



**Cambridge International Examinations**  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**HISTORY**

**9769/71**

Paper 5J China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

**May/June 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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

**Special Subject: Source-based Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) This question is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.
- (b) Examiners will be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.
- (c) The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Question (a)****Band 3: 8–10 marks**

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

**Band 2: 4–7 marks**

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

**Band 1: 1–3 marks**

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Question (b)****Band 4: 16–20 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

**Band 3: 11–15 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

**Band 2: 6–10 marks**

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated.

**Band 1: 1–5 marks**

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

**Special Subject: Essay Question**

*These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.*

**Introduction**

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and should be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners will give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 4 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

**Band 5: 25–30 marks**

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**Band 4: 19–24 marks**

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

**Band 3: 13–18 marks**

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

**Band 2: 7–12 marks**

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 1: 1–6 marks**

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

**Band 0: 0 marks**

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

## Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>To what extent does Document D corroborate the view of the importance of Taiwan to China expressed in Document B?</b></p> <p>Similarities: Both refer to the US military presence which is of obvious importance to China and both have anti-American resentment. Both refer to Japan as an issue – Document B to ‘Japanese imperialism’ and Document D to ‘foreign forces including the Japanese government’ as an issue. Document D confirms the existence of Chinese hostility to the independence of Taiwan and the US military presence.</p> <p>Differences: The thrust of the documents is different. For Document B it is a ‘useful’ issue for China more than a matter of real conviction. It is convenient for China to have this threat which brings together themes: US imperialism, hatred of Chiang, memories of Japanese imperialism. Document D suggests that there are real and not merely ‘useful’ grievances – Taiwan is part of China and its people are Chinese. There are historical claims and real resentment of foreign interference.</p> <p>Provenance Document D is from 1971, though the visiting scholars did not write their account until the following year and Document B is a magazine article from 1957, which shows the continued importance of Taiwan. Chou is unlikely to confirm the more cynical view of the issue to the visiting scholars. There is obviously no hint of the issue being convenient and every suggestion that there are genuine concerns and national feeling. The American commentator sees less conviction, but may be underestimating the genuine dislike of China for what is seen as violation of territory (in disputes with India, China showed concern for historic frontiers). Could China have seized the island if it had wanted to end the issue? This is doubtful in 1957 given the US possession of nuclear weapons. One document may underplay the diplomatic use of a ready-made grievance and one may underestimate the emotional significance of the issue.</p>	10



Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that US support for Taiwan was the main reason for tension between China and the USA in the period 1949–1972? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</b></p> <p>A and B see the Taiwan issue as being manipulated as part of wider policies. A sees the US wanting indefinite US dominance in the region and hoping that the military threat will weaken the Chinese Communist regime, hoping for an ‘internal breakdown’. Thus Taiwan is part of a much deeper tension and concern for the Far East as a whole. B indicates that Taiwan is merely a useful means of provoking Chinese and world opinion against the USA rather than necessarily being the main reason for conflict in itself. However, there are intrinsic issues – dislike of US military presence on the island and hostility to Chiang. This is more explicitly developed in C where Taiwan is seen as a US colony and a threat to the homeland. It also means that China is deprived of a seat at the UN. However, despite the references to threats from saboteurs and warships and plane, the issue is put in a wider context by reference to Chinese dislike of US containment and encirclement. It is difficult to see a genuine threat, but A might corroborate that China did face hostility and a desire by the US to end its regime. F read in connection with B this document could be trying to mobilise internal opinion against the US and bolster the regime by building up fears. In the context of internal developments and upheavals in China in 1966 and the anti-foreign feeling, this might suggest that Taiwan is being over stressed as an issue. D seems to suggest that Taiwan was of intrinsic importance, but given the nature of the occasion – a visit by Asian scholars – the broader issues are unlikely to have been raised. This broader hostility and desire for world revolution is referred to in E suggesting that Taiwan is of less importance than the overall hostility and tension between China and the West. It is argued here that ‘world revolution’, preparation for some apocalyptic confrontation with the west and possible nuclear war were behind Chinese foreign policy in the 1960s as well as stirring up revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Here, as in A, Taiwan in itself is not the issue, but rather much longer-term and extensive ideological rivalry. However, statements made in, People’s Daily in 1965 do need to be seen in the context of emerging power struggles and growing internal radicalism. In the same way as A should be seen in the broader context of US fears about Communism and the desire for its leaders to be seen to be taking an appropriately robust line.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>'The victory of 1949 owed less to the ideals of Communism and more to the personal appeal of Mao.'</b> Discuss.</p> <p>AO1 – It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. The case for Mao's leadership to be a key factor may rest on his ability to adapt Marxist-Leninism to conditions in China and so ensure that the Communists were sufficiently practical and pragmatic to get vital peasant support. His military theories and influence on the conduct of strategy could be seen as a major element which led to victory. He has been seen as a brilliant organiser whose leadership in the CCP Soviets was vital in maintaining support. His role in maintaining the discipline of the movement, in the Long March and as a guerrilla leader was praised by his admirers. His ability to sustain confidence and to inspire have been praised.</p> <p>AO2 – Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. While it may be doubted whether in a Chinese setting the ideals of Marxism were the main impetus for revolution, some may also doubt whether Mao's leadership was the key factor in success. Traditional Marxism had limited relevance to a predominantly agrarian society and promises of land redistribution, the conciliatory policies towards the peasants and the hatred of landlords might have been more important than ideology. However, the devotion to an ideal was a factor in keeping the outnumbered and harassed Communist forces from destruction after 1928. Regardless of Mao's actual qualities, his appeal was considerable, based on a range of theoretical writings and the myths that he was able to generate about key events like the Long March and his abilities as a leader. Some see the appeal of a sort of Emperor figure being more significant than political ideals.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>To what extent did China benefit from the economic and social changes brought about by Mao's regime between 1949 and 1956?</b></p> <p>AO1 – Policies that might be considered are: Land Confiscation and redistribution. Peasants were encouraged to identify landlord how suffered humiliation as class conflict was stirred by Party cadres. A great deal of violence occurred, but the party did not target better-off peasants for fear of famine. There were only cautious moves to collectivisation in the early period in power and encouragement rather than compulsion to join mutual-aid teams. A major element in social policy was emancipation of women. The new Marriage Law of 1950 outlawed arranged marriages, concubinage and provided for more equal property rights. There were educational changes to deal with high illiteracy rates and low school attendance. By 1956 there had been improvements, but still less than half of children between 7 and 16 were in school. There was also expansion of higher education. Public health issues were addressed by mass campaigns using local street and neighbourhood committees to discourage bad hygiene habits. There were improvements in drinking water and sewage. It proved more difficult to increase doctors, hospitals and local health centres. By 1952 the problems of food supply were incentivising more peasant cooperatives and the pooling of peasant resources and holdings. This policy proceeded fitfully in the face of peasant resistance; but food shortages led to requisitioning in 1954. In 1955 Mao pushed forward with collectivisation - by mid-1955 some 17 million peasant households belonged to cooperatives and by late 1956 only 3% of land was being farmed by individuals. In 1952 the first Five-Year Plan was introduced aimed at developing iron and steel, communications, machine tools and chemicals. Urban workers were fed by government procuring food at low prices from the peasants. Industrial growth was financed by loans from the USSR often repaid by food exports. Urban growth led to the increase of town dwellers from 57m in 1949 to 100m in 1956.</p> <p>AO2 – Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Discussion might be about the extent to which different elements in China benefited. The landowners and the traditional economic elites did not. Peasants did get land ownership, but increasingly lost control through the moves to cooperatives, the requisitioning and the Five-Year Plan's need for surpluses to be taken at low prices. There were improvements in health and education, but not as rapidly as might have been hoped, given the shortages of personnel and money and the conflicting needs to maintain a large defence establishment. There was social change in terms of greater equality between classes and between men and women, though here too there were limits as traditional attitudes in the countryside were hard to erode.</p> <p>Living standards in the cities rose, but the Soviet style industrialisation brought new disciplines and a lack of consumer goods. No set judgements are required and many will compare the society of 1956 favourably with that of China in the 30s and 40s. However, there were losers as well as beneficiaries.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>‘The Cultural Revolution was brought about more by Mao’s desire to increase his personal power than by his ideological concerns.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p>AO1 – In 1956 Mao announced that there should be more intellectual debate and criticism of the party and consideration of the progress made. ‘Let a Hundred Flowers blossom, Let a Hundred schools of thought contend’. The results of economic and social change had not been as great as had been hoped and there were disputes within the leadership. Mao’s own plans were being frustrated by officials and he turned to ‘intellectuals’ i.e. those with higher education and technical skills to help to develop China. Many educated people had stayed in China eager to participate in the transformation – but the Party was suspicious and exercised control of free debate. By 1956 the control of education, ideas and media was great enough to risk more debate without fear of ‘counter-revolution’. Plans for large scale collectivization and industrialisation were underway but had been met with some delays and opposition. Mao may have felt that debate might stimulate a greater paced of change. Mao feared that the party might ossify and that bureaucracy would obstruct on-going radical change and that a period of criticism of officialdom would sweep away barriers to change. Fearful of the type of opposition seen in Hungary when Khrushchev had attempted more openness, Mao’s fellow leaders opposed the policy which increased Mao’s determination and in 1957 he reiterated its aims and toured China to persuade local officials to accept the new policy. The politburo gave way. And there followed from May 1957 a considerable amount of criticisms that the party had oppressed the people by its bureaucracy and controls. Critical posters, public meetings and press articles appeared. The most famous was the Democracy Wall at Beijing University. Mao reacted critically, accusing ‘revisionists’ and ‘rightists’ of abusing the campaign and ‘poisonous weeds’ emerging rather than the promised flowers. In July 1957 there was a campaign against intellectuals – a wave of repression against critical students and intellectuals involved perhaps 500 000 victims.</p> <p>AO2 – Some see a deliberate plot to draw out opposition and attack the intellectuals that Mao distrusted and despised. Others see an improvised and poorly thought out strategy to try and cope with under performance in economic policy. Mao’s tendency to promote dynamic change to recreate revolutionary enthusiasm and to bolster his own leadership may be at the back of the campaign. Its consequences were to repress criticism, to make Mao and his party aware that there was a danger of opposition and to encourage a more radical strategy in the Great Leap Forward. In some ways the reaction against the educated classes anticipated, too, the Cultural Revolution.</p>	30