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

0470/42 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 the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. Nationalist; expansionist; anti-Semite; radical; revolutionary; populist; ambitious etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e. g. Anti-Semite as wants to exclude Jews as citizens; Expansionist as talks about a greater Germany; Populist over Old Age Pensions policy, 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 Confident; inspired loyalty; dealt with rivals; rebuilt the party; patient etc.

No Poor election result; no national influence; not taken seriously; 'part of the lunatic fringe'; cannot tell as he had never stood for election 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 Nazi pamphlet, the other is from a British professor 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]

(b) (i) Level 1 One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two.

e.g. SPD; Centre; DNVP; KPD; DVP. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies powers, e.g. Head of State. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops powers.
Award an extra mark for each power described in additional detail.

e.g. Head of state; Commander-in-Chief, Article 48 emergency powers to suspend individual rights and rule by decree; directly elected etc. [2–4]

© UCLES 2010

(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. Military / Freikorps background; Quasi-socialist image; close to Hitler; Munich / imprisonment; Aided the rebuild of the Party; Chief of Staff of SA from 1931; Destroying opposition in 1932/3 elections; Disliked by other leaders; His wish to unite SA and Wehrmacht made him a dangerous person for Hitler; Wanted more left wing policies which would upset Hitler's financial backers etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion:

Yes It gave Hitler more power.

No The death of Hindenburg was more important. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of Enabling Act *OR* other reasons, single factor given, e.g.

EA Gave Hitler dictatorial powers for four years; Gave him time and authority to arrest enemies (Communist Party already banned); In effect it made Hitler the legal dictator of Germany etc.

Other Night of the Long Knives; Death of Hindenburg; Allegiance of the Wehrmacht; Abolition of unions; improvement in jobs and prosperity etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of Enabling Act *OR* other reasons 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 the Enabling Act *AND* other reasons must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941.

2 (a) (i) Level 1 Repeats material stated in the source. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Life could be hard, dangerous and painful, etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. Life was hard as crops were taken and discipline was harsh.
Life was difficult – more died of hunger than from fighting 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 About 15 per cent supported other parties but they were divided against themselves in petty bickering. The 70 per cent of the population (peasants) played little part in politics – had more pressing issues at home.

No Bolshevik success was based on a small 10 per cent but all were very loyal, disciplined and organised 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 historian, the other is from a British secret agent 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. Secret police instituted by Lenin without official status in December 1917. Run by a Pole, Dzerzhinsky. Its purpose was to establish and protect the Communist Revolution. Corn requisition. Interrogation, torture, execution at HQ, Lubyanka Prison. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies elements. Gave Bolsheviks control of trade and industry. [1–2]

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

e.g. Peasants forced to give up surplus grain to the government to feed the Red Army and cities. Workers told where and when to work. All firms employing more than 10 workers were nationalised: banks, railways, iron and coal 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. Divisions amongst the Whites; Reds controlled the central area and most means of production/railways; Trotsky was an excellent leader and Red leaders were ruthless and efficient; Foreign Powers had no clear aims, and Bolsheviks were able to sell the war as a defence of Mother Russia etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. No, Stalin quickly changed it. [1]

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

Succ Gave incentives to work; peasants worked harder; industrial traders (Nepmen); economy began to recover; great progress with electrification of industry; towards the end of 1927, ordinary Russians were better off than at any time since 1914 etc.

Lack Introduced because of opposition to War Communism – Kronstadt sailors.
Seen as a capitalist plan by many communists. Still food shortages. No real overall improvement in heavy production to take USSR back to pre-First World War levels. [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 C: The USA, 1919–1941.

3 (a) (i) Level 1 Repeats material stated in the source. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. Naïve; greedy; victims of fraud – financial and political; bitter, etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g.

Taken in by 'rich creamy words'. Assured of easy profits by the 'highest authority. Overconfident in advisers, 'the wisest of hands' 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 Believed in a free market; confident to act on the edge of the law; willing to buy on credit – even into 1930 etc.

No Lack of sufficient and effective supervision; dishonesty; credit too easily available; increase in index shows solid reason for investments 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 an American study and the other is from an American analyst 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 element to a maximum of two.

e.g. Buying stocks with 10 per cent of the cost, borrowing money on the expectation of price rises to cover; brought in small investors; banks used the method directly etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies measures.

e. g. Tax and economic measures. [1–2]

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

e.g. Lowered taxes; cuts in expenditure; loans to Europe withdrawn; Federal Home Loan Bank; 1930 Hawley-Smoot raised tariffs still further; 1931 'Give a job' scheme; 1932 Reconstruction Finance Corporation etc. [2–4]

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for the reason, one for the reason explained.

e.g. Insufficient measures; Tariffs damaged rather than helped; Did not appreciate the full scale of the problem; Unwilling to take firm action against banks; 'rugged individualism'; Danger of welfare state; Resistance from Republicans, some Democrats and the Supreme Court; Could not restore confidence; Longer term problems of agriculture etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. Yes, the banking crisis weakened confidence. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of banking crisis *OR* other reasons, single factor given, e.g.

Bank 2000 banks had collapsed by 1930, 5000 by 1933;
Bank of US in New York worst failure in history (at that point) – 400 000 depositors lost savings; European banks collapsing weakened confidence further; trust in banks not restored; FDR's immediate reforms – the weakest 5 per cent closed permanently; Emergency Banking Act.

Other Distrust in Stock Market - fall in demand.
Unemployment – 25 per cent by 1933.
Agricultural depression.
Hoover's defeat in 1932 election. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of banking crisis *OR* other reasons 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 banking crisis *AND* other reasons 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. The protesters were happy and confident etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. All body language of smiles, greetings, clothing exuded confidence that the government must capitulate to the protesters demands 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 Markets for private sale of produce.
Agricultural workers' pay had tripled in 6 years.
Encouragement of small companies.
Consumer goods available etc.

No Consumer goods expensive.
12 per cent unemployment.
Crime and hooliganism 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 journalist, the other is from a historian so they both may 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. Hong Kong, Macao. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies factors.

e.g. Rose in influence during the Cultural Revolution; arrested after Mao's death. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes factors. Award an extra mark for each valid factor which is described in additional detail.

e.g. Gang were Jiang Qing (Mao's wife), Wang Hongwen, Yao Wenyuan, Zhang Chunqiao. Resented by most of the Party because of access to Mao (although Mao and Jiang were not that close). More radical than even Mao. Tried to manipulate Deng but after Mao's death they were toppled, arrested, and sentenced to death but sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. [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. 1988 and 1989 had seen severe economic problems in China with high inflation levels; for two months demonstrators demanded an increase in the pace of democratic reform, and protested CCP corruption; encouraged by the Gorbachev reforms in USSR and excited by his proposed visit on 15–18 May; power struggle in CCP hierarchy so mixed messages were given to the protesters. However, force was used on 3–4 June to disperse the protesters. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. Yes, capitalist businesses are now in China. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of change *OR* lack of change, single factor given, e.g.

Chan Deng did not see that it was anti-communist for people to enrich themselves; hence a decentralisation of much of the old communist interference in trade and a loosening of economic doctrine to allow foreign investment and international financial cooperation. Changes mostly in the financial and economic sectors.

Lack Very little true political reform; CCP remained very firmly in control of development; some mild building on previous Communist reforms with regard to health, welfare, education and women. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of change *OR* lack of change 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 change *AND* lack of change 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 inference(s), unsupported from the source.

e.g. Opportunities and conditions in native reserves need to be developed; to improve farming methods; to be self-financing; to increase government control; to direct labour supply; promote white ownership and land profit. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. Keen to acquire more land – another 6 million hectares to add to the 9 million already; self-finance through poll tax, rent and profit; to improve agriculture with systems of control over livestock 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 ICU failed; rural Africans faced too many hindrances; too localised; no national campaign before 1950s.

No Had ICU resistance; able to organise rural national organisation and mount strikes; women's campaign in the 1920s. [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 the major terms of an Act, the other is from a students' 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 aspect to a maximum of two.

e.g. Government owned Iron and Steel Corporation; State railway market monopoly. To build the first modern smelting and steel works in Africa. To be independent of European imports. Protected by tariffs. [1–2]

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

Level 2 Describes effects. Award an extra mark for each valid effect that is described in additional detail.

e.g. Benefited from World Depression; Increased production and value of gold improved government revenues and helped investments in other parts of the economy; Higher wages; Internal migration – blacks and poor whites; Townships to settle black women and families as well as men; Jo'burg townships of Sophiatown and Soweto grew rapidly and did have water / electricity. [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: Afrikaners divided (SAP v National Party) re British control; Hertzog's Nationalists opposed involvement in WWI in contrast to Botha/Smuts; Cape and Natal had more voters of British origin, Supporters for the Unionist Party; Growing appeal of Labour Party, especially to Rand miners and unions; influence of Broederbond; 'Fusion' government led to Malan's Purified National Party in 1934; United Party divided over Smuts support for British in 1939; some supported more liberal reform for blacks or communism. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. Yes, ended black ownership. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of land issue *OR* other issues, single factor given, e.g.

Land Land Settlement Act of 1912 and Natives' Land Act 1913;
Strengthened by the 1936 Act effectively ended individual black land ownership and expelled 'squatters' from white land, especially in Transvaal. Reserves increased the good land available to whites; benefited capitalist farmers; created more migrant labour for industrial development.

Other Other areas of success were industrialisation; growing segregation; Pass Laws; ending Cape non-white vote. Suppression of opposition. Weakness of black organisations. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of land issue *OR* other issues 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 land issue *AND* other issues 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. The Israelis thought that the victory had marked the end of Israel's involvement in war etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. Israelis felt that the war had dealt such a blow to the Arab states that they would no longer wish to start another war with Israel; they expected successful peace negotiations as they were now in a position of strength 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 UNO had involved itself and passed Resolution 242: that Resolution, if upheld, would give Israel what it wanted – secure borders and the right to live in peace etc.

No Khartoum meeting of Arab states showed the old intransigence of refusing peace, recognition and negotiation to Israel. The Arab struggle would continue 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 former President of Israel and the other is from a British history 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 area to a maximum of two.

e.g. Golan Heights, Sinai, West Bank, Jerusalem, and some small parts of Syria. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects, e.g. Surprise attack and cover for land forces. [1–2]

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

e.g. Knocked out Egyptian air force then did the same to the Jordanian, Syrian and Iraqi air forces. Action in support of Israeli land forces as they progressed into enemy territory; Blitzkrieg effect, 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. Arguments in the Israeli government led President Nasser to believe that he could threaten war without retaliation. May 1967 clashes between Syria and Israel – Nasser thought this could develop into a full scale attack and if he did nothing his reputation would be hit. Soviet intelligence told him that Israel would not fight on two fronts. Nasser had been accused during the 1960s by Arab leaders of cowardice towards Israel. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. Yes, both began to think differently. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of change *OR* no change, single factor given. e.g.

Chan Palestinians felt that the resolution of their cause must lay more and more in their own hands. More terror attacks such as three airliners blown up in Dawson's Field in Jordan; 1970 expulsion of Palestinians from Jordan; Munich Olympics 1972. Sadat wanted an accommodation with Israel but internal Egyptian politics would not allow this. 350 000 more Palestinians / Arabs now under Israeli rule. Although helpless for the most part, Arab hatred of Israel reached a new intensity.

No Most Arabs and their states would destroy Israel if they could; Solid refusal to accept the Israeli state despite such a shattering defeat; Khartoum declaration; UNO Resolution 242; 1968 Israeli-Egyptian artillery duel across the Suez Canal in 'War of Attrition'; 1972 Sadat sent home 17 000 Soviet advisers, Egyptian people restless, Sadat had to do something, helped lead to Yom Kippur War. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of change *OR* no change with multiple factors. Accept 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 change *AND* no change must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

7 (a) (i) Level 1 Repeats material seen in source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. There is a mixture of gauges and some more lines are planned etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. A mixture of broad and narrow gauged railways have been built with broad gauge largely found from London westwards; very few lines in Wales and Cornwall except for South Wales 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 The speaker has a vested interest but speaks of a new iron age; Dramatic claim of the world receiving a new impulse; sees it spreading all over etc.

No There must be a debate as to whether the pastoral / agricultural life must give way to a new mechanical age; Calls pastoral life the 'golden age' 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 map, B is a speech and C is from a history book 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 both. [6–7]

© UCLES 2010

(b) (i) Level 1 One mark for each correct gauge e.g. 7 feet (broad); 4 feet 8 and a half inches (narrow). **NB one mark maximum for right gauges but in wrong order.** [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies the Act, e.g. An act to guarantee railway transport each day. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes aspects of the Act. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail

e.g. Each company to run at least one train in each direction over its lines each day, stopping at every station, travelling at a speed of at least 12 miles per hour, and charging a penny a mile. These trains were known as 'parliamentary trains'. [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. Some of the early railways were making good profits so people wanted to join in on the 'bonanza; People believed that every railway would make a profit and this encouraged companies to set up lines between towns that had no industrial base; There were unscrupulous men who encouraged speculation with over optimistic prospectuses; by the 1840s many had become wealthy through the expansion of industry and so were keen to invest in new prospects like railways, thus fuelling the scramble to invest in railways etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. No, railways were an exciting adventure. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of problems *OR* solutions, single factor given, e.g.

Prob Caused much anguish in rural areas as the old way of life was forced to change; People believed that cattle / animals would be adversely affected by trains; To reach centres of towns houses had to be pulled down – even cemeteries moved – this was especially so in London;
Caused many canals to decline, leading to loss of jobs and investments;
Caused decay in long distance horse transport and death of stage coaches; Encouraged unwise speculation and loss of money.

Sol Quicker movement of bulk goods like coal; Enabled workforce to move about or commute to work; Enabled foodstuffs and fish to reach towns quickly, thus improving diet; Letter post carried on trains; Allowed ports to expand as goods more easily transported to and from; Raw material from abroad like cotton could be transported quickly to industry. [2]

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

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source.

e.g. The people attending think imperialism is a worthy option; everybody appears to be happy with the outcome, etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source.

e.g. Bismarck and the delegates think Leopold is a worthy man – 'illustrious creator' and applause at his name; Leopold appears to be the main beneficiary of the conference despite his absence, 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 Very little expenditure to help improve the lot of the natives;
Few knew any African language; implies disinterest and perhaps only interest in gain. Intimidated survivors to be forced labourers; bought and sold slaves etc.

No Leopold had asserted he wanted to provide wise government and public service; poor and rudimentary hospitals; shooting villagers for sport, 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 about the Congo and the other is a pamphlet 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 colony to a maximum of two.

e.g. Kameroons, German South West Africa (Namibia), German East Africa, Togoland. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies Leopold's role. Sponsored exploration. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes Leopold's role. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail.

e.g. Leopold sponsored Stanley to explore the Congo and other regions; occupied the area with Belgian forces, stating that he wished to bring good government to the area and improve the peoples; impressed European nations at Berlin Conference which confirmed his title to the Congo 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. Countries such as Germany and Italy only came into being in the second half of the nineteenth century so were late into the field. Britain was strong financially and militarily. Trade from industrial Britain gave footholds. Conquest by Britain from other Europeans e.g. Cape Colony. Desire and ambition. Missionaries. Experience of Empire building over three centuries. Countries like Portugal and Spain, former colonial powers, were in decline. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion. Yes, the Europeans wrecked Africa. [1]

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

Dis Exploitation of people and resources; some slavery; westernisation; destruction of old way of life; white domination of government and finance; missionaries? etc.

Ben In terms of communication (in understanding one another as well as by transport via railways, steamboats etc); opening up Africa for trade and creation of wealth; missionaries; education; medicine; technology, etc.[2]

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

© UCLES 2010