

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/33

Paper 3, maximum raw mark 100

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 October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument.</i>
2	18–20	<i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.</i>
3	16–17	<i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.</i>
4	14–15	<i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.</i>
5	11–13	<i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.</i>
6	8–10	<i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.</i>
7	0–7	<i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Section A

1 How far do Sources A–E support the view that the United Nations is responsible for the fact that no permanent solution has been found for the Kashmir problem?

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID USE OF SOURCES [1–5]

These answers will write about the Kashmir problem and might use the sources. However, candidates will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. If sources are used, it will be to support an essay-style answer to the question.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disprove it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14–16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at their face value.

L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17–21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22–25]

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Context

In 1947 the British government partitioned its former colonies in British India into the independent states of India and Pakistan. All of the states which had made up British India, with the exception of Kashmir, were incorporated into either India or Pakistan within 2 months of the transfer of power. The ruler of Kashmir (Maharajah Hari Singh) stalled in making a decision, in the hope of negotiating independence. In October 1947, Pakistani 'tribesmen' crossed the border and occupied a third of Kashmir. In response the Maharajah appealed to India for military assistance. In order to secure this, he signed the Instrument of Accession, through which Kashmir would legally accede to India. India has since claimed Kashmir. Pakistan argues that the Instrument of Accession is invalid and Kashmir remains a disputed state in international law. Pakistan still controls one third of the state, and there is a ceasefire line monitored by the UN.

Between 1948 and 1971, the UN passed 23 resolutions relating to Kashmir which could only be enforced with the agreement of both parties. Since the Simla Agreement of 1972, India and Pakistan have to settle their differences bilaterally. The UN has played no role other than trying to ensure peace along the ceasefire line. Despite this, the UN's involvement has provided some legitimacy to Kashmiri separatist movements. While Kashmiri separatism has drawn strength from UN resolutions, the UN's framing of the conflict as inter-state (India and Pakistan) has prevented international recognition of the Kashmiri nationalist movement. Kashmir is disputed between India, Pakistan and those wanting independence.

Other factors have added to the difficulty of the issue. Kashmir shares a border with the PRC and the USSR and so Cold War politics impeded UN activities. The USSR has tended to support the Indian case, while the USA has largely sided with Pakistan, more recently because it views Pakistan as vital to controlling the threat of terrorism. India and Pakistan both have nuclear weapons, hence the UN's priority to keep the peace.

Source A

Context: An Australian academic's assessment of the Kashmir problem, 1994.

Face Value: The UN has passed a number of resolutions in an attempt to end the conflict and get Indian and Pakistani troops to leave Kashmir. The UN wants the people of Kashmir to decide their fate by plebiscite, but believes that this can only happen once Indian and Pakistani troops have left. Both India and Pakistan have refused to do this, and so UN attempts have failed (**Y – UN has failed to get India and Pakistan to withdraw their troops**). Since both India and Pakistan have some justification for their views on Kashmir and there is no compromise which would be acceptable to both. The UN does not have the authority to impose a solution (**N – UN can only solve the problem if both India and Pakistan agree to a compromise, which has not happened**).

Beyond Face Value: The source provides a factual account of the background to the Kashmir problem. It is balanced in that it sees justification in the views of India and Pakistan and does not try to lay blame on either. By contrast the last two sentences provide an opinion; i.e. that the UN is not to blame for failing to find a solution to the Kashmir problem because both India and Pakistan have justifiable arguments and because the UN lacks the authority and power to impose a solution. While this is probably based on research and contextual understanding, it remains an opinion rather than a fact (**X-Ref with Source E, which believes that the UN is responsible**). (**N, but based on an opinion**).

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Source B

Context: Extract from an American magazine, 1957.

Face Value: India defies UN instructions and is breaking its promise to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir. Despite further UN resolutions, India has declared Kashmir to be part of India and has established its own Assembly there. The source implies that India is responsible for the ongoing problems (**N – India is responsible**). The source also criticises the UN for failing to make India obey its instructions (**Qualified Y – India shares responsibility, but UN weakness enabled India to ignore UN orders**).

Beyond Face Value: Implicit criticism of the UN runs throughout the source. The fact that *'The UN is now facing another crucial test'* suggests that this is not the first time that UN resolutions have been challenged, a point confirmed later. Finding a solution to the Kashmir issue is vital for future peace and for the UN's own prestige. It is implied that UN weakness has enabled India to ignore UN resolutions (**Y – UN has failed to ensure compliance with its resolutions. X-Ref with Source E, which also blames the UN for failing to find a solution to the Kashmir problem**). The source comes from a US magazine and was targeted at an audience which would have limited knowledge of the Kashmir issue. 1957 saw the height of Cold War tensions, the source reflects US frustration with the failings of the UN and the language is emotive. Moreover, the source is simplistic – it claims that *'India is defying the Security Council's orders'*; the Security Council resolutions were merely recommendatory (**X-Ref with Source C**). Arguably, this source is less convincing than Source A, (**X-Ref with Source A**) which is both academic and balanced in its assessment (**Y, but the source is not fully reliable. The source holds India partly responsible**).

Source C

Context: Extract from an article by a Kashmiri academic, 2008.

Face Value: The UN has been consistently weak over Kashmir. It has passed resolutions but these have been ineffective. They are recommendatory rather than obligatory – both India and Pakistan would have to agree to their application. By declaring Kashmir a disputed area, the UN has encouraged the Kashmiri separatist movement, but fails to give them international recognition. (**Y – UN should have been stronger in its resolutions. It has made the problem worse by encouraging Kashmiri separatists**).

Beyond Face Value: Despite resolutions, the problem remains. (**Y – UN has failed to find a solution**). The UN has encouraged Kashmiri separatism and adding another element to the dispute between India and Pakistan. (**Y – UN has made the problem worse**). In particular, the UN has been mistaken in framing the problem as a dispute between India and Pakistan, since this ignores the wishes of the Kashmiri people. However, the source is written by a Kashmiri academic and there is bound to be some element of emotive content (**X-Ref with Source E**). The source implies that the UN has been weak in that its resolutions have been recommendatory only. However, contextual knowledge of the UN shows that they couldn't have been anything else – the veto would certainly have precluded forcible methods (**X-Ref with Source A**). (**Y, but there is an element of emotive content and the source is less balanced in its understanding of the UN's role than Source A**).

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Source D

Context: An Indian view of the problems in Kashmir, 2001.

Face Value: Pakistan failed to comply with the UN resolution requiring it to withdraw troops from Kashmir, which, under international law, is part of India. India was under no obligation to hold a plebiscite. Pakistan is entirely responsible for the outbreaks of war in 1947, 1965, 1971 and 1989. India and Pakistan should refrain from the use of force and sort out the problem by bilateral negotiations, without recourse to international institutions. Since the UN has no jurisdiction over Kashmir, the UN cannot be responsible for failure to find a solution to the problem (**N – Pakistan is entirely to blame**).

Beyond Face Value: The source claims that Kashmir is part of India (**X-Ref with Source A, which shows that Kashmir acceded to India in exchange for support against Pakistani invaders**) and the UN has no jurisdiction over it – the UN does not have the right to interfere in the domestic affairs of a member state without that state's permission. The source claims that Pakistan failed to remove its troops from Kashmir in line with the UN resolution (**X-ref with Source B**). From India's point of view, the only issue to be resolved is the removal of Pakistani troops from Indian land and the UN's role is confined to monitoring the cease fire line. (**N – UN is not responsible; Pakistan is**). The source is biased. Its claim that Kashmir's accession to India is legal and recognised in international law is technically not true, since the UN called for a plebiscite. In blaming Pakistan, the source contradicts Sources B and E, which hold India responsible because of its failure to implement a plebiscite (**X-Ref with Sources B and E**). (**N, but the biased nature of the source makes it unreliable**). The source is correct in stating that '*India and Pakistan are required to refrain from use of force and to sort out bilateral issues by negotiations...*' – the Simla agreement of 1972 stated this and led to the end of formal UN involvement in the question of Kashmir's accession to India or Pakistan. Regardless of whether responsibility rests with India or Pakistan, the fact remains that the UN's call for a plebiscite has been ignored, demonstrating a fundamental weakness in the UN's mediatory powers (**X-Ref with Source C**). (**Y**).

Source E

Context: A Kashmiri view of the problem, 2010.

Face Value: The UN has failed to force India to fulfil '*its commitments*' by holding a plebiscite for the people of Kashmir. UN inaction enabled India to behave in a brutal and violent way in order to maintain control over Kashmir (**Y**).

Beyond Face Value: Generally, the source agrees with Source B and disagrees with Source D (**X-Ref with Sources B and D**). However, given the circumstances of the speech and the position held by the speaker, it is inevitable that the source would be critical of the UN's failure to ensure that India kept to her pledge of holding a plebiscite. Contextual knowledge shows that many Kashmiri separatist movements have developed with the aim of creating an independent Kashmir as originally hoped in 1947 (**X-Ref with Sources A and C**). India claims that these are terrorist organisations, sponsored and trained by Pakistan, and has tried to suppress them. The Kashmiri people are thus divided between those wishing to remain in India, those wishing to go to Pakistan and those wishing to be independent. Arguably, a plebiscite could make worse these divisions rather than calming them. Also, the original UN plan for a plebiscite did not include the option of an independent Kashmir (**X-Ref with Source A**). Given the frustrations of the Kashmiri people, it is inevitable that they will look for someone to blame, and the UN is the obvious candidate. While criticising the UN, the source does not suggest what the UN might have done to solve the problem or how the UN might have **forced** India to comply with the call for a plebiscite. This source is opinionated, lacking the objectivity of Source A (**X-Ref with Source A**). (**Y, but the source is unreliable because of its provenance**).

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Conclusion

Some of the sources argue that India is responsible for the failure to find a solution to the Kashmir crisis; others claim that Pakistan is responsible, while Sources B, C, D and E all contain some criticism of the UN for its role. Source A is possibly most objective and shows the complexities of the issue. Perhaps understandably, given the dangers of war between India and Pakistan, the UN has viewed the problem as political, its primary concern being to maintain the ceasefire. The Simla Agreement of 1972 turned the issue into a bilateral matter between India and Pakistan, effectively removing UN jurisdiction. The UN has never passed comment on the legality of India's claim that Kashmir's accession to India in 1947 is final. Given Cold War realities and the limitations of UN power and authority, this is understandable. As a result, India sees Kashmir as a part of the state of India, Pakistan claims that the status of Kashmir remains disputed in international law because no plebiscite has been held, while Kashmiri separatists still hold out hope on the basis of UN recommendations regarding a plebiscite.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

Section B

2 ‘The Cold War broke out in Europe between 1945 and 1949 for economic rather than political reasons.’ How far do you agree?

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the USSR wanted to gain reparations from Germany to help Soviet rebuilding, whereas the USA saw a strong Germany as key to the economic recovery of Europe. The USA, fearing any future Great Depression, wanted to rebuild European economies to provide a trading partner, which explains why Truman was so keen to keep the USSR out of as much of Europe as possible. This is seen by revisionist historians as the real aim of the Marshall Plan – a Plan which Stalin referred to as ‘dollar imperialism’. The USSR wanted its buffer zone for economic reasons (to supply vital raw materials) as much as security ones – the USA saw this as a threat to her own economic security. The Western Powers decided to unite their zones into Western Germany, with a single currency, and this led to the Berlin Blockade. The Cold War is often seen as a conflict of ideologies; the ideological differences between the USSR and USA were based on economic factors as much, if not more, than political ones.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that traditional historians explain Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe as part of an attempt to spread communism. US actions, such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, are seen as an attempt to stop this. Revisionist historians argue that Stalin was developing a buffer zone in Eastern Europe to protect the USSR from any future invasion from the West – a strategic move. Truman’s hard line against communism was largely political and conditioned by anti-communist pressures in USA – to win the next election, he had to be seen as tough against the political threat of communism. Kennan’s ‘long telegram’ and Churchill’s ‘iron curtain speech’ both see the Cold War as essentially political. Post-revisionist historians argue that the Cold War was caused by misinterpretations by both sides about each other’s political motives.

3 How far was American policy responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War?

In support of the view, it could be argued that US foreign policy was based on the mistaken belief that there was a communist plot which had to be resisted in order to protect the USA’s political, strategic and economic interests. Containment, roll-back, NSC-68, the domino theory and domestic political pressure regarding the ‘Red threat’ all led to US involvement in Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America, thus globalising the Cold War. The USA was directly involved in Korea and Vietnam, whereas the USSR was not. The Cuban crisis was caused by US over-reaction to Castro. In the name of protecting the world from communism, the USA supported non-democratic governments. The USA’s nuclear weapons programme helped to globalise the Cold War – e.g. Khrushchev claimed that one reason for placing Soviet nuclear weapons in Cuba was to restore the balance destroyed by the location of US missiles in Turkey.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that globalisation occurred because of a series of regional disputes into which the superpowers were reluctantly drawn. A primary cause of these regional disputes was the aftermath of decolonisation. The USSR could be held responsible for causing globalisation – e.g. by supporting communist regimes in Korea, Vietnam, Africa and involvement in the Middle East. There was evidence of Soviet intentions to expand communism and Stalin had consistently made statements regarding world-wide communist revolution. It was the USSR which placed nuclear weapons in Cuba, a direct threat to the USA and a clear breach of the Monroe Doctrine.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

4 Compare and contrast the policies of the USA and the USSR towards Korea in the period from 1950 to 1953.

The USA became directly involved in the Korean War, while the USSR was quick to distance itself from it. Initially Korea was not in Acheson's defence perimeter but the containment policy and NSC-68 meant that USA had to become involved when North Korea attacked the South. Under the guise of protecting a democratic state from the threat of communist expansionism, the USA's primary concern was protecting her own interests in Southeast Asia (especially Japan). Truman faced domestic anti-communist public pressure and the USA was convinced that the USSR was behind the North's attack on South Korea. To tackle this they enlisted the support of the UN, taking advantage of Soviet boycott of Security Council. Containment succeeded in pushing North Koreans back to the 38th parallel, then roll-back was employed to go beyond this original boundary – this brought China into the war and led to debate in the US about the possible use of nuclear weapons. South Korea was successfully defended, but the original boundary was restored.

The USSR did not want to get into direct confrontation with the US and Stalin's main interest was security in Europe. However, Stalin was not averse to using the Korean situation for political advantage and to strengthen his own position in the Pacific. Stalin was free to concentrate on Europe while the US was occupied in Korea. Evidence suggests that Stalin only approved of Kim's plans for invasion because he was convinced that the USA would not become involved. He was quick to distance himself from the war once the USA became involved. The USSR supplied advisers and weapons to North Korea, but left direct involvement to China.

5 Consider the view that the collapse of the USSR was caused by Gorbachev's attempts to modernise it.

In support of the view, it could be argued that Gorbachev was wrong to believe that his attempts to modernise the USSR (both politically and economically) could be achieved through a one-party state. His reforms split the Communist Party between those who wanted a more radical approach (e.g. Yeltsin) and those who felt the reforms went too far (e.g. Ligachev). Glasnost allowed greater freedoms within culture and the media; this allowed greater criticisms of the Soviet system both within the USSR and in Eastern Europe. Perestroika did not produce economic results quickly enough – having had their expectations raised, people became disillusioned. Gorbachev's reforms encouraged latent nationalism both in Eastern Europe and within the USSR. Gorbachev's ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine made it impossible for the USSR to prevent the loss of Eastern Europe, which was followed by declarations of independence by states within the USSR itself.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Gorbachev had no option but to attempt reform given the desperate state of the USSR. Economically, the USSR faced major problems due to the excessive costs involved in maintaining the nuclear arms race, involvement in Afghanistan and maintaining control over Eastern European states – nationalism was already rife within Eastern Europe and the Baltic States before Gorbachev came to power. Reagan's 'evil empire' policies put the USSR under even greater pressure. There was a pressing need to streamline the USSR following the sterile post-Khrushchev years. The 'command economy' was weighted strongly towards defence and heavy industry, leaving consumer goods in short supply – something which was particularly noticeable in Eastern Europe, where people could compare their situation with that of their Western neighbours. It was essential for Gorbachev to end the financial drain of maintaining the arms race, but to do this he needed to convince the West of his sincerity and determination to make the USSR more humane and democratic. The strains on the USSR were such that it would probably have collapsed anyway, even without Gorbachev's efforts to save it

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

6 To what extent did the nuclear arms race make the world a more dangerous place in the period from 1949 to 1963?

In support of the view that the nuclear arms race made the world more dangerous, arguments could include the destructive potential of nuclear weapons, as witnessed in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Weapons were developed that were ever more destructive. Following the USSR's development of its own atomic bomb in 1949, the USA developed a hydrogen bomb in 1952 (1000 times more destructive than the atomic bomb). Within nine months, the USSR had developed a lithium bomb (easier to use with conventional bombers). By 1954, the USA had its own lithium bomb. The delivery systems for the weapons became more effective. By 1955, USA had developed a bomber with intercontinental range (B52). By 1956, the USSR had an equivalent (TU20). These were slow and vulnerable, but by 1957 the USSR had developed the first ICBM. By 1960, USA had developed the first submarine-launched missile (polaris). The US was deeply concerned by what it saw as Soviet advantage in terms of nuclear weapons, but this was largely illusory. By 1962, the USA had 4000 missile warheads compared with 200 in the USSR.

Arguments to challenge the view could include that the destructive potential of nuclear weapons highlighted the dangers and encouraged superpowers to use other methods – e.g. the concept of limited warfare and the use of conventional methods (the USA did not use nuclear weapons in Korea). The possession of nuclear weapons meant that both USA and USSR were keen to avoid direct confrontation – e.g. the USSR did not get directly involved in Korea. Nuclear weapons were seen as a deterrent. The Cuban missile crisis highlighted the threat even more – both the USA and USSR were keen to find a 'safe' way out of the problem. Fear of repetition of the Cuban missile crisis led to MAD, arguably the ultimate deterrent. It also led to the 'Hot line' and the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963.

7 Analyse the factors which led to the decline in American dominance of the international economy by the 1980s.

The USA had been the dominant economy between 1945–1970, as evidenced by Marshall Aid, assistance to Japan, the importance of the dollar and the key role played by the USA in GATT, the World Bank and the IMF. During 1970s and 1980s, the US economy was adversely affected by a number of issues which threatened its dominance;

- high costs of defence and the Vietnam War
- budget deficits from the 1960s onwards
- falling value of the dollar and the collapse of the Bretton Woods system
- effects of oil crises
- recovery of West Germany and Japan
- the development of the EEC
- the rise of the Asian Tiger economies

However, the USA remained the dominant economy in the 1980s, though perhaps not as dominant as in the period from 1945–1970. It was not just the USA which experienced economic recession in the 1970s and 1980s; the whole world economy suffered. Problems in the USA had an enormous effect on the world economy as a whole, demonstrating the continuing nature of US influence. Recession in the 1970s and 1980s was largely a temporary phenomenon in a trend of otherwise general growth. The revival of the West German and Japanese economies, together with the development of new economies such as the Asian Tigers, was in the USA's economic interests – e.g. by providing trading partners.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9697	33

8 'The success of the Asian Tiger economies was largely the result of favourable domestic circumstances.' How far do you agree?

The four original Asian Tigers (Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea) experienced rapid economic growth between the 1960s and 1990s. Within twenty years, they established urbanised work forces (largely in the high productivity sectors of manufacturing and services), radically reduced death and birth rates, and achieved high rates of literacy. In 1963, they accounted for 1.6% of the world's total exports; by 1988 they accounted for 8.1% (almost as much as Japan – 9.6%).

In supporting the hypothesis, it could be argued that all of the Asian Tigers benefited from similar internal factors. They were characterised by authoritarian political systems, providing some state control over economic growth. For instance in South Korea, military rule pushed through industrialisation based on the Japanese model; the government controlled banks, the Economic Planning Board and encouraged conglomerates (e.g. Hyundai, Samsung). In Taiwan, there was a large state sector, tightly controlled and efficiently run. Singapore and Hong Kong practiced state socialism, funding key infrastructure projects and controlling development. Growth was led by exports as in South Korea which exported cars and banned their import. Both South Korea and Taiwan imported materials and components from Japan and then exported the finished products, primarily to USA. Singapore and Hong Kong, small states with no raw materials, relied on free trade. Cheap labour was widely available from the agricultural sector in South Korea and Taiwan. Improved educational systems provided a skilled work force and tax and savings incentives were coupled with high growth and income rates. There was also flexibility; Taiwan moved from the production of cheap labour-intensive manufacture (e.g. textiles and toys) into the expansion of heavy industry and infrastructure; Hong Kong moved from textiles into electronics and high tech industries; Singapore became the centre of the new Asian Dollar Market after 1968.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that external factors were crucial. The states benefited economically from their colonial experience; British commerce in Hong Kong and Singapore; Japanese industrialisation and US land reform in South Korea and Taiwan. Foreign investment was also important. For instance South Korea benefited from American aid as the US saw South Korea as a key to preventing the spread of communism in Asia. Threatened with invasion from China, Taiwan relied on US security guarantees and economic aid. Both South Korea and Taiwan benefited from 'soft' loans and joint industrial ventures with Japan, which, in turn, benefited from the availability of cheap labour.