UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2010 question paper for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/41 Paper 4 (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 October/November 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, 1918–1945.

1 (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. He was arrogant, calculating low view of the German people. Well up in Nazi hierarchy etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source.

e.g. Second only to Hitler as a speaker, cool, calculating and sometimes funny; appealed to the basest of German instincts etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 Agrees *OR* disagrees, no support from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Everything to promote Nazi ideas and leadership; centralised control of radio etc.

No To entertain; to reflect the concerns of the German people; to enlighten; not to be tightly organised; to promote Nazism's image internationally 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 German historian and the other is from Goebbels himself 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. Party rallies; publicity for strength; entertaining; parades/displays; stage for leader; speeches etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect which is described in additional detail.

e.g. Ministry for Propaganda and Public Enlightenment; only Culture Chambers' members licensed; censorship; removal of Jews and their works; subsidies; promotion of German art and literature 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. Night of the Long Knives; army opposition; regime and industrialists suspicion of any socialist tendency; unnecessary – SS became more significant; Lutze weaker leader than Rohm; conscription etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, they highlighted German triumphs. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of media control OR other policies, with single factor given, e.g.

Media Control of press; censorship; cheap radios with short range controlled what Germans read or heard.

Other Education; military successes; employment; anti-Semitism; SS/Gestapo effective; any opposition already crushed or feeble; control of other aspects of the media. Any successes in military or economy; or any fear factors are relevant here. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of media control
OR
Other policies, 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 media control *AND* other policies 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. Government made threats but did not take the event too seriously etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s), with reference to the source.

e.g. Warned that it would take resolute measures but only posted notices in the city centre. Did not think much would come of the march. Tsar went away for the weekend 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 Said he would look after the welfare of his people, using the same methods as his father etc.

No He did not understand the political ambitions of the nobility or professional classes. He did not understand change 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 British writer and the other is Nicholas II himself 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. Representative institutions which emerged during the 1905 revolution, first formed in St. Petersburg, then elsewhere. Re-emerged during 1917 to organise strikes and revolutionary activity. Rival of the Duma in Petrograd etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies events, e.g. March to Tsar's Winter Palace. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops events. Award an extra mark to each valid aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. Tsar absent; troops open fire; number of deaths; Gapon and the people thought the Tsar would respond to their pleas and petition 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. Had the support of the ruling classes, army and secret police. Opposition not united and some in exile. October Manifesto bought time until troops returned from Russo / Japanese War etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, the Tsar was blamed for everything. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of the war being the cause OR other reasons, single factor given, e.g.

War Defeats, losses of men, territory. Shortages. Deserting troops joined the discontented workers and radical parties. Country being run during the war by a German Tsarina and Rasputin etc.

Other War was a catalyst. All the fundamentals for a revolution were present. Land issues, aspirations to take part in government. Example of earlier revolution and discontent. Loss against Japan. Treachery of October Manifesto. Watered down Duma etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of the war being the cause OR other reasons, 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 the war being the cause *AND* other reasons must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941.

3 (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. Miserable conditions, homeless; insufficient to live on; little chance of a job etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source.

e.g. Dressed poorly in rags and resents the rest of the neatly dressed world; has to choose between cost of shelter or cost of a cheap bread and beans meal 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 Numbers / period in Washington; riots; President certainly thought so; dealt with as if a real army; did kill police; political threat – see FDR's comment etc.

No They were peaceful; only 8,000 on the march; limited request; Congress had approved; democratic right to express views; unlikely to have brought families if violence was intended 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 song and the other is from a website 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. Roosevelt's radio talks to reassure and restore confidence as well as to explain his intentions. Simple language but not patronising etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies measures. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops measures. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. Closed banks the day after FDR took office; the weakest 5 per cent were closed permanently; Emergency Banking Act; government grants and expert advice to be provided 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. Would only need to stimulate demand; economy could recover to avoid becoming a welfare (socialist?) state; unconstitutional; resistance from Republicans, business and the Supreme Court; cost etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, lots of people got jobs. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of reducing unemployment *OR* other successes, with single factor given, e.g.

Yes Alphabet Agencies like CCC, TVA and NRA etc. were designed to give people jobs and to kick start their lives back in work and to restore confidence in them and in business etc.

No Other Agencies like NIRA and Social Security Act allowed unions to bargain – restored workers' prospects that way; Banks reformed; supervision of Wall Street; NRA and AA to help bosses. Government intended only emergency relief, not long term relief; cut backs in 1938; still 9 million unemployed in 1939; agricultural measures insufficient; little intention or success in helping blacks in the south or women generally etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of reducing employment *OR* other successes 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 reducing unemployment *AND* other successes must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c. 1990.

4 (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. They did not understand one another; a meeting of two different but massive egos etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source.

e.g. Stalin saw himself as an expert in all things while Mao spoke in riddles and of ancient philosophies, which was all lost on Stalin. Hence clash of two different but massive egos 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 Implies free gifts from USSR, and an offer to do a deal over shared ships with USSR able to use China's coastline etc.

No USSR's demand for a deal and share of ships implies distrust of Chinese and resentment at being taken for granted in the past 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 Russian writer and the other is a British book 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. Hong Kong, Macao. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies elements, e.g. China saw Tibet as part of China. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail.

e.g. Tibet independent after the fall of the Qing dynasty in 1911. In 1950 troops of communist China marched in, annexed Tibet in 1951, though it formally remained autonomous. 1959 – Dalai Lama left for India with 100 000, after futile attempts to co-operate with China. Since then China has sought to integrate Tibet into China (expect less polite descriptions). [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. Rivalry for the leadership of the socialist world; personal rivalry between Khrushchev and Mao; nuclear secrets; differences of emphasis of the two regimes; industrial versus agricultural bases; revisionism versus dogmatism; Khrushchev's 'peaceful co-existence' stance; criticism of Stalin when CCP was developing a cult of the personality for Mao etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, they started to talk. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of improving relations OR non-improving relations, single factor given.

Yes After the withdrawal of Soviet aid in 1960 there was an attempt to isolate the USSR. Ping-Pong diplomacy. Nixon's visits to China, expansion of economic activity, UNO etc.

No Ideology, support for KMT by USA during the Civil War; Taiwan; Korea; Vietnam; India; Tibet; UNO with Taiwan representing China; mutual suspicion etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of improving relations OR non-improving relations 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 improving relations *AND* non-improving relations 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 source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. Resented the British; had long memories; felt God was on their side etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source

e.g. Resented British brutality; believes the Heavenly Judge will come to a different verdict than the British judge; feel the British still see them as conspirators 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 Brought in settlers; some Boers joined in; rapid development; wealth; made Johannesburg an important city etc.

No Brought in profiteers; worried Boer government which failed in its attempt to restrict the growth of Johannesburg 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 poem and the other is from and American book 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. Farm where diamonds were discovered; name of Consolidated Mines which came to control two-thirds of the world's diamond industry; controlled new city of Kimberley; Rhodes, its founder in 1888, soon had a South African monopoly. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects.

e.g. Grew bigger; more capital intensive; dominated by Rand millionaires; political significance; blacks the main unskilled workforce. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops aspects, Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. Surface claims gave way to deep mining of both diamonds and gold; huge investment from Europe; Barnato, Rhodes, Robinson, Wernher-Beit and Eckstein dominated. Black workers had to live in compounds to prevent theft. Copper also developed but not so spectacularly 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. Political power: by 1890 he was Prime Minister of Cape Colony, influencing the GB government. Economic importance: Founder and head of De Beers and of the Consolidated Gold Fields; head of the British South Africa Company, which he had set up for development of northern areas; imperial ambitions: instrumental in GB taking Bechuanaland in 1887 and founding Rhodesia in 1890; railway builder; distrusted by Kruger. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, GB wanted all the gold. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of GB's fault OR others' faults, single factor given, e.g.

GB GB did not make the issue of suzerainty clear after First Boer War; Kruger was convinced that GB was behind the Jameson Raid and wanted to take over the Transvaal; failure of the Raid humiliated GB internationally and made Chamberlain more determined; GB needed to exclude German influence etc.

Other Boer nationalism; SAR Treasury strong from gold, could buy weapons; Kruger, Steyn, Smuts; importance of Randlords; individuals such as Rhodes, Jameson and even Chamberlain acting independently. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of GB's fault.
OR
Others' faults 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 GB's fault *AND* others' faults 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 the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. They were getting closer to a deal but more negotiations were needed on specific issues. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source.

e.g. They were getting closer and had produced two separate documents of agreement but needed more negotiations on the issues of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip 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 He is going to Jerusalem and the seas have opened for him to cross etc.

No The whole thing is fraught with danger as he has opponents on the Palestinian side as well and the hawkish Israelis 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 British newspaper, the other is a cartoon 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. Retreat for US presidents, isolated from Washington; place for negotiations, in private in more relaxed fashion etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. Carter set up talks providing a secure and private venue; acted as a mediator and go-between, and achieved success against the odds; agreement would protect US oil imports – oil weapon had been used by OPEC during Yom Kippur War 1973. Used US pressure to push the process along 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. Convinced that Israel could not be defeated in war. Egypt was wasting resources in war and preparations. The cost of the Yom Kippur War. USA and USSR were now more circumspect about Middle East support. Efforts of Nixon and Kissinger to persuade Sadat and Golda Meir to talk. 1974 Sadat quarrelled with USSR – Kissinger arranged US loans to bolster Egypt's industry. Sadat more inclined to listen to the West now etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. No, many countries oppose Israel. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of settlement of problems *OR* non-settlement, with single factor given.

Yes Acceptance as a state by Egypt and Jordan governments – not necessarily by the peoples. Political, military and economic influence of USA had a positive effect at times (also can be a negative factor).

No In 1990 still hostility from Iraq, Iran, Syria and Lebanon. Accept comments about refugees being moved out of states. Organisations in Palestine and their Middle East supporters etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of settlement of problems *OR* non-settlement, 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 settlement of problems *AND* non-settlement 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 source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. It was very successful and made a lot of money etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. Showed that passenger traffic would be profitable; highly successful with engineering projects (Chat Moss); costs very low £40 000; and huge increase in passenger numbers from 1832 to 1849 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 Investigation in House of Commons; resurrection of waterways wanted; crippling of British industry; objections by an industrialist etc.

No Not suggesting the abolition of the railways; wants an amelioration of the charges made by railway companies; wants some form of compromise to protect the canal system and methods of carriage 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 book and the other is a title page of a report so both could 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. Robert Stephenson, I K Brunel, Thomas Brassey, William Cubitt, Peter Lecount (assistant to R Stephenson) Joseph Locke, Samuel Pete, George Hudson etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies difficulties. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops difficulties. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect that is described in additional detail.

e.g. Engineering problems of rivers, hills, different kinds of rock, tunnelling and bridges. Workforce difficulties largely Irish, hard work and conditions, death by explosions, rock fall and disease. Opposition from public – saw danger where none existed, effect on cattle, horses and the human skeleton 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. Many saw advantages of this form of transport; opportunities to make killing; inflow of capital / entrepreneurs; availability of materials and engineers; popular acclaim; relative cheapness etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. No, the poor could now holiday at the seaside. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of disadvantage OR benefit, single factor given, e.g.

Dis Affected jobs in other forms of transport, long distance horse carriage travel and canal transport; houses demolished to accommodate lines – even graveyards at times; some disruption in countryside etc.

Ben Cheap and easy travel; provided direct employment; also indirect employment in iron and steel, coal and short haul horse transport; deliveries faster from countryside to markets; postal service etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of disadvantage.
OR
Benefit 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 disadvantage *AND* benefit must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the 19th Century.

8 (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. Thinks whites are superior; little concern for black interests or lives; blacks are there to be exploited etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source.

e.g. Do not worry about exploiting blacks and increasing their burden; little concern for black lives, the shooting with Maxim's and Dum-Dum bullets seems almost a game 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 Long term planning required; wants to avoid violence which could ruin the best laid plans; suggests patience and gentleness in the best policy etc.

No Considers force as a means; would avoid force as it will not work in the interior; whatever method is to be used, he is determined to colonise 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 – A is a poem, B is a speech and C is a report 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 sources 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 aspect to a maximum of two.

e.g. Served as a soldier in 1880s. Explored and made treaties in Middle Niger 1894–5 and became the High Commissioner for Northern Nigeria in 1897. Governor of Hong Kong 1907–1912. Most important work was the unification of Nigeria 1912–1914. He introduced a system of indirect rule to Northern Nigeria before extending it to the whole country. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. System introduced by Lugard with the idea of maintaining rule of the local rulers under British authority. No grants of land to Europeans as this belonged to local rulers. British Crown was sovereign but the administration that carried out its orders was native in composition and methods, Nigeria prospered under this dual mandate and it was cheap for Britain. Cheaper, more cost effective in military and administration, kept the locals, especially the chiefs, happier 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 sort out various European claims to areas of central Africa; mostly Congo. European nations realised that without some sort of agreement on spheres of influence there was always a chance of a war occurring between European nations – as nearly happened over Fashoda. The 'Scramble for Africa' was really on and Berlin was an attempt to control it. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions. Yes, good intentions but bad people. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of good intentions OR bad outcomes, with single factor given, e.g.

Good Many explorers, missionaries spoke about high minded reason of education, science Christianity, medicine. All sounding idealistic and helpful to native areas etc.

Bad Sadly, very often the agents of delivery were not always as high minded; often ignorant and intolerant of local issues and customs; brute force often used. National interests of imperialist countries always came first etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of good intentions *OR* bad outcomes 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 good intentions *AND* bad outcomes must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010