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

0470/43 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 seen in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. Disciplined; threatening and had public support etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The photo shows the Freikorps marching in disciplined fashion; they are frightening as they have weapons; they have drawn huge crowds to see them which implies support 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 Range and significance of opponents; faced a number of revolts; needed to call on paramilitaries; left capital etc.

No Working class rallied; no direct opposition from the army; survived 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 a picture and the other is by a German 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 correct name to a maximum of two e.g. Rosa Luxemburg; Karl Liebknecht. [1–2]

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

Level 2 Describes weakness. Award an extra mark for each weakness described in additional detail e.g. Proportional representation meant many parties, coalition government and very slow progress; under Article 54 the Chancellor and ministers had to resign if they lost a vote of confidence in the House of Legislature – easily engineered with so many parties; under Article 48 the President could rule by decree 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. Terms of Versailles treaty; myth that they had not been defeated; reduction in size; monarchists; elitists; suspicious of any socialist tendency; distrusted Weimar and sympathised with the Freikorps etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, savings were worthless; No, Dawes Plan. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of hyperinflation *OR* other disasters, single factor given e.g.

Hyp. Increased resentment towards the government; strengthened the right-wing; greater disaster bitterness towards Versailles and the French; bartering; food shortages; savings worthless etc.

Not Made paying reparations cheaper; led to American aid; brought Stresemann to power; Rentenmark helped economic recovery; those in debt could pay off; at first, workers protected by union wage agreements; industrialists benefited because of one union wage agreements collapsed etc.

OR one greater 'disaster' – e.g. Treaty Versailles; weakness Constitution etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of hyperinflation *OR* other disasters 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 hyperinflation *AND* other disasters 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. Not especially bright; lucky with his timing; passionate etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. 'Right man in the right place'; not the cleverest lawyer; emotional speaker who could sway the public 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 Cheer mutinous soldiers; wore the red ribbons and carry the red flags of the revolution; declared their sympathy for the revolution etc.

No Not 'revolutionaries, more spectators or in-between types'; rarely took part in the fighting; usually scattered when the firing began 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 – Both A and B are from British historians of the 1990s 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. Mensheviks, Constitutional Democrats (Cadets), Octobrists, Socialist Revolutionaries etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies elements, An attempted military coup to stabilise Russia. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each valid element described in additional detail e.g. Kornilov thought that the Bolsheviks were traitors and decided to move against the Petrograd soviet. Brought troops to the city. Kerensky armed the Bolsheviks to fight but Kornilov's troops were persuaded to desist. Kornilov arrested. Bolsheviks now armed and popular. Provisional Government embarrassed 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 explanation e.g. Provisional government continued the war, and the losses and defeats continued; sense of mutiny in the army, and the protests and opposition continued; did not deal with the land issue; presence of soviets, especially the rivalry with the Petrograd soviet; actions, slogans and propaganda of the Bolsheviks. No elections etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, defeats made Nicholas unpopular. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of the war's impact *OR* other reasons, single factor given e.g.

WWI Losses and defeats undermined the Tsar, especially when he took command; this meant he was away from St. Petersburg and the government was effectively in the hands of his German wife and Rasputin; peasant soldiers away from home; monumental losses of men slowly undermined the natural loyalty to Tsar etc.

Other The bases of the revolution had been present before 1905; Stolypin and his reforms only delayed the explosion; land issues; autocratic rule; losses against Japan; failure to honour October Manifesto; peasant and worker conditions; economy; agitation from revolutionaries, disgruntled politicians etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of the war's impact *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 war's impact *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. Recruiting the attractive; offering opportunities; challenging accepted social patterns; liberating? [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Attracted nationwide entry for Pageant; exhausting nature of the event, so beauties needed diversion of frivolous discussions; could be financially beneficial if movie contracts were obtained 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 Several states set up controls; worried film industry; set up own censorship; shared some similar objectives etc.

No State enforcement was weak; much of the MPPDA list was only advisory; cynical avoidance; film-goers enjoyed freedom 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 newspaper and the other is from a history of the cinema 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 the title of the movie, one mark for the star e.g. The Jazz Singer, Al Jolson, 1927. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies massacre e.g. Killings on St. Valentine's Day 1929; gang feud etc. [1–2]

Level 2 Develops massacre. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Capone's South Side Italians vs Bugs Moran's North Side Irish over liquor; neither boss present; Capone's men disguised as police lured Moran's seven into a warehouse; 'executed' by machine/shot guns 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. Prohibition made control of the liquor trade/clubs (speakeasies) very profitable; to control prostitution; corrupt police and politicians; ruthless gang leaders/organisations; Mafia; any drinker in a public place had broken the law, so most of the country were criminals – easier to take another step etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, they had greater freedom; No, company bosses were rich. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of young *OR* other groups, single factor given e.g.

Young Enjoyed jazz clubs; cinema; flappers; job opportunities; migrated to cities; breaking down of strict social rules; rural areas had stricter codes so little change there etc.

Other Some single groups benefited in that women, for instance, benefited from the vote and labour saving devices; all working class enjoyed greater job opportunities and rising wages; entertainment by radio and cinema, and transport by car benefited all; young whites/blacks and immigrants often did not have a pleasant time in 1920s etc.
NB – Reward qualification re groups of young which did not benefit. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of young *OR* other groups 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 young *AND* other groups must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990.

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

Level 2 Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the source e.g. They appear studious and devoted to Mao etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. All devoted to Mao as they studiously read their 'Little Red Books'; Cult of Personality from the poster and orderliness 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 China is a cultural desert; censorship of books, songs plays etc. Mme Mao is Mao's cultural police, ensuring no resurrection of culture etc.

No Only until Mao died; there were some books available but of a propaganda nature; also some songs and paintings 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 a picture and the other is a joint venture by a Chinese woman and her British husband so both sources 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 aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Book of Mao's thoughts; given to each Red Guard; almost a passport to do whatever Red Guards liked etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies campaign. To rid the state of 'olds'. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes the campaign. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Red Guards to challenge and punish all types of authority figures, destroy antiquities; humiliated teachers, scientists, managers, any form of history in collections, museums buildings 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. An attempt to keep the revolution on a pure Marxist-Leninist course; opposition to Mao grew during the GLF and right wingers wanted incentives in the communes, and an expert managerial class. Mao called these people revisionists and used the Cultural Revolution as a means of getting rid of them and re-establishing his own control etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, they gained very little at all. [1]

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

Ben Healthier, better educated, better organised population, still mostly in rural areas where much land had been improved. Grain production had kept pace with population rise. Steel production had tripled; light industry kept a reasonable flow of consumer goods compared to USSR; women etc.

Lack Famines and deaths associated with GLF and the Cultural Revolution; madness of backyard steel; misuse of labour at times; insecurity of life from purges; few had felt much change at all; the CCP system vulnerable to the latest of Mao's fads etc. [2]

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

© UCLES 2010

Depth Study F: 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. well organised; supported; peaceful; ambitious aims etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Well planned with recruitment of numbers, and organised protests, planned chanting of slogans; the number of 10 000 taking part could be threatening in a protest 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 Took time to reinforce and respond; requested that the crowd move from the compound's fence etc.

No Scale of the reinforcement and reactions; nervous and inexperienced officers, conscious of police being killed recently in another protest; no order to disperse was given 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 South African and the other is from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission 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. 1953 Act forced segregation in all public amenities, buildings, public transport, beaches etc. 'Europeans only' and 'Non-Europeans only' signs erected; The act stated that the facilities provided for different races need not be equal. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects e.g. Powers to restrict movement and association; anti-Communist. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. 1950 Suppression of Communism Act; any organisations, meeting and publications could be banned; no way to appeal. An order could restrict an individual to a specific magisterial district, required to report to police, prevent association with more than one person at any given time (including family); prevented visiting various public places and educational institutions.

[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. Nationalist majority; Malan and Verwoerd hardliners. Saw separation as a 'mission'; myth of the Covenant; fears of whites especially in cities; overt, systematised extensions; 'separate development'; weakness of opposition etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, movement was restricted. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of Pass Laws' impact *OR* other reasons, single factor given e.g.

PLs From 1952 it was a criminal offence to be unable to produce a permit when police required; extended to include women; permits needed to leave rural area and to seek work in urban areas; opposition grew – Defiance Campaign; it gave the government agencies great control of non-white population.

Other Only required for non-whites; Bantustans successful; Population Registration Act; Group Areas Act forced removal of both blacks and coloureds from white urban areas; work restrictions; banning of strikes by blacks; loss of Coloureds' franchise; education; segregation of all non-whites etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of Pass Laws' impact *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 balanced argument.
BOTH sides of the Pass Laws' impact *AND* other reasons 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. Nasser is informing people, and justifying and explaining his actions; sense of anger in the tone of the piece etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Explaining that he has seized the Suez Canal and its company as it was dug by Egyptians, many of whom died; tone is angry at Egyptian sacrifices to line the pockets of foreigners, and angry at USA for withdrawal of financial support for the Aswan Dam 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 Destroyed Egyptian military supremacy, and captured and/or destroyed most of the Egyptian weaponry; knew now that they could defeat Arab armies on the battlefield etc.

No Had to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and Sharm-el-Sheik; no territorial gains; Egyptians felt that Israel had only won because it had Britain and France as fighting partners [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 part of a Nasser speech, 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. A secret agreement between Britain, France and Israel to overthrow Nasser. Israel would invade Sinai, and then GB and France would act as peacemakers by getting forces between the two sides – effectively occupying the Canal Zone. The plan suffered several leaks. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies reactions. Anger and protest. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes reactions. Award an extra mark for each reaction described in additional detail e.g. USSR threatened to attack Britain with missiles – a cover, no doubt, for its own actions in Hungary; USA prevented Britain from receiving oil from Latin America, causing a collapse in the value of the pound sterling. [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 explanation e.g. The Sevres Plan had fallen apart after initial military success in Sinai, and occupation of the Canal Zone; Britain and France were humiliated by the forced withdrawal after threats and actions of the USA and USSR; The idea of a ceasefire under UNO auspices would, at least, give the Israelis some protection now that GB and France had gone. It would buy time to reassess and organise for any future action etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, they still all hated one another. [1]

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

Chan Britain and France now unpopular in the Middle East and would play only a minor role in future. Nasser now very popular and would want to try his hand again in the future; the oil weapon had been used successfully and petrol rationing was common in the developed world. USSR aid replaced US aid to Egypt but Egyptian weapons and equipment losses would take years to replace; for a while Fedayeen raids ceased which gave Israel a breathing space etc.

No The Palestinian problem was unresolved and would prove difficult for a number of states; the basic distrust and hatred remained; the outcome did not change the status quo after the 1948/9 war; USA and USSR still interested in the area, seeking to solve the Middle East problem or taking advantage of it etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of change *OR* lack of change with multiple factors given. 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* lack of change 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. The work was very heavy and it was dangerous etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The work of tunnelling was difficult at the best of times but clay made the job not only difficult but also dangerous; the death at this new engineering site was of sufficient interest for a newspaper to report 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 Contractors adopt cheapest method of working; no close reference to dangers at work; life recklessly sacrificed, leaving behind widows and children; methods and results were evil etc.

No Contractors may only be 'tempted' to ignore safety; fierce competition is to blame, not the contractors; the Manchester Guardian is campaigning for better working conditions 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 and B are both from newspapers and C is from a nineteenth century 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 which 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. Excavation of rising land so that railway lines can be laid on the level. Cuttings used when the rising land is not steep enough to warrant a tunnel etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies problems e.g. Solutions required when the land was not flat etc. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes problems. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Rising ground – cuttings; shallow valleys – embankments; sharply rising ground – tunnels; water – bridges; boggy ground by solidifying it deeply or at a shallow level – Chat Moss on the Liverpool/Manchester line is a good example 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. Lived rough lives – often fights between rival gangs; largely Irish which were looked down on anyway; often illiterate and uncouth; stealing in the working area; many drunken brawls when paid; many navvies together appeared threatening; left behind dirty camps and showed little responsibility to the area etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertion.
Yes, some made fortunes; No, some lost fortunes. [1]

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

Ben Brought about the rapid expansion of railways; brought employment to many; opened up areas to better travel and communication arrangements; caused poor companies to go bankrupt which left behind bigger and stronger companies; forced government to legislate about railways; boost for coal and iron industries etc.

Lack Many people lost money through speculation on poor companies; fraud caused investment to slow in the 1850s; brought change too rapidly in some areas; problems of navvies behaviour etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of benefit *OR* lack of 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 benefit *AND* lack of benefit 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. Rhodes is a visionary, racist, and an expansionist etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Rhodes wants the British Empire to expand as British rule will benefit everyone; thinks the British are a superior race; thinks that most of the world is uncivilised 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 Fed up with disputes that lead to war and cost lives; think that the British will bring peace etc.

No Frustrated and exhausted with the responsibility of ruling; want British to bring civilisation and Christianity; need an excuse to get rid of heathen customs 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 speech and the other is from a letter 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 country to a maximum of two e.g. Angola, Mozambique. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aims e.g. To share out Africa. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes aims. Award an extra mark for each aim which is described in additional detail e.g. To sort out spheres of influence for European countries in Africa and thus avoid conflict; to lay down guidelines for the colonisation of Africa, end slavery, promote Christianity, bring just laws and order, prevent wars; to confirm Leopold as the owner of the Congo; to lay down rules for navigation of African rivers and lakes 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. European countries competing with one another for a slice of Africa; belief that colonisation would increase trade and raw materials; desire to take civilisation and Christianity to barbarians (White Man's Burden); a large empire was seen as a sign of power and prestige (Place in the Sun); countries wanted to match British success overseas etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions
Yes, Europeans owned most of Africa at the time. [1]

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

Succ Depends what you mean by success. Brought benefits of trade, raw materials and markets to Europeans; established Christianity in many places; allowed exploration and order in many places. For Africans it brought education, technology, medicine.

Lack Conflict and jealousies among Europeans; tropical diseases. Africans lost much of their own civilisation; detribalisation; exploitation and slavery; treated as an inferior class of human beings 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