Cambridge IGCSE

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

HISTORY **0470/21**

Paper 2 **May/June 2016**

2 hours

No Additional Materials are required.



READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

An answer booklet is provided inside this question paper. You should follow the instructions on the front cover of the answer booklet. If you need additional answer paper ask the invigilator for a continuation booklet.

This paper has two options.
Choose **one** option, and answer **all** of the questions on that topic.
Option A: 19th Century topic [p2–p7]
Option B: 20th Century topic [p8–p14]

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.

The syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 1/Level 2 Certificate.

This document consists of **14** printed pages, **2** blank pages and **1** insert.

DC (LK/SW) 115137/2
© UCLES 2016

CAMBRIDGE International Examinations

[Turn over

Option A: 19th Century topic

WAS BRITISH REACTION TO THE INDIAN MUTINY JUSTIFIED?

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

Background Information

When the Indian Mutiny broke out in May 1857 there were only 35 000 British soldiers in India. Delhi became the focal point of the Mutiny and recapturing the city became a priority for the British. In September, after a week's vicious street fighting, it was back under British control. However, it was not until March 1858 that Lucknow was recaptured.

The way the British reacted to the Mutiny has caused much controversy. Much of the British press, outraged by atrocities committed by the rebels, demanded harsh punishments. Soldiers and civil servants in India reacted with hangings and shootings, and casualties on the Indian side were soon much higher than on the British. Worried about actions like these, in July 1857 Governor-General Canning issued a 'Clemency' Proclamation ordering a more moderate reaction and in November 1858 an amnesty was announced.

Many people at the time, and since, have argued that British methods were justified and necessary, while others have claimed they were cruel and barbaric.

SOURCE A

The Mutiny had laid waste vast areas and had cost 40 million pounds, the lives of 2034 soldiers in action and many murdered British civilians. It was a time for restoring order. An amnesty only lasted until 1859. Hundreds of Indians, many of them simple men whose only wish had been to avoid trouble, were hanged. It is difficult to assess the extent of the reprisals because many Indians fled, or died from famine, rather than being killed by the British. Exaggerated claims have been made about the number that were killed but it may have been hundreds of thousands. English officials demanded the cruellest punishments and apparently were delighted to watch them. Two Englishwomen who had turned up to watch rebels blown from guns, rode away with their clothing and horses shining with blood. A British journalist was shocked at the things that were done, and many officers told him that the worst effect was the destruction of confidence which the natives formerly felt in British justice.

However, the British did try to learn from their mistakes. The policy of annexation was dropped and every attempt was made to keep the princes on their side. It was also made clear that no interference with the Indian religions was to be allowed. The biggest change was that power to rule India was taken from the East India Company and given to the British Crown. Lessons had been learned and India was quiet again.

From a book published in 1973.

© UCLES 2016

SOURCE B

In response to the Indian Mutiny there was an 'untold holocaust' which caused the deaths of almost ten million people over ten years, beginning in 1857. Conventional histories have counted only 100 000 Indian soldiers who were slaughtered in savage reprisals, but none have counted the number of rebels and civilians killed by British forces desperate to impose order. It was a holocaust, one where millions disappeared. It was a necessary holocaust in the British view because they thought the only way to win was to destroy entire populations in towns and villages. It was simple and brutal. Indians who stood in their way were killed. But its scale has been kept a secret. Letters in which civil servants described 'the kind of vengeance our boys have wreaked on the abject Hindoos and Mohammadens, who killed our women and children' lay unopened in government warehouses. On 3 March 1858 a Proclamation was issued in Oudh Province which confiscated all land and property to the British government. It was regarded as far too severe by many British officials and increased the determination of many rebels.

After the British retook Delhi, gallows were erected throughout the city and the hangings began. Large crowds of officers and Europeans gathered to watch the entertainment. The executioners were bribed by the crowds to make sure their prisoners were a long time dying. Many others were shot, sometimes 400 a day, to satisfy the bloodlust and the desire for revenge. The amnesty announced in November 1858 only lasted until January 1859 and was designed to separate the rebel leaders from their followers. The rebel leaders responded to it by reminding everyone of the treaties and promises broken by the British in the past. Some rebels kept fighting well into 1859. The pacification of India took much longer than anybody expected as many of the rebels at Lucknow escaped into the countryside. The uprisings did not die out until years after the original mutiny had fizzled away.

From a book published in 2002.

SOURCE C

A very large proportion of the English community has a violent hatred of every Indian of every class. There is a vindictiveness even amongst many who ought to set a better example. Not one man in ten seems to think that the hanging and shooting of 40 or 50 thousand mutineers can be wrong.

A letter from Governor-General Canning to Queen Victoria, September 1857.

SOURCE D

Lord Canning will easily believe how entirely the Queen shares his feelings of sorrow at the unchristian spirit shown – alas! also to a great extent here in Britain – by the public towards Indians. It is, however, not likely to last and comes from the horror produced by the unspeakable atrocities perpetuated against the innocent women and children which really makes one's blood run cold. For the perpetrators of these awful horrors no punishment can be severe enough.

A letter from Queen Victoria to Governor-General Canning, November 1857.

SOURCE E


You must know that this is nearly the only form in which death has any terrors for a native. If he is hung, or shot, he knows that his relatives will be allowed to claim his body, and will give him the funeral rites required by his religion. But it is agony to him if he knows that his body will be blown into a thousand pieces, and that it will be altogether impossible for his relatives to be sure of picking up all the fragments of his body. He cannot bear the thought that perhaps a limb of someone of a different religion to himself might possibly be burned or buried with the remainder of his body.

From an article published in a British magazine, November 1857, about the practice of blowing Sepoys (Indian soldiers) from the mouths of guns.

© UCLES 2016

[Turn over

SOURCE F



A cartoon published in Britain, November 1857. 'Clemency' means forgiveness and leniency.

© UCLES 2016

SOURCE G



A cartoon from a British magazine, September 1857.

SOURCE H



TOO "CIVIL" BY HALF.

The Governor-General Defending the POOR Sepoy.

A cartoon published in Britain in November 1857. 'Civil' means courteous and polite.

© UCLES 2016

Now answer **all** the following questions. You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources which you are told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 Study Sources A and B.

How different are these two sources? Explain your answer using details of the sources. [7]

2 Study Sources C and D.

How surprised are you by Queen Victoria's reply to Canning's letter? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

3 Study Source E.

How useful is this source as evidence about the Indian Mutiny? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

4 Study Source F.

Why was this source published in November 1857? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [8]

5 Study Sources G and H.

How far do these two cartoons agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

6 Study **all** the sources.

The British killed many Indians because of the Mutiny. How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that this British reaction was justified? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

© UCLES 2016

Option B: 20th Century topic

WHO WAS TO BLAME FOR THE OUTBREAK OF HOSTILITIES BETWEEN IRAQ AND THE US-LED COALITION IN JANUARY 1991?

Study the Background Information and the sources carefully, and then answer **all** the questions.

Background Information

On 2 August 1990 a huge Iraqi army crossed into Kuwait. Nearly all Arab states condemned this action, although Saddam Hussein felt he had good reasons for the invasion. He had borrowed huge amounts of money from Kuwait during the Iran-Iraq war and, although Kuwait had benefited during this war, it still demanded the money be repaid. Saddam Hussein regarded Kuwait as an artificial country created by Britain. According to him, it was really part of Iraq.

Within days of the Iraqi invasion, Saudi Arabia requested that US troops be sent to protect it from an Iraqi attack. President George Bush responded quickly. Later in the month the UN Security Council announced economic sanctions against Iraq. The USA then worked hard to create an international coalition. In November 1990 the UN Security Council issued a resolution which gave Iraq until 15 January 1991 to withdraw from Kuwait. It also authorised the use of force to make Iraq comply. On 17 January 1991, the Allies began an aerial bombing campaign.

Some historians claim that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was unjustified and was bound to lead to an international military conflict. Others claim that the USA was looking for an opportunity to destroy Saddam Hussein's power. They claim that the USA was not keen on relying just on sanctions or seeking a diplomatic solution.

SOURCE A

In 1990, Iraq accused Kuwait of stealing oil from an Iraqi oil field. Some feel there were several other reasons for the Iraqi invasion, including the fact that by the end of the Iran-Iraq war, Iraq was not in a position to repay the $80 billion it borrowed from Kuwait. Iraq tried to repay its debts by raising the price of oil through OPEC's oil production cuts. However, Kuwait prevented a global increase in oil prices by increasing its own production, thus crippling the Iraqi economy. This was seen by many in Iraq as an act of aggression. This economic warfare by Kuwait was made worse by Kuwait's alleged slant-drilling across the border into Iraq's Rumaila oil field.

The Iraqi government justified its invasion of Kuwait by claiming that Kuwait was a natural part of Iraq carved off due to British imperialism. By overthrowing the unpopular Emir of Kuwait, Iraq was granting Kuwaitis greater economic and political freedom. It can be suggested that Saddam Hussein's decision to invade Kuwait partly came as a reaction against an international conspiracy against Iraq which was meant to weaken Saddam's regime. British and American efforts to block export of weapons technology to Iraq were seen by Saddam as evidence of this. However, following the invasion, Saddam's unwillingness to accept a negotiated solution to the Kuwait crisis supports the view that fear of problems within Iraq meant that Saddam had to keep the crisis going.

From a recent article about events in the Gulf in 1990.

© UCLES 2016

SOURCE B

Existing in the shadow of powerful states such as Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran, Kuwait's existence was threatened ever since it was created as a self-ruled area. Iraq considered Kuwait as part of Iraq. The Kuwaitis believed that these difficulties could be solved by money and never took the danger from Iraq seriously. In 1989 Iraq began to issue threats towards Kuwait. Iraqis had several reasons for this behaviour. They could not repay the money that had been borrowed to finance the war with Iran. Arguably, this war was in Kuwaiti interests but Kuwait refused to forget Iraq's $65 billion debt, thus providing a justification for an Iraqi attack. Other reasons were alleged such as Kuwaiti oil drilling in the Rumaila oilfield, which lay in disputed border territory, and Kuwaiti overproduction of oil which brought prices down and harmed Iraq when it sold its oil.

An additional justification for Iraqi action was that the whole of the Kuwaiti royal family were hated in Kuwait and by the Arab world. They ran their country as their private enterprise. By comparison to feudal Kuwait, Iraq was a modern secular state.

In May 1990 Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) agreed to lower their oil output but they continued producing more oil than assigned to them by OPEC. This caused increasing economic problems for Iraq. It should be mentioned that Iraqi accusations against Kuwait were reasonable. Kuwait was stealing Iraqi oil and selling it at low prices. These developments were playing into the hands of Saddam Hussein, who wanted better control over the oil resources, and into the hands of the USA, which was interested in obtaining Saudi permission to base their troops in Saudi Arabia. By mid-July 1990, the situation had reached boiling point. A crucial moment was when the US Ambassador in Iraq was told by Saddam that he would not use force against Kuwait. In response, the Ambassador stated that the USA had 'no opinion' on disputes between Arab nations. The Iraqis misunderstood this as a sign that the Americans would not oppose an invasion of Kuwait. This was a grave mistake and may explain why Saddam refused to negotiate after the invasion. This simply played into the hands of the Americans who, far from wanting Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait, were waiting for the opportunity to destroy Iraq as a major power in the area and preserve oil supplies for the West.

From a recent article about events in the Gulf in 1990.

SOURCE C

America is coordinating with Saudi Arabia and the UAE and Kuwait in a conspiracy against us. They are trying to reduce the price of oil to affect our military industries and our scientific research, to force us to reduce the size of our armed forces. Another part of this conspiracy is a probable Israeli military air strike to destroy some of our important targets.

Saddam Hussein to Wafiq al-Samara'i, the Deputy Director of Iraqi military intelligence, July 1990.

SOURCE D

I know you need funds. We understand that and our opinion is that you should have the opportunity to rebuild your country. But we have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disputes with Kuwait.

The US Ambassador speaking to Saddam Hussein during a meeting in July 1990.

© UCLES 2016

SOURCE E

In an attempt on our part to create a peaceful atmosphere in the region and in order to reveal America and its ally, the monster Israel, we have decided to propose the following.

All cases of occupation, and those cases that have been portrayed as occupation, in the region, be resolved. These include Israeli occupation of Arab lands, a Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon and withdrawals by Iraq. All withdrawals should take into consideration Iraq's historical territorial rights and guarantee the Kuwaiti people's right to decide on their future. The immediate withdrawal of American forces from Saudi Arabia, to be replaced by an Arab force, must take place.

Should the United States and its agents fail to respond to these proposals, then we the people of Iraq, along with our brethren in the Arab world, will resist its evil intentions.

From a radio announcement by President Saddam Hussein in August 1990, after the invasion of Kuwait.


SOURCE F

American officials analysed the meeting between Secretary of State James Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz. One senior American official, talking about Mr Aziz's refusal to accept President Bush's note to Saddam Hussein, said he did not believe that Mr Aziz had come with any authority to strike a deal, or signal even a partial withdrawal. He was there to assess America's position, flash some steel teeth and report home. Mr Aziz said he could not receive the letter because 'the language in the letter is not compatible with the language that should be used in correspondence between heads of state.' After the meeting American officials said they had had no expectation before the discussion that the Iraqi side would bend or waver.

From a US newspaper, 11 January 1991.


© UCLES 2016

SOURCE G




A cartoon published in Britain in October 1990.

SOURCE H



A cartoon, about Saddam Hussein, published in the USA in the second half of 1990.

SOURCE I



A cartoon published in the USA in November 1990.

Now answer **all** the following questions. You may use any of the sources to help you answer the questions, in addition to those sources which you are told to use. In answering the questions you should use your knowledge of the topic to help you interpret and evaluate the sources.

1 Study Sources A and B.

How different are these two sources? Explain your answer using details of the sources. [7]

2 Study Sources C and D.

Does Source D make Source C surprising? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

3 Study Sources E and F.

Does Source F prove that Saddam Hussein was not sincere in Source E? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

4 Study Source G.

What is the message of the cartoonist? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge. [7]

5 Study Sources H and I.

How far do these two cartoons agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge. [8]

6 Study **all** the sources.

How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein was to blame for the outbreak of hostilities with the US-led coalition in January 1991? Use the sources to explain your answer. [12]

© UCLES 2016

BLANK PAGE

© UCLES 2016

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge International Examinations Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cie.org.uk after the live examination series.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.