknown artist depicts Mongol horsemen and the conditions they faced as they battled Jin warriors in the mountains. From *The Compendium of Chronicles* by Rashid-al-Din Hamadani (early 14th century).



**End of prescribed subject 1**

**Turn over**

## Prescribed subject 2: Conquest and its impact

Read sources E to H and answer questions 5 to 8.

The sources and questions relate to Case study 1: The final stages of Muslim rule in Spain – Context and motives: Social and economic context in Iberia and Al-Andalus in the late 15th century; heavy taxation.

**Source E** José Enrique López de Coca Castañer, a professor of medieval history, writing in the article “Institutions on the Castilian-Granadan Frontier” in the collection of academic essays *Medieval Frontier Societies* (1989).

We can distinguish between treaties where the sultan of Granada agreed to be a vassal of the king of Castile [a vassal being a person who holds land on condition of service to a ruler], and truces, which were merely suspensions of hostilities. The Nasrid dynasty had begun its historical existence as a Castilian vassal in the mid-13th century. This vassalage had been a condition of survival, but it also meant that a basic contradiction was built into the fabric of the state.

For a Muslim ruler to be a vassal of a Christian sovereign revolted [went against] every principle of Islamic law. And the vassalage of Granada was not only humiliating but a financial burden. It involved the sultan’s attendance at the Castilian court and the sending of military contingents to fight against fellow Muslims as well as Christians. Granada also had to pay large sums of money, known as *parias*, as an annual tribute to Castile. In order to get the money, the sultans taxed their Muslim population far more heavily than Shari’a or religious law allowed.

**Source F** The Treaty of Granada (1491), signed between Abu Abdallah [Boabdil], king of Granada, and Isabella and Ferdinand, queen and king of Castile and Aragon.

Article 3. Isabella, Ferdinand, and Prince Juan [their son] will, after the surrender, accept all Granadans – from King Abu Abdallah [Boabdil] down, great and small, men and women – as their vassals and natural subjects. In return the monarchs guarantee to let them remain in their houses, estates, and to protect their inheritance now and for all time. Isabella and Ferdinand will not allow any harm to be done to the Granadans without due legal process and without cause, nor will the Granadans have their estates and property or any part thereof taken from them; furthermore, the Granadans will be honoured and respected by all Christian vassals ...

Article 14. Neither Abu Abdallah nor any other Moor of Granada will have to pay taxes on their houses for three years. They will simply have to pay a harvest tax of one-tenth in August and autumn, and one-tenth on cattle in their possession in April and May, as the Christians are accustomed to paying.

**Source G**

Diego Melo Carrasco, a professor of medieval history, writing in an article “En torno al vasallaje y las parias en las treguas entre Granada y Castilla (XIII–XV): Una posibilidad de análisis” [On vassalage and parias in the truces between Granada and Castile (13th–15th centuries): a possibility of analysis], for the academic journal *Medievalismo* [*Medievalism*] (2012).

The parias [tribute] payments always existed between the two states in recognition of the hegemony [dominance] of Castile, and they were one of the main causes of conflict between them. For Granada, making these payments was never pleasant, since they hinted at Granada’s inferiority with respect to Castile. In addition to monetary taxation, vassalage was accompanied by commercial exchanges, the development of border institutions and constant Castilian interference in domestic affairs in Granada.

The reason for the fighting between Castile and Granada would have been, almost always, the restoration of that vassalage, especially when the Muslim ruler did not want to accept it. That is to say, war was waged to restore submission and the parias payments. For their part, the Sultans of Granada visited their Castilian overlord on various occasions, especially during the 13th and 15th centuries, to pay their respects, request truces, or simply because they were called to court to resolve political issues.

**Source H**

Alejandro Ferrant y Fischermans, a Spanish painter of historic and religious themes, depicts payment of parias in the 11th century in a detail from *Payment of tributes to Sancho Garcés III* (1865). The payment of parias by Muslim rulers to Christian rulers was a significant element of their relationship until 1492.



**End of prescribed subject 2**

**Prescribed subject 3: The move to global war**

Read sources I to L and answer questions 9 to 12.

The sources and questions relate to Case study 1: Japanese expansion in East Asia (1931–1941) – Responses: International response, including US initiatives and increasing tensions between the US and Japan.

**Source I** Andrew Gordon, a US historian, writing in the book *A Modern History of Japan: From Tokugawa Times to the Present* (2003).

When Japan moved into northern Indochina, the US responded with a gradually expanding export embargo. This provoked some sections of the Japanese military to argue for a pre-emptive strike against the United States and its allies. Japan followed this by extending their hold over Indochina, gaining Vichy permission to occupy the entire peninsula in July 1941 [‘Vichy’ refers to the government of the French state between 1940 and 1944]. The agreement left Japan as the virtual ruler of the French colony.

The Americans countered this advance with a strong and threatening move. Roosevelt immediately pulled together an international embargo that cut off all foreign oil supplies to Japan. He also offered military supplies to China. Without oil Japan could not sustain its military or economy. It faced a difficult choice. It could agree to American conditions for lifting the embargo by retreating completely from China. Or it could take control of the Southeast Asian oil fields by force and negotiate for a ceasefire from that strengthened position.

For a time, it pursued both courses. Japanese diplomats sought in vain to negotiate a formula for a partial retreat in China that might satisfy both their own reluctant army and the United States. The Japanese military, meanwhile, drew up plans for an attack that might force the Western powers to recognize its hegemony in Asia.

**Source J** Osami Nagano, Chief of the Japanese Naval General Staff, speaking at the Imperial Conference, 6 September 1941.

Based on the assumption that a peaceful solution has not been found and war is inevitable, the Empire’s oil supply, as well as the stockpiles of many other important war materials, is being used up day by day with the result that the national defence power is gradually diminishing. If this deplorable situation is left unchecked, I believe that, after a lapse of some time, the nation’s strength will diminish.

On the other hand, the defence of military installations and key points of Britain, the United States and other countries in the Far East, as well as military preparations of these nations, particularly those of the United States, are being strengthened so quickly that by next year we will find it difficult to oppose them. Therefore, wasting time now could be disastrous for the Empire. I believe that it is imperative [essential] for the Empire that it should first make the fullest preparations and lose no time in carrying out positive operations with firm determination, in order that it can find a way out of the difficult situation.

**Source K**

Chihiro Hosoya, a Japanese professor of history, writing in the article "Miscalculations in Deterrent Policy: US-Japanese Relations, 1938-1941", for the academic publication *Journal of Peace Research* (1968).

According to a US public opinion survey of late September [1941], the number of Americans favouring strong action against Japan had greatly increased. Furthermore, Roosevelt stated on 12 October that the United States would not be intimidated. The Tripartite Pact had worsened relations with the United States. Japanese army officers demanded an acceleration of southern expansion. Even before the Tripartite Pact, Japan had demanded permission to move troops into southern Indochina and did so on 28 July. The Japanese pressures on Indochina led the US government to freeze Japanese assets in the United States and to impose an embargo against Japan. Officers in the Japanese navy were resolved to go to war because of the oil embargo. They were anxious about the existing supply of oil turning the Japanese navy into a "paper navy" [powerless navy].

**Source L**

David Low, a cartoonist, depicts Japanese expansion in the cartoon "Enough in the tank to get to that filling station?" in the British newspaper *The Evening Standard* (8 August 1941). The sign on the side of the building is "Dutch E. [East] Indies" and on the vehicle it is "Jap. [Japanese] Oil Reserves".



**End of prescribed subject 3**

**Turn over**

#### Prescribed subject 4: Rights and protest

Read sources M to P and answer questions 13 to 16.

The sources and questions relate to Case Study 1: Civil rights movement in the United States (1954–1965) – Nature and characteristics of discrimination: Segregation and education; Brown versus Board of Education decision (1954).

Note: In Source M the word “Negro” is used to reflect the place and time of the original English language source. Today, in many countries, the word is no longer in common usage.

**Source M** Earl Warren, US Chief Justice, delivers the decision of the US Supreme Court in Brown v Board of Education, 17 May 1954.

We cannot turn the clock back to 1896 when Plessy versus Ferguson [a court judgment that had ruled that it was legal to have segregated schools as long as those schools had equal facilities] was written. We must consider public education in the full light of its present place in American life throughout the nation ... In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education ... Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be available to all on equal terms.

We come then to the question presented: Does segregation of children in schools on the basis of race, even though the facilities may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does ... To separate Negro students from others solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority ... that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone ...

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of “separate but equal” has no place. Separate educational facilities are unequal.

**Source N** Photograph of protesters at a pro-segregation rally in Baltimore, 1954. The posters at the front of the photograph read: “We want our rights”; “We can’t fight alone. Join us now!”; “We can’t fight alone”.





**Source O**

Tom Brady, a judge and a leader of the pro-segregation White Citizens' Council movement, writing about his speech to the Indianola Citizens' Council in his pamphlet *A Review of Black Monday* (28 October 1954).

The Supreme Court says, "You have got to sit a black boy down by a white girl to have it equal." ...

You can't do it! You can't put little boys and little girls together—blacks and whites and have them sing together, play together, dance together, and eat together, sit side by side, and walk arm in arm, and expect for the sensitivity of those white children not to be broken down. You can't do it! Why? That is exactly what has happened in the north, [but] they have a sufficient number of whites to absorb, and perhaps assimilate, the blacks ...

We can see what happens on the surface. We don't know what happens to the brain of [a black] man ... We don't know what it takes to make his mind different from our mind.

This Supreme Court sets aside all the laws of biology! By putting these children together in schools we will abolish all racial differences that God made. I have a little field [at the] back of my home. I notice the blackbirds stay together ... I notice the geese and the ducks stayed separate from each other and yet the Supreme Court would set aside these basic laws of God and of nature and compel these various individuals to mingle, just as you would blackbirds with partridges ...

**Source P**

Michael Klarman, a professor of history, writing about the effect of the Supreme Court's 1955 judgment, *Brown II*, in the academic book *Brown v Board of Education and the Civil Rights Movement* (2007). In *Brown II*, the Supreme Court decided on "gradualism", that is, the gradual application of the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v Board of Education* (1954) to end school segregation.

*Brown II* was a clear victory for white southerners ... The Court approved gradualism, imposed no deadlines for beginning or completing desegregation, issued vague guidelines, and entrusted the final decision to local judges. When informed of the decision, Florida legislators [law-makers] broke into cheers ... A Mississippi politician celebrated the fact that a local Mississippi judge would decide when desegregation would be feasible [practical]. Southern law-makers commented that desegregation might be feasible in another fifty or one hundred years.

Black leaders were disappointed with the decision ... A black journalist, John H. McCray, admitted that he "can't find too much to cheer about", and he criticized the Supreme Court for "seeking to do business" with diehard [determined] southern segregationists.

**End of prescribed subject 4**

**Prescribed subject 5 : Conflict and intervention**

Read sources Q to T and answer questions 17 to 20.

The sources and questions relate to Case study 2: Kosovo (1989–2002) – Causes of the conflict: Ethnic tensions between Serbs and Kosovar Albanians, rising Albanian nationalism.

**Source Q** Julie Mertus, a professor of law, writing in an academic history book, *Kosovo: how myths and truths started a war* (1999).

Politicians manipulate public fears in order to suit their own needs to stay in power ... An antidemocratic coalition within Serbia began to formulate a nationalist ideology and produce propaganda. Serbs were said to be the victims of Albanians in Kosovo; they needed the protection of a strong leader like Slobodan Milosevic ... In an atmosphere of economic and political insecurity, the victimization ideology begun in Kosovo caught on quickly ...

Over time, the nationalism became radicalized: difference was framed in terms of perceived physical differences in skin, nose, ears, sexuality ... A gendered imagery of Albanian men and women was adopted. In the Serbian and Yugoslav presses, Albanian men were accused of violence against women, although Kosovo had the lowest reported incidents of sexual violence in Yugoslavia. Albanian women were portrayed as mere baby factories, despite statistics indicating that childbirth rates of urban Albanian women and those of other urban women in Yugoslavia were nearly identical. Accused in the past of being culturally inferior, Albanians were increasingly depicted as also being genetically inferior.

**Source R** V Mićović, a Serbian researcher, gathering data for a graduate thesis “Socijalna distanca i etničke stereotipije kod srednjoškolaca mađarske i srpske nacionalnosti” [Social distance and ethnic stereotypes in high school students of Hungarian and Serbian nationality] (1986).

160 seventeen-year-old ethnic Serbian and Hungarian High School students living in Serbia were asked questions about their ability to accept other nations. Given 50 proposed attributes, both positive and negative, students chose the ones they considered typical of each nation.

These are the Serbian students’ perceptions of Albanians.

Attributes	% of Serbian high school students who considered the attribute typical of Albanians
Undeveloped (uncivilized)	76.2
Dislike other nations	55.0
Sly [cunning and or deceitful]	55.0
Aggressive	50.0
Uncultured	50.0
United	45.0
Like to rule	42.5
Dirty	41.2
Backwards	38.8
Introverted	37.5
Insolent	36.2
Argumentative	33.8

**Source S** Djuric Bosko, a Serb who moved out of Kosovo, being interviewed by an American researcher in 1995.

I was a police officer for 32 years but I had to leave ... My neighbour was watering his yard and then he would "forget" to turn off the water and my basement would be full of water. Then they would go through my yard shouting: "Go, move out, what are you doing here?" ... It was not safe to walk during the night. Kids were often assaulted and beaten [by Albanians] ... My kids had problems at work. Serbs were never given promotions, so my children moved away...

Resolving the conflict in Kosovo depends mostly on foreign policy. Albanians have huge support from outside and therefore they don't agree to living jointly with the Serbs. They want an ethnically clean Kosovo. If they get independence, they will expel the few remaining Serbs from there ...

Their natality [birth rate] is, I think, the greatest in Europe. Every woman of theirs gives birth to ten to fifteen children, and very few Serbs have more than two or three kids. Emigrants from Albania were coming, too. Even the SUP [Secretariat of Internal Affairs, the Serbian police] was buying properties in Kosovo for them.

**Source T** Tim Judah, a reporter and political analyst, writing in an historical investigation *The Serbs: history, myth and the destruction of Yugoslavia* (2009).

Hostility between the communities was aggravated in the 1990s by poverty, which in turn became increasingly difficult to redress [remedy] because of the Albanian population explosion coupled with Yugoslavia's growing economic crisis. Increasing numbers of Serbs sought their fortune elsewhere, and in villages with small Serb populations the more Serbs that left, the more insecure were those that remained behind. They felt uncomfortable surrounded by a hostile Albanian population. Albanians claim that Serbs began to leave for economic reasons, and Serbs that they did so because they were threatened, and even attacked. There is truth in both arguments. Anti-Serb graffiti were daubed [painted] on the walls along with demands for a republic. The Yugoslav police and army clamped down harshly when angry unemployed Albanian youths demonstrated.

**End of prescribed subject 5**

---