UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/42 Paper 42 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1941.

1 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Army had influence with Kaiser; Army unwilling to accept responsibility for defeat etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences supported from the source e.g. Army blames the civilians for defeat and now has them in government making peace; persuades Kaiser to bring into government those responsible for defeat to make a difficult peace etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Lost war; autocracy ended; lower military mutinous; workers; discontent nationwide; republic etc.

No Army influence; peaceful transition of government to Ebert; moderate Socialists; armistice meant peace and a chance to recover; 'revolution from below' only had a possibility of success – implies short-lived etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from Ludendorff and the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid territory to a maximum of two e.g. Alsace-Lorraine; Eupen and Malmedy; West Prussia and Posen; Upper Silesia; North Schleswig; Danzig; Memel; Saarland (if qualified); Lithuania; Latvia and Estonia. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Communist; names leaders etc. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in Additional detail e.g. Communist rising to create a socialist state based on workers' councils, centred on Berlin; bitter street fighting with Freikorps; fate of Rosa and Karl etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Used by government to suppress KPD; Berlin strike; Bavaria; brutality led to left-wing distrust of Weimar; assassins; semblance of military; focus for right-wing/monarchists; Kapp Putsch – army and workers' responses etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, avoided revolution; no, signed Versailles. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of success OR lack of success, single factor given e.g.

Yes Faced reality of military defeat; peace; overcame right and left-wing revolts; gained and maintained democratic constitution; dealt with hyperinflation; Stresemann – some economic recovery, improving foreign relations; sheer scale of problems etc.

No Accepted harsh settlement; occupation of the Ruhr; printed money; blamed for all public woes; did not gain army support; lost middle class; left and right-wing distrust; not well-organised/supported. French invasion and American loans etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on both sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of success AND lack of success must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941.

2 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Conditions were very bad and workers becoming very angry etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Shortages of basic food and heating materials were increasing malnutrition and disease to the point where a physical reaction from the masses was expected etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Loss of soldiers' lives blamed on the Tsar; lost the confidence and support of the army; middle classes disgusted by defeats etc.

No Incompetence of Tsarina upset middle classes; shortages and price rises upset the workers etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a secret police report and the other is British so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Massive demonstrations of up to 500 000 against the Prov. Govt. including Kronstadt sailors; Kerensky had enough support to crush (400 dead); Trotsky arrested, Lenin fled; could have signalled the end for Bolsheviks etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies person. 'Mad monk'. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes person. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Monk who eventually reached court; healing powers (Crown Prince Alexei); influence at court and over Tsarina (Lovers?); excesses. Ruled with Tsarina when Tsar appointed himself C-in-C. Inefficiencies of government; assassinated December 1916. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. The affair embarrassed the Provisional Government and increased the popularity of the Bolsheviks. Kornilov, C-in-C of the army thought that the Bolsheviks were traitors and the Prov. Govt. too weak to deal with them. August 1917 he brought troops to Petrograd. Government released Bolsheviks from gaol and armed them; many troops mutinied and Kornilov was arrested. Now the Bolsheviks were free, armed and seen as defenders of the revolution; Provisional Government weakened and looked even weaker etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the peasants wanted land and food. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of stated issues OR other issues, single factor given e.g.

Stated The land issue had always been prominent in peasants' minds and the government did not pass laws to deal with this – peasants took matters into their own hands. There was a general shortage of food and no policies to help. Much production lost as peasants away at war etc.

Other The Provisional Government seemed no better than the Tsar and continued the war; there had been no attempt to have promised elections for Constituent Assembly (postponed till November 1917); opposed peasants taking land; undermining influence of revolutionary groups, especially Bolsheviks; returning exiles etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of stated issues OR other issues with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of stated issues AND other issues must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941.

3 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. No power in politics or economy; not regarded as intelligent; patronised etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Men discuss heavy matters of politics and economy away from women; when they join women they talk of lighter, cultural and gossip matters etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Gained the vote; some still pursuing equal rights; others had role in international pressure group; play a part as volunteers etc.

No Idealists did not pursue a political career; regarded as frivolous, lacking tenacity and knowledge; politician still canvassing support on female inferiority etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from Eleanor Roosevelt and the other is from a politician so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Asians, ex-convicts, prostitutes, beggars, paupers, anyone with physical or mental defects, illiterates; political radicals. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aims e.g. Preserve WASP America. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes aims. Award an extra mark for each aim described in additional detail e.g. Resist communism; deal with black menace; oppose corrupt white businessmen; gain political power. Also may comment on aims re Catholics/Jews etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. To preserve white northern European dominance; to limit Catholic numbers; equated immigrants with anarchists and radicals; avoid competition for jobs and housing; racism etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
The blacks always had a difficult time. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of black suffering OR other groups, single factor given e.g.

Black In southern states with Jim Crow laws; violence and lynching continued; still seen as a 'Negro problem'; throughout USA always last to get jobs and houses; poor housing; ghettos; seen as an underclass in places etc.

Other Might differentiate between black treatment in north and south; Native Americans; immigrants; Catholic; Jews; Communists; drinkers; Allow differentiation between social, economic and institutional intolerance etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of black suffering OR other groups, with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of black suffering AND other groups must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990.

4 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inference, unsupported from the source e.g. The peasants became very selfish and lazy etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The peasants became careless of the amount they ate and the amount of work done as all incentives had been removed and the commune would take care of all needs etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Enthusiastic working together in millions; production of roads, dykes, reservoirs; planting of trees; avoidance of famine by efficient use of available food etc.

No All undermined by weather and poor harvests, and withdrawal of USSR aid; weather not in government's control; could have been a greater disaster than it was etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from a Chinese person, the other is from Britain so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 mark for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Without violence, peasants persuaded to join collective (co-operative) farms in order to increase food production. By 1956 95 per cent of all peasants in collective – numbers ranging from 100 to 300 families, with joint ownership of land and equipment etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies campaign. An attempt to improve the second class position of women. (1–2)

Level 2 – Develops material. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect that is described in additional detail e.g. 1950 Marriage Law abolished child marriage, infanticide, bigamy. Other laws gave women maternity benefits, and equal pay to many working women. now legally on equal footing with men – still traditional attitudes in countryside though. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. 1958 – an attempt to drive the revolution/socialism forward; to reorganise collectives into communes; to make agriculture more efficient; to change the emphasis of industry; to undertake major projects like roads, canals, dams, reservoirs irrigation channels etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions
Not much. Many died in famines. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of success OR lack of success, single factor given e.g.

Succ Got rid of corrupt KMT rule; dealt with land issue (several times); improvements in public health, working conditions, welfare, education, position of women. China had a higher world profile etc.

Lack Still much food shortage; little improvement in the countryside for peasants; CCP as controlling as ever as KMT and landlords were. Some plans caused suffering and disaster. Much torture, cruelty and large numbers (millions) died in 'Antis' campaigns. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument – annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of success AND lack of success must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

5 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Events not fully reported/understood; whites fear for the future etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Whites have some idea of events but unaware of the extent of the violence; fear for the future as the police and army's brutality will not save white privilege etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes International praise; active opposition; release of Mandela; apartheid weakening after 40 years; government responding with reform etc.

No No explicit commitment; no date for Mandela's release; only partial reform; de Klerk's weak justification; Conservatives' attitude etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from Helen Joseph and the other is from the BBC so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid issue to a maximum of two e.g. Formulating the new constitution; setting up of the interim government; electoral system; future of the homelands; time period for implementation of changes. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies actions e.g. Opposed ending of apartheid; used force. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes actions. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. 200 groups recruiting and arming; supported Conservative Party; voted NO in 1992 referendum; AWB led by Terre Blanche most likely to be mentioned; assassination of Chris Hani 1993; formed own air force of 6 small planes; increased membership to 20 000 by 1993; 1994 supported Bophuthatswana homeland ruler's refusal to join in election, killed over 100 in battle, 3 AWB killed. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. **Can look at both long and short term reasons.** Poverty; drink; male majority; weapons available; limited policing; traditional Xhosa/Zulu rivalry, ANC/Inkkatha; vying for majority in 1994 election; secret government involvement v. ANC etc. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, ANC had a long commitment to end white majority rule. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of ANC importance OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

ANC Authority/reputation/continued commitment to Freedom Charter; prepared to acknowledge white fears/seek compromise; role of Mandela; 1994 showed public recognised ANC's role etc.

Other Link to Spear of the Nation worried whites; collapse of USSR made ANC less of a threat; de Klerk began the process in 1990; role of international and economic pressures; other groups/negotiators; violence escalating; white support in 1992 referendum; only compromise could ensure peaceful acceptance etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of ANC importance OR other factors with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of ANC importance AND other factors must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1994.

6 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. They had no freedom of action and very little freedom of thought etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They were banned from many activities and intimidated in other areas so that they had no freedom of action and very little freedom of thought etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Financial support from Kuwait, Qatar and Saudi Arabia, with the last supplying arms etc.

No Most countries bordering Israel were reluctant to encourage Fatah raids. Saudi arms supplied discreetly etc. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a Palestine Liberation Organisation member, and the other is a joint venture of a Palestinian and a Jew so they could both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid aim to a maximum of two e.g. To unite various Palestinian Arab groups opposed to the existence of Israel. PLO Covenant (1964) called for a democratic and secular Palestine with the elimination of the state of Israel. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Humanitarian and emergency aid packages. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect which is described in additional detail e.g. UNWRA (UN Works and Relief Agency) maintained camps, rations, welfare services. Camps in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan. Food, shelter, schools, medical care. BUT UNO resolutions supporting Palestinian rights were largely ignored by Israel etc. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. 1967 **Jordan** was the main PLO base. Hostility between Jordanian government and the PLO. PLO wanted to topple King Hussein. Senior army officers worried about PLO power. Fighting 1970 – Black September – cease fire; PLO forced out 1971.
Lebanon was the main base after Jordan expulsion. Attacked northern Israel; PLO involved in Lebanon politics; sided with Shia Muslims in southern Lebanon and fought with them in Lebanese civil war. Israel invaded in June 1982; fierce PLO resistance but driven out in August. Went to Tunisia. **One aspect – max 4 marks.** (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, he was the most famous Palestinian. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of importance OR lack of importance, single factor given e.g.

Imp Founder of Fatah. Leader of PLO. Recognisable face of Palestine cause. Invited to UNO. Speeches; 1987 Intifadah convinced him that Palestinians should take control of the West Bank and Gaza as a mini state; December 1998 accepted the state of Israel and UN Resolution 242; rejected the use of terrorism. Pleased Israeli Labour Party and USA.

Lack Always associated with terrorism; never completely trusted; expulsions from Jordan and Lebanon; divisions in Tunisia; Syria controlled and encouraged radicals to overthrow Arafat. Prisoner of the need to compromise; other countries' and persons' influences; UNO etc. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of importance OR lack of importance with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped assertions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of importance AND lack of importance must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

7 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. House building is driven by profit and greed with little thought given to health or the people who will have to live in the houses etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Carpenter and builder buy up building sites and cover them with so-called houses; no thought about the people who live in them, ventilation or drainage; creates overcrowding with many families to a room etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the sources. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the sources e.g.

Yes **C** – The fact that a leader of a local community feels the need to write about and publicise the poor conditions means that some take it seriously etc. **B** – Many bodies at different times have passed 29 measures.

No **C** – The fact that a book has to be written about conditions means that many have not taken the problems very seriously; all the description indicates that there has been little planning and little action to remedy or consider problems etc. **B** – Many measures by different bodies with different objectives, at different times indicate an uncoordinated approach to the problems. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the sources. Addresses the issue of How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information than the others, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – A is a description from 1848, B is from a newspaper and C is from a book by a churchman, so they could all be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A, B and C to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Expect examples of northern industrial towns like Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield etc. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies sources and ways e.g. Water taken from and sewage emptied into rivers. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes source and ways. Award an extra mark for each valid source and way described in additional detail e.g. **Water** – came mainly from wells, pumps, springs and rivers. Some houses had piped water but the origin could still be as afore-mentioned. **Sewage** – Drainage channels or gutters leading to river or stream; cesspits, serving a number of dwellings, emptied at intervals; dungheaps where all dwellings in locality dumped waste – removed at intervals. Proper sewers built usually in later part of the century. **One aspect only – max 3 marks.** (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Impure water supplies – supply contaminated by faecal discharge. Little idea of what the disease was or how it was spread. Densely populated areas aided spread; large-scale outbreaks usually started in ports where it arrived from cholera hotspots of Europe or the East. Interaction of poor public health, overcrowding and ignorance. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, things got better when proper sewers were built. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement, single factor given e.g.

Imp The amount of legislation post-1840s shows increasing awareness; also increasingly effective measures. The fear of cholera and other diseases helped to arouse public and official consciences, although there was opposition to regulation. There was a dismissive attitude towards the poor, especially immigrants, and so efforts to improve public health were seen as a waste of money.

Lack There were still epidemics in the last quarter of the century so the problems persisted with bad housing a verifiable cause; deteriorating houses created a large 'slum' problem in many cities and health deteriorated despite measures. Average life expectancy was rising at the end of the century and infant mortality decreasing. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of improvement OR lack of improvement with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of improvement AND lack of improvement must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

8 (a) (i) Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no inference made. (1–2)

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. English people would be very privileged and pampered; an easy life etc. (3–4)

Level 3 – Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The young man has to do little for himself, just sitting in his dressing gown and being readied for the day by many servants; surrounded by luxury, pets and the trappings of wealth – clothes, decorations etc. (5–6)

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. (1–2)

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g.

Yes Dalhousie had not foreseen problems, so lack of his foresight is a factor; discontent at westernisation policies of the previous 30 years; reforms threatened traditional Hindu and Muslim ways of life; lapse and annexation; suppression of religious practices.

No A mutiny of the Bengal native army; Christian missions recruiting; Western education. Implies more of a general and overall threat from westernisation than specific Dalhousie reforms. (3–5)

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' (6–7)

(iii) Level 1 – Useful/not useful – Choice made on the basis that one is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. (1)

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is a drawing and the other is from a British history book so they may both be biased/unreliable. (2)

Level 3 – Choice made on the nature or amount of information given. Must specify what information. (3–5)

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.
Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. (6–7)

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 – One mark for each valid detail to a maximum of two e.g. A brotherhood of religious fanatics whose cult was murder for its own sake, usually of casual acquaintances who had given no offence. (1–2)

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies benefits. Communications, education and religion. (1–2)

Level 2 – Describes benefits. Award an extra mark for each benefit described in additional detail e.g. Road and railway building. Telegraph. Education opened up prospects for Indians to enter the Civil Service. The end to practices like suttee and infanticide. (2–4)

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation. (1–2)

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Issue of greased cartridges – pig and cow fat – offending both Hindu and Muslim faiths (but much of this was rumour and the cartridges were quickly withdrawn). Harsh treatment given to sepoys in the spring of 1857. Fewer white officers and often of lesser calibre than earlier ones led to a breakdown in trust between sepoys and officers. Some regiments infiltrated by agitators who saw that their religious and political aims needed sepoy support. (2–6)

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the East India Company had to go. (1)

Level 2 – Explanation of change OR lack of change, single factors given e.g.

Chan. EIC disbanded to make way for control by British Government with a separate department and Minister for India, and a resident Viceroy in India representing the Queen Emperor. Changes in formal management and treatment of Indians in areas. Advances in Civil Service and recognition later of Indian political parties and aspirations.

Lack For most ordinary Indians life carried on as normal but there was now another educated class of Indians carrying out much local management. Britain's industrial revolution still continued to undermine textiles in India and grinding poverty continued for many. (2)

Level 3 – Explanation of change OR lack of change with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped assertions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). (3–5)

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of change AND lack of change must be addressed. (6–8)

© UCLES 2010