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

0470/43 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.

- 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. Want an obedient, pro-government society; want a non-judgemental, nationalist society prepared for military action etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Demands an end to Weimar decadence with reference to moral decay in family and society; wants non-critical state with an end to academic freedom, democratic and Jewish interpretations 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 All-pervasive; constant events and slogans; tailored to suit the audience, especially the young; opposition could only try to avoid etc.

No Did not convince all people; population already susceptible to Nazi appeal; seeking positive leader and policies 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 American and 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]

© 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 group to a maximum of two e.g. Edelweiss Pirates, White Rose, Meuten in Leipzig, Baum Group in Berlin, Swing movement. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. Attempts to control faith. Tense situation. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Early acceptance, later persecution of some; Muller Reich Bishop to 1935, then Kerrl Ministry; Protestant split – 1934 Confessional Church, hundreds of clergy to concentration camps e.g. Niemoller, Bonhoffer (executed 1941); Concordat with Catholic Church, but later interference with schools and youth movement; Bishop Galen 1941 protest over euthanasia 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. Job creation – state funded projects on infrastructure – Autobahns etc.; Labour Service, compulsory for young from 1935; rearmament; Four-Year Plan; conscription; removing women from labour market etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, propaganda most important; No, Hitler the overall driving force. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Goebbels OR another leader, single factor given e.g.

Goebb Propaganda via newspapers, radio, film, art, censorship, rallies; impact on a whole people etc.

Other Unable to disguise problems from 1941 onwards; Hitler more popular – speech maker and foreign successes; Himmler more efficient – SS, Gestapo, police etc.; Goering – air force, SA, economy; Ley – DAF; von Schirach – Hitler Youth; Heydrich – Final Solution; von Ribbentrop – foreign policy, influence on Hitler etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Goebbels OR another leader 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 Goebbels AND another leader 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 seen in the source, no inference made. [1–2]

Level 2 – Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. They are poor and shabby etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. They appear to be protesting for collectivisation and against the kulaks; they look regimented and emotionless; propaganda photo? 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 Chaos; unplanned; no machinery; famine and death numbers; concealed so no international aid could be claimed or delivered etc.

No Grain still being collected; towns fed; exported grain brought industrial plant; Stalin happy as famine broke peasant resistance 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 photo and 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]

© 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. Richer peasants who owned land, employed poorer peasants and controlled most village Mirs. Largely grew out of Stolypin's agricultural reforms etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies organisation. A collective system of farming. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes organisation. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Collective farms or 'kolkhozy'; peasant farmers did not cultivate their own land but farmed all the land available in cooperation with their neighbours. In theory, they then shared the profits; in practice, they became state agricultural workers. [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. Insufficient grain being produced by the old system to feed cities and new industrial workers; to expand land under cultivation; to use machinery like tractors; to eradicate the kulaks; to sell grain abroad to buy technology and experts etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, a lot died. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, single reason given e.g.

Ben Long term gains in food production with regard to grain and animals; kulaks eradicated; fed the cities and bought foreign technology; made the peasants cooperate; in spite of occasional poor harvests, the Russians were better fed etc.

Lack Short term famines; millions died; on hold early on as officials were 'dizzy with success'; force used; propaganda and scapegoated kulaks; very few human rights respected; still poor harvests in the long term; experiments as far ahead as Khrushchev's Virgin Lands scheme 1954 failed etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit 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 AND lack of benefit 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. Overall doing well but agriculture variable etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The value of the economy increases to 1929, after which there is a dramatic fall; the value of cattle is variable but reaches its peak in 1929, while the peak prices for cotton are in 1925 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 Loss of job security; no trust in banks; curtailed spending; not reassured by government action etc.

No Bank irresponsibility; most already in debt; concrete reasons for fearing unemployment 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 statistics, the other is a website so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

© 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. Buying shares in expectation of a quick profit; buying on the margin; cheap loans; lack of regulation; prices rising throughout the 1920s; encouraged by the example of those making a killing etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies effects e.g. Went bankrupt; helped FDR win election. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes effects. Award an extra mark for each valid effect described in additional detail e.g. 659 banks went bankrupt in 1929. 1930 – 1352, 1931 – 2294; largest was the Bank of the United States in New York; businesses cut production; wage cuts; job losses. US loans to Europe called in; undermined Hoover, benefited FDR 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. Hoover seen as a 'do nothing' President; Republican principles made Hoover a prisoner of his party; treatment of the Bonus Army; FDR and his whistle-stop tours; success as Governor of New York; Democrats united for once; promises of action (vague). [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they lost their jobs; No the middle classes lost all their savings. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of the poor's losses OR benefit/other groups' losses, single factor given e.g.

Loss Unemployment – 14 million by 1933; 1939 still 9 million; wage reductions; loss of homes; starvation; migration etc.

Ben Poor eventually benefited; Social Security Act; trade union reform; job creation via Alphabet Agencies; intolerance pre-dated the Wall Street Crash but remained.

Other Bankers/Wall Street losses; regulation; businessmen's loss of markets; savers; politicians etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of poor's losses OR benefit/other groups' losses 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 poor's losses AND benefits/other groups' losses must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

4 (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. All was frenetic and violent; needed some kind of discipline to diffuse anger etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. All was frenetic with groups fighting one another; the PLA was used as a mediator but even their representative was kidnapped; needed a cooling off period with Red Guards sent to the countryside 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 Ruling Central Committee leading the demand for unity; appeals to party committees to seek out the dissenters and convert them; get rid of the burdensome past and join the rest in the struggle etc.

No States that the Cultural Revolution is a revolution which will meet resistance; blames dissent on Capitalist Roaders and old lifestyle; admits there are comrades who have made mistakes 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 British, the other is from the Chinese Communist Party 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. Small red book, full of Mao's political and philosophical thoughts; often read; used by the Red Guards as a passport to carry out vengeance on the educated classes in humiliation meetings and punishments etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies meetings e.g. To make 'opponents' face their errors. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes meetings. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. The Cultural Revolution condemned anything old or anyone educated; Red Guards therefore targeted antiquities, and managerial, teaching, scientific and library personnel. They would be humiliated; made to confess errors and then often badly beaten; some died 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. To re-energise the Communist revolution; to regain his position in the Party – lost some face with the failure of the Great Leap forward; factions in the Party wanted to develop a managerial class of experts; Mao hated this and called them Capitalist Roaders and revisionists – too much like the Russian model; to remove or put down enemies in the Party etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, some Chinese were better off. [1]

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

Chan The easing of economic restrictions under Deng and the movement towards international cooperation via UNO and the World Bank has seen the Chinese economy expand, and China become a world superpower; much better standard of life for many Chinese and greater access to consumer goods etc.

Lack Deng still had the CCP in complete control of political life with abuses of human rights; any resistance crushed – Tiananmen Square; rural Chinese saw very little improvement or change; factories, dams and city expansion saw many deprived of land and property etc. [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]

© 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. Radical, determined, optimistic, communist (?), contradictory, idealistic etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Support valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Idealistic and optimistic in that it believed in equable sharing and equable government; wants peace for all ever after but acknowledges they will have to fight to get peace 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 Organised; all races represented; number of delegates; range of concerns; not intimidated; refused to be provoked etc.

No Bannings; police powers and provocative actions; unable or unwilling to resist the actions of state agencies 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 a Charter and the other is from an autobiography 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. A white, mainly English-speaking World War II veterans' organisation formed 1951; leaders included Louis Kane-Berman, Harry Schwartz, later Liberal MP, communist Joe Slovo, Adolf 'Sailor' Malan, President; torchlight marches to oppose removal of Coloureds' vote in Cape Province; largest march attracted 75 000 protesters; lasted 5 years; membership up to 250 000 etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies aspects e.g. It was destroyed; forced removals. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for valid aspects described in additional detail e.g. Oldest township's mixed population not in line with Group Areas Act; removal February 1955; early morning heavily armed police forced residents out of homes; taken with belongings on government trucks 13 miles from city to government empty fields; peaceful protest by ANC and white liberals; area bulldozed and replaced by Afrikaner town named Triumph. [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. Morale-boosting Anglican priest; 1956 book Naught for Your Comfort was a bestseller, banned in South Africa; 1959 founder member of the British Anti-Apartheid movement – President 1981; worldwide publicity/fundraising; influence over Tutu, Mandela; honoured by UN, ANC; tumultuous welcome in SA in 1991 after 35 year absence. [2–6]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, a racial classification; No, other acts were worse. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of damage by Registration Act OR damage by another Act, single factor given e.g.

Reg Act – Designated racial group of every citizen; all to carry Racial Classification document; basis for enforcement of all the other apartheid laws; to aid separate development etc.

Others Abolition of Passes Act 1951 tightened all aspects; Reservation of Separate Amenities Act 1953 segregated all facilities. Restricting areas to live: Group Areas Act led to forced removals; Prevention of Illegal Squatting; Native Laws Amendment restricted black peoples' town dwelling; 1956 no right of appeal. Loss of political freedom: Separate Representation lost Coloured Cape vote; Bantu authorities in homelands abolished NRCs. Affecting work: Building Workers Act; Native Labour prohibited black strikes. Limited education: Bantu Education Act; Extension University Education. Restricting personal freedom: Prohibition of Mixed Marriages; Immorality Act. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of damage by Registration Act OR damage by another Act with multiple reasons. 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 damage by the Registration Act AND damage by other Act must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1994

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. The population appears to grow bigger; immigration seems to reduce etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The population grew steadily from 1948 and multiplied by a factor of four, while immigration has reduced by 1968 to one sixth of the 1949 rate. This would appear to suggest that population rise now depends more on natural birth rate rather than immigration. Reduction in immigration would appear to show that many of the Jews who wished to settle in Israel have already done so. [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 Enormous increase in exports from citrus fruits to plastics etc.; main customers USA and Britain. Has a tourist industry etc.

No Experiences difficulties in finding foreign markets, especially among Arab and communist states. Tourist industry disrupted by war 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 statistics and the other is by a British writer 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. Collective agricultural settlements (first in 1909). Often sited in unpromising areas to regain land from arid areas, and to increase food production etc. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies issues e.g. Both claim the city as having central religious importance. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes issues. Award an extra mark for each valid issue which is described in additional detail e.g. After Mecca and Medina, the Al-Aqsa mosque is the third most holy site for Islam. Since Jerusalem was the capital of King David's kingdom (c. 1000 BC), it has been the epicentre of Jewish cultural, social, religious consciousness. UNO wanted the city to have international status (1947), but after the war 1948/9, the western half fell under Israeli control, and the eastern half, including the Wailing Wall, came under Jordan. After the Six Day War Israel occupied the whole area. Bone of great contention in any peace negotiations. [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. Early promises e.g. Balfour Declaration, and developing Zionism, appeared to make the Jews feel they had a right to a homeland. After WWII, sympathy and the Jewish lobby in the USA meant that a Jewish state could exist in Palestine. GB opted out of its mandate and UNO plans were heavily 'influenced' by USA. The unity and determination of the Jews to resist all attempts to eradicate Israel: the disunity among Arab states – some totally against Israel like Iran and Syria, while others like Jordan and Egypt have reached an accommodation of sorts. Support of USA. [2–6]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they always stick together. [1]

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

Unity Once the state was established, it would appear that one thing all Israelis agreed upon was the defence and maintenance of the state. The Israelis have resisted assaults and defended 'their' territory vigorously and efficiently throughout the period 1945–1994 against Arab states and from a variety of Palestinian and foreign sponsored terrorist groups.

Lack With evidence from both religious and political groups in Israel, it would appear that the right wing religious parties hold the Likud Party in check. They wish to make no compromise with Arabs/Palestinians. More radical and centre groups e.g. Labour Party have attempted to make deals and accommodations. There are exceptions e.g. Begin at Camp David. A very complicated question. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of unity OR lack of unity 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 unity AND lack of unity 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. To try and improve their conditions and improve their lives etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. To improve their conditions which are constantly eroded by wage reductions; to achieve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work 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 The authorities were determined to prevent association, trumped up charges from inappropriate laws to seal conviction and punishment as a warning to others etc.

No Case showed that there were no appropriate laws against association, so authorities are attempting to intimidate; this intimidation does not appear to be working as Loveless is writing about it and exposing the conduct of the trial just 3 years later. [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 a resolution, the other is from an individual 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. Took over New Lanark mill near Glasgow in 1800. He showed it was possible to make a fortune in textiles without exploiting his workers. He paid good wages, gave good conditions of work and housing. No children under 10 to work: they went to his school instead. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies the case. An attempt to squash attempts to form associations. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes the case. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. 1833 Magistrate determined to crush Dorchester labourers as a warning to others who might want to form unions. Charged under the 1797 Act which was clearly not intended for this purpose – was introduced to prevent mutiny in the Navy. Sentenced to 7 years transportation. Outcry. Released and returned in 1838. [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 explanation e.g. Fear that they would force up wages and bring ruination to businesses; thought that unions and their powers would bring revolution; unions would change the workers status and they would no longer be servile and know their proper place in the scheme of things etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, if you were poor, you stayed poor. [1]

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

Ben More jobs and often higher wages than in agriculture or the domestic system. Housing and shops often provided by the factories; chances of promotion or self employment later; the creation of wealth benefited the whole country and so all society benefited.

Lack Employers' wealth increased out of all proportion to the workers; insecurity of jobs; harsh conditions (although a few workplace laws had been passed by 1850); growth in slum housing; dangers to health of factories and housing; no unions had survived as yet to plead the workers rights etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of benefit 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 AND lack of benefit 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 by the source e.g. China is a lost cause with no hope of recovery etc. [3–4]

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. The poor government of China has left the country defenceless and with no control of its own future; it is a vacuum waiting for predators in military or commercial sense to break it apart and exploit it 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 sources. [1–2]

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

Yes Source C seems to be a call on all citizens to start afresh and come to the aid of the country; Emperor will lead by example in resolve, abolition of past abuses, and problem solving etc.

No Source B accentuates the collapse of China; the size of the defeat against Japan which forced China to give much to Japan which it had been able to resist giving to other powers which had interests there. [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 and B are British and Source C is Chinese 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 defeat to a maximum of two e.g. Port Arthur, Weiheiwei, Pyongyang, Yalu River, Manchuria. [1–2]

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

Level 1 – Identifies consequences e.g. Impacts badly on China's standing in the world. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes consequences. Award an extra mark for each consequence described in additional detail e.g. Loss of face, status and ranking in the world, but especially in the Far East; now vulnerable to attacks from other states – local or international; had to cede territory to Japan – a lesson to other states; weakened Imperial rule at home – more challenges from warlords 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. Weakness of the army; poor preparation, planning and leadership; weak direction and government; lack of outside help. Strength of Japan – now a modernised military power since mid-nineteenth century; modern weapons; Japan building an industrial state. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, they could be taken by any country. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of turning point OR not a turning point, single factor given e.g.

Turn It made the West realise the weakness of China and the difficulties of maintaining a protected presence there. Other countries, including Japan, would now view China as vulnerable and a strong line could now be taken with it. See developments in early twentieth century – GB allies with Japan; fall of the Manchu dynasty.

Not Largely in the minds of the ruling class in China; refused to accept that she was now weak and a second-rate power; tried to maintain a strong face to other countries – largely seen as arrogance etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of turning point OR lack of turning point 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 turning point AND not a turning point must be addressed. [6–8]

© University of Cambridge International Examinations 2011