



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

HISTORY (PRINCIPAL)

9769/05J

Paper 5J Special Subject: China under Mao Zedong, 1949–1976

For Examination from 2016

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

2 hours

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

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

This document consists of **11** printed pages and **1** blank page.



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.

- 1 (a) How far is Brezhnev's view of the Cultural Revolution in Document C corroborated by the views expressed in Document D? [10]**

Document C argues that in the context of other policies, the Cultural Revolution has gone against Marxist-Leninism and divided the communist world. Document D argues that it has prevented capitalist restoration and is therefore in line with true communism, and also that it is a new stage in building socialism. Document D agrees that it has been divisive but only because the USSR is supporting 'neo-restorationist elements'. Document C argues that the revolution is discrediting Marxism but the focus of D is that it is defending the essentials of Marxism and 'is the only correct position for progressive and revolutionary workers throughout the world'. Document C sees it as 'Counter Revolution' whereas D sees it as defending revolution against revisionism applauded by bourgeois elements. Document D is unconcerned with the views of imperialists whereas C is concerned that the Cultural Revolution will give grist to the imperialists' mill. Both do see problems – even D sees forces set in motion which got out of control and C sees a threat to the people's democratic power; but the differences are greater.

In origin, both C and D are from outside observers; both are from a communist background. However, D is so far removed from power that it can afford to sympathise with the radicalism and renewal it sees in China; C is from a position of power and this brings more responsibility and concern for the view of communism from the outside world. Document D responds to perceived idealism and may not be in a position to know fully what is going on. Document C is responding to perceived instability and a gulf between Soviet and Chinese communism and may well be better informed of the actual disruptions.

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents that the motivation for the Cultural Revolution was political rather than ideological? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]**

Document A may well suggest political motivation because the victims have to beg Mao to forgive their crimes. However, the reference to ‘reactionary authority’ and the violence with which traditional authority figures are treated suggests a radical ideology which is targeting all forms of previous traditional hierarchy. The source is not intent on explaining but rather on recounting the violent effects and it may be that local animosities played a part; but the typicality of these scenes all over China suggests that in a broad sense ideological motivation is behind this. Document B also suggests ideology and suggests that the Cultural Revolution aimed to defend the proletarian revolution against bourgeois corruption. It suggests that ideological purity has been threatened by forces within the party and makes direct reference to ‘revolutionary ideology’. The references to the inter-party strife may suggest a political dimension, but the thrust is ideological.

Document C challenges the ideological justification for the Cultural Revolution and sees the struggle in terms of international politics, with hostility directed to Russia over political disagreements. Far from ideologically-based promotion of socialism, this source sees counter revolution. In context this refers to the political desire of Mao to overcome possible enemies in the party and to build his own authority again rather than an ideological desire to renew the revolution. Document D sees ideology at the core of the Cultural Revolution and rejects the alternative explanation of splits between Mao and his supporters and Liu Shao-chi. For D, this is a resistance to bourgeois change and revisionism – the only correct solution for progressive and revolutionary workers.

Document E sees the revolution in a political context of declining international influence and the political fallout from the Great Leap Forward. There is also the suggestion that personal power rather than ideology lay at the core and that Mao was reviving ancient imperial/mythical traditions. To assess these views candidates could use their contextual knowledge of the Cultural Revolution including: the questioning of Mao’s leadership in the wake of the failures of the Great Leap Forward; the concern about the rift with Russia; Mao’s previous actions to secure personal power and eliminate rivals; factions within the leadership and the influence of Mao’s wife and the so-called ‘gang of four’. Against this candidates could note the genuine fervour with which, as A shows, the Cultural Revolution was waged; the impact of years of ideological propaganda and the genuine feeling that the Revolution should be revived.

2 How far do purely military factors explain the Communist victory in 1949?

[30]

AO1/AO2 – Candidates should set the rise of Mao and the importance of his ideas, especially about the role of the peasants, his reputation and the myths of the Long March and the defence of the communist strongholds, his strategic ideas and his personal appeal, against the following: the weakness of his enemies, both in the party and in the Guomindang; the unpopularity of Jiang Jieshi's continuing links with foreign powers; the military failures of the Guomindang in the Civil War; the acquisition of Japanese military resources abandoned in Manchuria; the economic problems, particularly inflation; the desire of the peasants for land reform; and the role of other communist leaders, especially in the military sphere. On the other hand, the CCP took this opportunity to confront the Japanese. The CCP fought courageously, although they were poorly equipped with mostly improvised weapons. The Chinese saw this as patriotic and supported them with food, shelter and men.

The majority of the population were poor peasants. Mao had adapted the theory of Marxist revolution to make peasant support crucial, and in theory and practice the CCP stood as a contrast to the GMD and Jiang. The image projected by CCP propaganda was that government officials were corrupt, manipulating the currency so that they could profit, and abusing their power in order to take money from the people. Mao understood the importance of the masses, and promised land reforms whereby rich landlords were driven off their land, which was then distributed among the poor farmers. In the Soviets run by the CCP, there were examples of progressive reforms – schools and medical treatment. Mao recognised that the peasants were the source of food supply. He sent officials to work alongside peasants so that they would better appreciate their difficulties.

Mao once said 'women hold up half the sky.' He understood the importance of the role of women in society and that half of the population were women. He helped them by giving them rights they never used to have, abolishing 'feet-binding' and giving them a right to work.

Mao's influence on strategy has been disputed, but the CCP and GMD did have different tactics and fighting style. Because the CCP were poorly equipped, they chose to fight with guerrilla tactics and refrained from head-on confrontation. The CCP's army consisted mainly of volunteers whose morale was high because they believed in what they were fighting for – a better life. The GMD on the other hand had conscripts; they were forced into fighting and had no belief or sense of loyalty to their superiors. This eventually led to mass desertions and therefore victory in battle for the CCP. Mao accepted that there would be a prolonged struggle but that logic and revolutionary theory meant that the CCP would be victorious, and this confidence and persistence were important elements in his leadership, despite its faults. The failure of the GPD, however, meant that even their US allies had become sceptical of their ability to offer stable leadership.

Candidates should judge whether military factors were mainly responsible for communist victory or whether, for all his faults, Mao provided other key elements in the success, particularly in his adaptation of Marxism to meet peasant needs. Candidates should also take external factors into account.

3 Assess the view that Communist rule brought little economic benefit to the Chinese people in the period 1949–65. [30]

AO1 – In 1949 China was economically weak. The economy had been disrupted by war and inflation was a serious problem; industrial output had dropped by 75% since 1937. In order to stabilise the economy, the People's Republic introduced a new currency, controlled it strictly, and set all wages by the price of five staple products: rice, coal, flour, oil and cotton. The regime was committed to control of the economy, but the full extent of this was not apparent immediately. In 1950, the government passed the Agrarian Reform Law, which officially ended land ownership in China. All land and agricultural tools were to be evenly distributed among the landlords, rich peasants, and poor peasants. In reality, though, the enforcement of the law led to bitter trials in local rural communities. Poor peasants denounced the landlords and rich peasants. Most lost everything and many were executed. Not until 1953 did the Chinese government collectivise farms. In the first stage, peasants were required to help one another on their various plots of land. In the second stage, peasants were required to pool their tools, labour and land, though they still retained rights over individual plots. In the third stage, completed in 1956, farms were completely collectivised under co-operative communities of farmers. By 1957, there were some 800,000 collective farms in China, each consisting of about 600 to 700 individuals. Finally, in 1958, the social life of the country was transformed into communes.

By and large, Mao was wedded to a Stalinist programme and launched the First Five Year Plan in 1953. Under this plan, China embarked on an ambitious project of building factories and infrastructure. Even though the plan wasn't implemented until 1955, the massive outlay of industrial investment doubled industrial output in China by 1957. The Second Five Year Plan followed in 1958. In addition, the government completely reformed education to emphasise science and engineering over liberal arts; the university curriculum was reformed to emphasise technical studies and specialisation over broad knowledge. A more characteristic Maoist policy emerged in 1958, partly because of the limitations of the Five Year plans and partly as a result of a desire to use China's greatest resource – labour – and to pursue social engineering on a larger scale.

In February 1958, the National People's Congress announced the 'Great Leap Forward' movement that called for major increases in steel production and electrical and coal output. The goal was to surpass British industrial output by 1972. In order to achieve this, the planners of the Great Leap Forward blurred the distinction between industry and agriculture and encouraged new communes in which there would be small-scale industrial production in the form of 'backyard furnaces'. Agriculture would be modernised by large-scale schemes and overall planning. The social distinctions between urban workers and peasants would be reduced and the socialist community would emerge in a more idealised form. The Great Leap Forward produced spectacular results in output; the quality, however, left much to be desired, as the government later admitted. Most of the steel produced was simply useless because backyard furnaces could not produce quality steel the way giant steel mills could. The disruption to agriculture is said to have had much more serious consequences. It is estimated that millions of people died as a result of the famine which followed.

AO2 – Candidates could argue that in the light of China's situation in 1949 with raging inflation, the material destruction from years of war, the industrial limitations and the need for land reform, the earlier years of communist rule did bring benefits despite the flaws in the programmes and the weaknesses of central planning and misplaced campaigns. Candidates might debate the effects of the Great Leap Forward after 1958 with some candidates seeing an improvement in infrastructure and in the use of China's greatest resource – labour – and others simply seeing disruption, famine and unproductive attempts to localise production in communes for ideological rather than practical reasons. Most candidates will put forward an unfavourable view of the later period, but it is important to see economic achievements or lack of them in context.

4 How successfully did Communist China conduct its relations with the USA in the period 1949–76? [30]

AO1 / AO2 – Initially the USA was seen as the Imperialist supporter of the Guomindang and any chance of normal relations was ended by the virtual expulsion of US consular staff on the mainland and then by Chinese involvement in the Korean War. The large-scale invasion by Chinese ‘volunteers’ drove US forces into headlong retreat, but China was at a military disadvantage as the USA was an atomic power and was prepared to use atomic weapons. Chinese participation ensured US hostility for 20 years, endangered China and encouraged US support for Taiwan; it prevented China from being part of the UN and isolated her. Similarly, Chinese support for North Vietnam worsened relations. At its peak, Chinese military involvement reached 170,000 troops and substantial help was given to North Vietnam from 1962. This confirmed US hostility, and trade with China was restricted by US embargoes. In the end, China failed to establish a firm alliance with North Vietnam after the victory and faced a war in 1979. However, given declining relations with the USSR and the advantages that economic links with the USA might bring and the danger of nuclear conflict and isolation, China was pragmatic enough to maintain links at ambassadorial level with the USA after 1954 and to negotiate a relaxation of trade restrictions in 1969.

Recognising the attractions that entering China’s markets had for the USA and the mutual hostility to Russia, China encouraged more links including the famous ‘Ping Pong’ diplomacy, using Romania and Pakistan as intermediaries. Kissinger visited Beijing secretly in 1971 and in February 1972 there was Nixon’s famous visit to China. Zhou Enlai overcame internal opposition in China and disquiet among its allies (Lin Biao, the head of the army, died in mysterious circumstances after opposing the talks) and saw that China might gain more than she gave. Indeed, China continued to influence South-east Asia, giving aid to North Vietnam and the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia; it gained more security and did not have to budget for conflict against both Russia and the USA. China gained co-operation against unwelcome Russian influence in African states in which China had an interest and gained from the end of trade restrictions. China kept the momentum going with a US liaison office in 1973 and a visit by Ford after Nixon’s fall. Despite human rights abuses, the USA has recognised the value of relations with China and in the post-Mao period economic relations have increased in importance.

Candidates might argue that there was a failure to develop relations by continuing interference in South-east Asia after 1972 and an excessively ideological approach before 1969. Others may see a growing flexibility and an ability to see where China’s diplomatic and economic interests lay.

