CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Educatio

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0470 HISTORY

0470/41 Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the efficient; powerful; spied on everyone etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the member to head of SD; Gestapo added to SD; 'vast network of informers' 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 Reduced number of camps and prisoners; some judicial action against guards lost; new categories of inmates; execution added to punishments etc.

No Remained savage; political prisoners still important category; about halved the number of inmates; SS still involved 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 is more detailed/ gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a German, 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]

(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. Transfer of power to the cabinet from Reichstag for four years; could amend the Constitution without consent; made dictatorship legal; basis of banning trade unions and political parties; purge of civil service; destruction of federal structure; route to Hitler becoming Fuhrer after death of Hindenburg etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Unions made illegal; replace Front (DAF)

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for ea additional detail e.g. 1933 – May, offices of tra leaders arrested; unions and strikes forbidden; for workers and employers; National Labour S year olds; 'Strength through Joy' incentives etc

(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. SA 'too socialist'; about 2.5 million members; Rohm too powerful; rivalry SS/Himmler; disliked by upper class; Hitler needed army loyalty; claimed SA intended revolt etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, many were killed. No, propaganda more important. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Anti-Semitism success OR other factors, single factor given e.g.

A–S Loss of civil rights; Nuremberg Laws; Kristallnacht; concentration camps; anti-Semitism had popular support; historical anti-Semitism and new racist ideas in Germany; Hitler's personal resentment and Mein Kampf; 'stab in the back' theory etc.

Other Too small a group (about 100 000) to affect control; other minorities persecuted; another policy more effective – bureaucracy, propaganda; economic policies, Hitler Youth, foreign policy successes; Great Depression; Versailles Settlement; November Criminals; unsolved economic issues; propaganda pre-1933; weakness of Weimar Government etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Anti-Semitism success 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 Anti-Semitism success AND other factors must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the Government has not fulfilled the hopes of the s restrictions etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Unfulfilled hopes of peace; restricting the soldier's right to free speech; poor government as restricting food and ammunition whilst expecting the troop to keep fighting 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 Desertion was common; once away from the front they disappeared – implies support for revolutionaries' demand to stop the war etc.

No Stayed while in the front line; cadets support the policy of government; 'root of mischief' was the revolutionaries in Petrograd; sinister news implies opposition to revolutionaries 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 is more detailed/gives more information but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a soldier, the other is from an eyewitness so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximu
and sailors garrisoned in the Petrograd area –
elect a new member so the balance of view in t
originally moderate, later swung support to sup

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies July Days. Demonstrations against th
followed by a crackdown. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes July Days. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Massive demonstrations against the government; 500 000, many of whom were armed Kronstadt sailors; Kerensky had sufficient support to crush them (400 dead); arrested Bolsheviks, including Trotsky; Lenin fled in disguise to Finland 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. Stolypin's land reforms had failed – could not keep up with the rising peasant population; strikes on an upward spiral before the war; repression against peasants, workers, intelligentsia, Jews; revolutionary parties developed new strength, Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries – newspapers and propaganda; failures and shortages of the war; Tsar's command; middle class frustrated by weak Duma and broken promises; Rasputin and Tsarina etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, Lenin only got back in April.

Level 2 – Explanation of Bolshevik agitation OR other fa

Bols All revolutionary parties found new sup
shortages and defeats hit the people, B
attractive slogan of 'Peace, Bread, Lan
Bolshevik influence in Petrograd Soviet; Trotsky, organising and speaking genius; leadership and organisation; Provisional Government played into their hands over Kornilov – releasing and arming them, making them appear to be the heroes for saving the government etc.

Other Continuation of the war; delayed elections for the Constituent Assembly; growing economic chaos – shortages, strikes, defeats, mixing of troops and workers; Kornilov represented discontent from officer class; no land reforms etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of Bolshevik agitation OR other factors with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestion 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 agitation AND other factors must be addressed.
[6–8]

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeat material stated in the source, no infere

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
a threat to freedom, business, social harmony

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Attacked 'rights', 'integrity'; state 'monopoly/regulations'; 'corrupt' and 'inflame' 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 Upheld opposition to major policies; gained Congressional support; divided Democrats; F.D.R. abandoned 'Packing Plan' etc.

No Only some policies challenged; major ones accepted; changed attitude within two years 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 is more detailed/gives more information but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a Republican source, the other is from an American historian so they could both biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid critic to a maximum of
Smith, Father Coughlin, Francis Townsend, Wi

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Began welfare state; pensio

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for ea
additional detail e.g. Contributory unemployment insurance; pensions for over 65s; widows and disabled support; payment of pensions from 1940; federal system; unemployment federal/state provision and thus variable in amounts; about 35 million covered but not domestic or agricultural workers 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. Alphabet Agencies were temporary; 1937 cuts in budget; confidence remained low; employers resisted implementation of policies/taxation; discrimination against black and native Americans; mechanisation; Dust Bowl; still weakening agriculture; lack of international trade etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, it created jobs. No, it was only in one part of USA. [1]

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

TVA Within 10 years the area was transformed from the most depressed to a showpiece for progressive agriculture; benefited an area of 40 000 square miles in seven states; electrification/flood control/irrigation; longstanding achievement etc.

Other Did not stop evictions; tenants displaced by the project not recompensed; many could not afford electricity, only 1 in 5 in the area. Other policies more successful – AAA, essential to cut production to allow agriculture to recover; more work created by NRA/PWA; longstanding benefit of Wagner Act – workers' rights; Social Security Act affected largest number, first provision etc.

[2]

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

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
came back to haunt them; justice by humiliatio
justice etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Justice was obtained by speaking about crimes of violence and theft of tools etc.; landlords were broken to offer their land and possessions as compensation; very changed outlook for landlords who were often tried and then executed 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 'Going too far'; the landlords have driven the peasants to act severely – implied as Mao is defending peasants; 'who deserves severe punishment' implies some got just that etc.

No The peasants are clear sighted, and know who deserves light treatment and who not; peasants keep clear account and 'seldom has the punishment exceeded the crime' 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a British eyewitness, the other is from Mao himself so they could both be biased /unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum
persuaded to join together in collective farms i
production. By 1956 about 95% of all peasants
of between 100 to 300 families) with joint owne
equipment.

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies aspect. An attempt to increase production of heavy goods. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect described in additional detail e.g. Trying to develop heaving industry (iron, steel, chemicals and coal); Centrally planned economy, with Soviet cash, equipment and advisers; there was some success but Mao began to think that heavy industrialisation was not right for China – began tensions between regimes and led to Soviet withdrawal in 1960 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. Industrialisation had created a new class of technicians and engineers; Party cadres, who organised the masses, politically and economically, felt that the new class would undermine their authority; feeling pleased with progress so far, the government felt that open discussion would improve relations between cadres and experts and intellectuals; called the Hundred Flowers Campaign etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Simple assertions
No, industry was not really repaired.

Level 2 – Explanation of resolved problems OR unresolv
e.g.

Res Some good recovery from the ravages
been restored; inflation under control; e
of the land issues solved; progress in industry; position of women had been addressed; better education and healthcare etc.

Unres Still much to be done to help agriculture and industry; natural Chinese conservatism against change had not been overcome; Mao had to drive through two revolutions to overcome reluctance to change – Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of resolved problems OR unresolved problems with multiple factors. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of problems resolved AND unresolved problems must be addressed.

[6–8]

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the living conditions; repressive etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the allowed'; overcrowded and inadequate cooking facilities; toilets and showers shared so little or no privacy; 'liquor banned' 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 Superintendent meets on arrival, passes etc.; building programmes to meet needs; more settled population; unwanted migrants arrested and moved etc.

No Resistance to rent; unbalanced gender ratios; Rand towns could not keep up; arrival of unwanted migrants; speed of expansion of urban Africans 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from an online history and the other is from a British history of South Africa so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum
for African land ownership under Natives' Land
basis; c. 7% of land for 70% of the population;
losing land/rural workers; those without passes
Reserves; foundation of later 'Bantustans' etc.

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies effects. Extended Reserves; SANTs dictated agricultural/living conditions - betterment; designated 'black spots' etc. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes effects. Award an extra mark for each valid effect described in additional detail e.g. Land area up to 13%; final death of any black land-ownership; evictions from 'black spots' to Reserves; strengthened state control; some agricultural improvement; more cheap rural labour 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. Worldwide demand for gold and diamonds; rapid price increase and mining developments; State investment especially in iron and steel (I.S.C.O.R.); armaments; agricultural subsidies; more railways; cheap labour; no black trade union rights etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, increased employment/wages. No, whites did better. [1]

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

Ben Both black and white South Africans benefited from industrial developments; gold boom; government subsidies, war stimulus – more jobs, wages increases, lowering of the colour bar; growing trade union activity; black workers, the best paid in Africa; better housing, facilities, health etc.

Lack Agriculture and rural economy did badly in the 1930s; black South Africans lost land rights; Reserves overcrowded; Pass system tightened; wage differences sustained; immigrant workers in the mines kept wages down; no black trade unions allowed; black opposition groups ineffective 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]

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

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
when living amongst people of a different cultu
behaviour etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Continued to live, behave and dress as they had in Europe; making no allowance in dress for the cultural niceties of those they were living amongst; young Arab males fascinated even if they did not approve; lived together with Arabs 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 We cannot make peace with you; making peace would mean the Arabs would have accepted Israel's existence; situation in Egypt and Arab world would not permit it etc.

No Already talking; have an armistice; 'We are not ready' implies possibly, later; 'We cannot yet live in peace with you' – later perhaps 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One source is Palestinian and the other is mixed Palestinian and American rabbi 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 sources in context.
Include at this Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum
defence; originally formed in 1920 as a secret f
settlements from Arab attack; organised illegal
War; disapproved of violence of Irgun and Ster
defended new state of Israel and was the nucl
army etc.

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies difficulties. Caught in the middle of warring Jews and Arabs; trying to keep peace. [1–2]

Level 2 – Describes difficulties. Award an extra mark for each valid difficulty described in additional detail e.g. Economically crushed and war weary; GB tried to keep peace between Jews and Arabs; unpopular with both and attacked by both sides; also trying to stop illegal entry of Jewish refugees – Exodus; King David hotel, 22 July, 1946 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. After the British handed over its mandate to the UN, delegates went to Palestine to consider the problem; reported that a two-state solution would be best; Zionists accepted but Arabs and Britain did not – said it would mean war; agreed by a UN vote in November – some states heavily leaned on by President Truman; decision angered Arabs as it took ‘their land’; Jews not entirely satisfied; dissatisfaction showed itself in breakdown in law and order as Jews and Arabs fought etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
No, the Jews did all the fighting.

Level 2 – Explanation of American support OR other fact

USA Increasing support for Zionists from US
Jewish lobby; money and aid from USA
as mandate holder, and for refusal to a
Europe; pressure from US government and companies to get support for votes at UN; influence and support of President Truman etc.

Other Weakness of Britain; organisations like Irgun, Stern Gang, Haganah; determination and organisation of Jews; sympathy after Holocaust; weakness and division of attacking Arab nations – different agendas; leadership of Israeli forces; fighting for survival etc. [2]

Level 3 – Explanation of American support 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 – Answer that offer a balanced argument.
BOTH sides of American support AND other factors must be addressed.
[6–8]

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the
smells indicate a place of industry; heavily pop

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the
would indicate that conditions are injurious to health; 300 000 workers in poor conditions; all working for the profit of a few; profit appears to come before any kind of pleasant life 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 author appears to believe that workers in industries where steam engines are used do little else than watch them work with no effort of their own; industries of spinning and weaving are particularly blessed by the machines etc.

No Lace making and stocking weaving do not use steam engines so they involve hard work; industries which do use steam engines still require manual assistance as in 'delicate operations of joining threads' 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – Both sources are written in the 1830s and we do not know the authors so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid example to a maximu
transport (canals and railways), building.

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies factors. Geographical benefits; availa

Level 2 – Describes factors. Award an extra mark for eac
additional detail e.g. Climate damp so good for brittle cotton; closeness to sea – later aided by Manchester Ship Canal; availability of coal, water and labour force; financiers and entrepreneurs available and willing to finance operations 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. Work was often better paid in industrial areas; enclosures had forced people from the land and they went to seek work in industrial areas; decline of the domestic spinning and weaving industries in the face of industrial enterprises; work less seasonal than in rural areas etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, some laws had been passed. [1]

Level 2 – Explanation of Parl improvement OR other factors/lack of improvement, single factor given e.g.

Parl Factory Acts especially that of 1833, public health acts especially that of 1848; legalisation of trade unions; repeal of the Corn Laws 1846 etc.

Other All legislation was limited and often hard won; and then circumvented by artful employers; slum dwelling got worse and there were major epidemics of cholera and other diseases in the first half of the century; wages remained low – parliament had nothing to do with this; the new Poor Law intended to help but often caused distress to many in towns etc. [2]

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

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Ninetee

(a) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Repeats material stated in the source, no infer

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, unsupported from the imperialism brought benefits to all those that h Empire; says that we are justifiably proud of w etc.

Level 3 – Supports valid inferences with reference to the source e.g. Says Britain has brought great benefits to conquered people, replacing, for example, 'misery and oppression' with 'peace and justice'; British are hugely proud and passionate about their Empire and its bringing 'good to the world' 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 Using power to spread the peaceable light of their institutions is the main reason for conquest; imperialism for selfless and philanthropic reasons etc.

No Caused by other needs – military or naval conquest; the need to find places for the ever increasing population 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 is more detailed/gives more information, but does not specify what information. [1]

Level 2 – Useful/not useful – One is from a British peer and the other is from a French Prime Minister, 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 the Level answers that cross reference between A and B to show reliability.
6 marks for one source, 7 marks for both. [6–7]

(b) (i) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – One mark for each valid territory to a maximum
Niger, French Guinea, Upper Volta, Gabon, Fr
Equatorial Africa, Dahomey, Ivory Coast, and

(ii) Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not a

Level 1 – Identifies methods. Peaceful or non-peaceful.

Level 2 – Describes methods. Award an extra mark for each valid method described in additional detail e.g. Treaties – legal or not; trade stations caused creeping colonisation; capture and force of arms; international conferences e.g. Berlin; occupation by excess population; protectorates 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. Already an established colonial power; powerful as a naval and military force; strength of maritime trade and industrial output; trusted by many Africans as opposed to slavery and slave trade; some countries like Germany and Italy were late comers as only formed as countries in the second half of the nineteenth century etc. [2–6]

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

Level 1 – Simple assertions.
Yes, every country wanted ‘a place in the sun’. [1]

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

Prest All countries were aware of world prestige, and history had shown that acquisition of an Empire gave a country world status. It showed strength and ability etc.

Other Trade and exploitation of natural resources were important; in some cases it was strategic necessity; ‘White Man’s Burden’ to spread to ‘barbaric’ and ‘savage’ nations the
institutions and civilisation of Europe; to spread the word of God; altruism for some, exploitation for others etc. [2]

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