UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 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.

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

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2011 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 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. For dissidents; labour camps; increasing number of camps; disciplined with savage punishments etc. [3–5]

Level 3 – Supports valid inference from the source e.g. Severe punishments for natural discussion, collection of both true or false information; hanging and shooting 'pour encourager les autres' from breaking rules; rules of Dachau then used across the whole camp system etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Cared nothing for other so-called racial groups like Russians and Czechs; saw non-Germans as slaves and fodder to make the life of Germans better; other groups were no better than human animals etc.

No Noble towards their own; loved animals; honest and decent to fellow Germans; will adopt a decent attitude to human animals etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Both sources are from Himmler; one a set of rules and the other is a speech 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Bergen-Belsen, Berlin-Marzhan, Breitenau, Buchenwald, Flossenburg, Hinzert; Neuengamme; Oranienburg, Ravensbruck, Sachsenhausen, Mauthausen (Austria). [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Inferior, frightening, parasites. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Sub human/animals; Bolsheviks; moneyed; undermining real German values; corrupting life and females; responsible for Versailles etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Long-term objective; logical progression of earlier policies; military power; areas controlled; sheer number outside Germany; technology; Wannsee; Himmler; as war turned rate increased to get rid of the evidence etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, people dare not talk; No, genuinely popular policies. [1]

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

Fear SS, Gestapo, concentration camps; punishment of opponents – Rohm, 3 million Germans in prison or camps; Communists, Socialists, some in Churches, Army; informers everywhere.

Other Popular/middle/upper class support; Hitler Youth; effective economic policies; military success; propaganda; anti-Semitism; not possible to judge in a totalitarian state etc. [2]

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

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of fear AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

2 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. No-one appears to have planned anything and nobody has agreed how to proceed; the event could 'go either way' etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The parties had not cooperated in forming a plan; the whole thing depended very much on the troops' reaction to working class protest etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Idle gossiping does not suggest the authorities had lost control when queues are as important as actions; actions by Cossacks and police; troops surrounding factories etc.

No The ladies think the revolution is starting; swept like a great flood; meetings being held; no great energy from government forces; factories occupied and youths shooting etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from an Okhrana agent, the other is from an old Menshevik 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. First formed in the 1905 Revolution and formed again throughout the country in 1917. Councils of workers and soldiers etc. to co-ordinate strikes and demonstrations. St. Petersburg Soviet rivalled the Duma in power etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies Rasputin's role e.g. Healer, confidant, adviser. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes Rasputin's role. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. A spiritual healer around whom there was much scandal and gossip; he became popular with Tsarina after appearing to help Crown Prince Alexei with his pain from haemophilia; gained even more power when Nicholas took over as C-in-C and left government to Tsarina, heavily influenced by Rasputin; expect rumours of suspected affairs; assassinated in December 1916 etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Losses in the war, shortages of food, general dissatisfaction with the conduct of the war, government, chaos and the Tsar; general dislike of the Royal Family and rumours; government either unable to work/control or totally dysfunctional etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the Bolsheviks were very popular. [1]

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

Bolsh Return from exile; organisation and purpose; April Theses made understandable promises; Kornilov Affair; support from the soviets; ability of Lenin and Trotsky etc.

Other July Days had shown that they were vulnerable; flight of Lenin; dissatisfaction with the Provisional Government over the issues of war, land, elections; elections for Constituent Assembly saw Bolsheviks gaining only a quarter of the seats, behind Social Revolutionaries – Lenin ordered Red Guards to close down the Constituent Assembly after one day etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Bolshevik OR other factors, 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 Bolshevik AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

3 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Relieve poverty; match jobs to skills; benefit community by new services; strengthen families; restore morale and national strength; wages rather than handouts etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Match jobs to skills – better to have bricklayer building hospitals than digging ditches; restore morale by giving women a job and removing them from the breadline – her family benefits etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Cost; private enterprise suffered taxes; jobs lost; restricted freedom etc.

No Projects benefited all; must, therefore, have created jobs; higher wages; social security; taxes not just on business etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Both sources are American, one is a speech and the other is from an historian 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. NRA; motto 'We do our part'; employers had voluntarily agreed to codes to outlaw child labour, improve working conditions; minimum wage; Presidential approval; over 2 million employers joined the scheme etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies effects e.g. Made unions legal; membership increased. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes effects. Award an extra mark for each term of the Act described in additional detail e.g. Had developed from Section 7a of NIRA; workers had the legal right to membership of unions; collective bargaining; controlled unions illegal; membership trebled to 10 million by 1941; strikes for recognition; employers' resistance – sometimes armed etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Chance of land; jobs; traditional migrant labour for harvests; tenant farmers driven from land elsewhere; Dust Bowl; Okies and Arkies etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, more employed; No, many still unemployed. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of better OR not better, single factor given e.g.

Better Alphabet Agencies had improved life for many (expect names and details); unemployment had dropped from 12 million to 9.5 million; groups benefiting from Social Security Act; environmental improvements; reform of the banking system etc.

Not Still 17 per cent unemployed; Alphabet Agencies and policies limitations (expect details); agriculture problems remained; cost; little intention or success in aiding blacks, the South or women etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of better OR not better 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 better AND not better must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

(a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Unless opponents were overtly against the regime and commerce, all should be treated with some leniency; anti-landlord etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Industrial and commercial enterprises run by landlords should be untouched; the only punishments to be meted out were to be to the worst counter-revolutionaries; in the meantime, patience and forgiveness were to be the order of the day etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. 1–2]

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

Yes Stopped being a field army; defensive units for railways and cities only; lost its offensive spirit etc.

No Army still in existence; a garrison army with a role of defending lines of communication; not ineffective, just changed its role etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is from Mao himself and the other is from an American 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two e.g. The island which became the HQ and home for the nationalist KMT movement; permanent thorn in the side of the CCP government; represented China at UNO with a seat on the Security Council; protected by US navy etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies aid e.g. Materiel to support nationalist efforts. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aid. Award an extra mark for each element of aid described in additional detail e.g. Arms and equipment; money; advisers – generals and technicians; medical support; communications – especially by air etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Better organised; better led; deserters; performance and actions of KMT brought support to Communists; attention to the land issue and justice throughout the war; popularity from fighting a foreign enemy, Japan; KMT represented all that was bad in China whereas CCP seemed to offer a new start etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, the Communists stole all the American aid. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of strengthen OR not strengthen, single factor given e.g.

Stren War and final victory against Japan weakened a foreign adversary; Chinese saw the Communists as fighting a national war; peasants compared the treatment of CCP and KMT troops; deserters to Communists brought weapons and expertise; war weakened KMT, its support and resolve; performance of Jiang, his forces and obvious corruption undermined considerable American support for nationalists.

Not Still much larger KMT force in existence with US support; Communists had taken losses during the war; Communists only controlled small areas of China in 1945; the new UNO recognised the KMT government as representative of China; still a huge mountain to climb to keep gains if Civil War continued; most Chinese people just wanted to get back to normal life without worrying which type of government was in power etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of strengthen OR not strengthen 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 strengthen AND not strengthen must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

5 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. International opposition; fears of Afrikaners; disunity; bloodshed etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Fears that sanctions may force changes that will alter severely the position of the Afrikaners in South Africa; thinks sanctions are encouraging violence; almost a hint that he might not oppose a transfer to majority rule as long as the process is peaceful etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Willing to make labour reforms; investing in black education; demonstrations; international pressure; dialogue with Mandela.

No Only some reforms, not all demands met; crackdown on unrest; Mandela still in prison; took 3 years to respond to his proposals etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is South African, the other is American 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid term to a maximum of two e.g. Abolished old Senate in favour of three sections: House of Assembly for whites (178), House of Representatives for coloureds (85), House of Deputies for Indians (45). Electoral College of these three groups to choose State President and could advise the President's Council. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies the role e.g. Chief Minister of Kwazulu homeland. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes the role. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. By 1980 Buthelezi fully controlled effective social and political Zulu organisation; criticised the government from inside the system; worked to combine the Kwazulu and Natal as multi-racial – government refused 1985; accepted Mandela as leader of blacks but criticised ANC guerrilla tactics; 1985–7 violence with other black groups etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Black bitterness against the new constitution; ANC guerrilla tactics and call for civil unrest to make South Africa ungovernable proved effective; AZAPO; UDF rallies; riots; police action was provocative but inadequate to contain; needed army support etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, government could not contain violence; No, whites were beginning to see it just caused trouble. [1]

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

Viol Violence escalated on both sides; townships descending into anarchy; increasing cost to government was not sustainable etc.

Other Gradual dismantling had begun before the violence; effects of economic sanctions; role of Botha, de Klerk, Mandela, UDF; National Party losing support; violence worst between black groups etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of violence OR other factors 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 violence AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1990

6 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Divided in views but conceded in the end that the fight must continue etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Thought that the tactics of 1964 had caused current Arab problems; cautious views wanted to stop the struggle; Arafat the most influential personality and he wanted to continue etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Glad her son died away from the camp; press takes pictures and brands them as 'beggars'; 'This is no life' etc.

No Her sons have fought, are fighting and will fight again for the cause; eight-year-old preparing to fight; deaths are not stopping the struggle etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is a Jewish/Palestinian cooperation, the other is from the PLO 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid state to a maximum of two e.g. Lebanon, Tunisia [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies aims e.g. To achieve a Palestinian homeland. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aims. Award an extra mark for each aim described in additional detail e.g. 'Our political vision of a free Palestine is a democratic, secular, non-racial state where all Palestinians – Christians, Jews and Muslims – have equal rights. The Palestine Liberation Movement considers itself a part of the people's struggle against international imperialism. We are fighting the same enemy whether it is in Latin America, Vietnam or Palestine.' (Yasser Arafat). [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Fatah launched guerrilla attacks on Israel from bases in Jordan; volunteers growing daily after successful Fatah resistance on Jordan base at Karemeh; attacks on Israel and Israelis rose; Hussein feared Palestinians were overrunning his country; they paraded openly; Arafat did not control all groups; hijacking of planes and blowing them up at Dawson's Field, East Jordan lost much sympathy; 17 Sept 1970, Hussein launched his loyal army on the Palestinians. Fierce, bloody battle – Palestinian fighters had to re-locate to Lebanon. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Not much; the Palestinians' cause is an embarrassment. [1]

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

Supp Outwardly, and in principle, all Arab states support the establishment of a Palestinian state. But, do they wish it to replace the state of Israel? Is the Palestinian issue just a means to embarrass Israel? Support from Syria through Lebanon, from Iraq and Iran has been given openly. Are support, money and weapons secretly given by other Arab states? Saudi Arabia?

Lack Issues that the Arab states have had with Israel and the wars fought are largely about land. Egypt is interested about Sinai, Syria about the Golan Heights, Jordan about the West Bank and Lebanon about southern Lebanon. Could be argued that Egypt and Jordan have a permanent understanding with Israel, and no concerns for the Palestinians. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

7 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Kent workers are being targeted by strangers to break the law; told that action would improve working conditions etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Kent workers are being targeted, according to the poster, by so-called 'friends' to break the law in the belief that this will help them get better wages etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Asks the lowest, degraded, slave-like workers to wake up and take an interest in the state and future; indifference quoted etc.

No Only applies to agriculture; one Tolpuddle Martyr is aware; Loveless thinks there are people aware to come and join from all points of the compass etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is a poster and the other is 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]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid detail to a maximum of two e.g. Workers opposed to change like introduction of machinery. Originally led by 'Ned Ludd' against machines in the stocking industry; eventually workers with violent reaction to change – machine breakers. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies Owen e.g. Factory owner; philanthropist. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes the work of Owen. Award an extra mark for any valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Aimed to improve working and living conditions for workers. In his own factories in Scotland – New Lanark, he improved working conditions, housing etc. Wanted to spread the idea of associations – hence he founded GNCTU – but was not able to prevent its demise. Ahead of his time etc. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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 felt they were not working; there were a growing number of 'illegal' associations; an out of date law – established during the Napoleonic Wars – now being applied and causing ill-will; ardent reformers like Francis Place publicised iniquities; Select Committee recommended a change to parliament. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they were laughed at. [1]

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

Fail Aims largely political, thought outrageous at the time and none of its demands were achieved before the fall of the movement; poor communications; two wings – Moral Force (Lovett), Physical Force (O'Connor); seen as dangerous by the Establishment, especially in 1848, but so many forged signatures in its petition it collapsed; brought scorn and set backs to workers' association.

Lack Only annual elections of its six demands not now implemented; others – pay for MPs, equal electoral districts, universal manhood suffrage, abolition of MPs property qualification, secret ballot. Showed the working classes could work together; publicised political inequalities in the country etc. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

8 (a) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. British trying to be friendly and respectful; Chinese ruling classes see British as inferiors etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. British send a letter hoping for peace and goodwill; arrogant Chinese send reply which indicates goodwill cannot exist while the merchants have to take crumbs from the Emperor; the British seen as a much lower class etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes Source C seems to show that the British are now in a position to dictate terms and relationship with the Chinese.

No The lament in Source B indicates that the ex-American President feels insulted as China appears to refuse trade and diplomacy on equal terms etc. [3–5]

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

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Source A is a reply to a letter, Source B is a lecture and Source C is another letter so they could all be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

(b) (i) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – One mark for each valid term to a maximum of two e.g. China ceded Hong Kong to Britain and opened 5 'treaty ports' (Shanghai, Canton, Foochow, Amoy, Swatow). Paid compensation for confiscated opium and a war indemnity. Import duties lowered from 65 to 5 per cent. British nationals exempt from Chinese law. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Identifies aspects of war. Largely a war at sea. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects of war. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. 1839, Chinese forbade opium trade and demanded the merchants of Canton surrender their stocks of opium. Tried to follow this up by firing on a British warship. British then conducted a mainly naval campaign in which they bombarded Canton and its forts. [2–4]

(iii) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

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. Social and health effects upon the Chinese population; China had no control over the trade; resented increasing influence of foreign traders and their interference in local matters; contravened 'Dragon Seat' position; China got little out of it but others, especially Britain, gained great profits in this trade from India to China etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 – No evidence submitted or response does not address the question. [0]

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, the Europeans took all they could. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit to China OR lack of benefit, single factor given e.g.

Ben Brought work and wealth to some; brought western goods so helping to bring China out from medieval isolation; some Chinese journeyed to Europe or America and returned with some degree of western industry etc.

Lack Much of the trade was opium based which affected the Chinese people badly; profits were largely for Europeans; resentment and argument increased as Europeans and western ways dominated areas; brought two wars which damaged China and its people badly etc. [2]

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

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011