www.dynamicpapers.com

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2009 question paper for the guidance of teachers

0470 HISTORY

0470/04 Paper 4 (Alternative to Coursework), maximum raw mark 40

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

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE International Examinations

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918–1945

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s) unsupported from the source e.g. It was a planned coup and he was not working alone etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Planned, 'during all those weeks'; not alone working with others etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees, unsupported from source. [1–2]

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

Yes Seemed to be a failure; scarcely known unimportant movement; political nobody; did not have masses on his side etc.

No Brilliant achievement; catapulted into headlines; learnt an important lesson etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is from Hitler, 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]

(b) (i) Award one mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. German signatories of the Treaty of Versailles, much reviled by many Germans etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies aspects. It was Hitler's book. [1–2]

Level 2 Identifies aspects. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Hitler's autobiography written in prison after Munich Putsch, two volumes. Bible of Nazism, policies especially on race and lebensraum etc. [2–4]

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Weimar Government accepted the Treaty of Versailles; constitutions created coalition governments and not strong government; hyperinflation and Ruhr – Munich Putsch; policies of Stresemann at home and abroad; to Hitler the Weimar Government encouraged liberalism and encouraged immoral behaviour which upset Hitler's core support among some conservative Germans, farmers etc. [2–6]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, he learned his lesson after the Munich Putsch failed. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of legality OR non-legality, single factor given.

Legal Held elections; made laws to gain power – Enabling Act; invited by Hindenburg; proper party etc.

Not legal Terror and violence; role of SA; attitudes and some early policies re minorities; propaganda; perhaps Night of the Long Knives. [2]

Question focus 'to become Fuhrer' i.e. After death of Hindenburg, 1934.

Level 3 Explanation of legality OR non-legality with multiple factors given. 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 legality AND non-legality must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905–1941

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. Massive undertaking with inexperienced, but enthusiastic workforce etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Supports valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Details of excavation and steel against volunteers and peasants who did not understand the machinery etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes Failure in agriculture led to famine; bad problems in transport and shortages in industry; so bad it had to be planned again etc.

No Could famine be predicted? Exhausted from previous efforts; still increased production by 15% in 1933; learned lessons of failure and prepared to re-plan the whole thing etc. [3–5]

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

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

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

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

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

(b) (i) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Workers praised and used as role models because of astounding feats of production etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies Plan. Lenin's State Planning Commission. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes Plan. Award an extra mark for each aspect described in additional detail e.g. Became the permanent planning organ for USSR. Set targets for the development of industry, power supply and transport. Planned for investment to create future wealth and expansion. Closely related to the government's plans for agriculture etc. [2–4]

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Lenin had said it was a temporary measure and coal, iron and steel were still under government control. Many Bolsheviks saw it as a betrayal of Communism. Stalin wanted to put his own stamp on policy. Need to control production in order to force modernisation and progress for defence etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions
No, life was dire in the USSR. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of benefit OR hardship, single factors given e.g.

Ben. Little unemployment; better education, health services. Position of women. More equal society (but Communist grandees lived as well as previous aristocracy).

Har. Difficult working and living conditions for most; Fear; punishment; purges; few consumer goods etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of benefit OR difficulty 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 hardship must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919–1941

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Confident view of the economy; firm believer in rugged individualism; deluded? [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Links opportunity and wealth to a free society, implying lack of government interference; boasts that the system in the USA has almost abolished poverty – a delusion? Etc. [5–6]

(ii) Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with no support from the source. [1–2]

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

Yes 4 million agreed to strike and worried the government; steel strike was nationwide; definite plan to cut working week etc.

No Steel strike failed; union membership fell; World War One gains were lost; employers had government co-operation for unconstitutional actions; opposition of Supreme Court etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is from Herbert Hoover, the other is from an American history book so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

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

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

(b) (i) One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Railways, railroad manufacturing; coalmining; alcohol; textiles; house building. Accept agriculture and shipbuilding. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies advantages. Speeds up the process. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes advantages. Award an extra mark for each advantage described in additional detail e.g. Faster production; reduced costs of production; less training and less skilled labour; uniform product. Allow benefits to US society etc. [2–4]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

(iii) Level 1 Single reasons. 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. Confidence in economic boom; more wealth to invest; banks keen to lend; buying on the margin; hire purchase; lack of regulation etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, it was already falling. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of it being the cause OR not being the cause, single factors given e.g.

Yes Thousands bankrupted; banks went bust; millions could not pay mortgages; loans withdrawn from companies meant closure and unemployment; withdrawal of loans to Europe lost markets; confidence shattered etc.

No Only a minority had played the market; inequalities of wealth already limiting demand in 1920s; overproduction; agriculture and older industries already suffering; raising tariffs meant loss of foreign markets; early government support was inadequate etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of it being the cause OR not being the cause, 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 it being the cause AND not being the cause must be addressed. [6–8]

Depth Study D: China, 1945–c.1990

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from source e.g. The population donated anything metallic for melting down etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. It was a foolhardy campaign as useful implements were melted down, creating shortages of necessary farming and living items – water wagons, cooking utensils etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes Steel of poor quality; water management poor; peasants diverted from food production to making reservoirs risked famine etc.

No Overall, and in time, output was increased; tree planting and irrigation projects prepared for a better future in agriculture etc. [3–5]

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

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is partly from a Chinese person, the other is from a British book so they could both be biased/unreliable. [2]

Level 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) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Communes much bigger; could have specific groups for specific tasks; local government function etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies Campaign. To encourage intellectual criticism of state and party. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes Campaign. Award an extra mark for each valid aspect which is described in additional detail e.g. Mao thought the intellectuals would be converted to communism but the Campaign merely allowed criticism of the Party by intellectuals and students. Campaign abandoned with purges and prison for critics. Some say it was a device to 'out' the critics so they could be dealt with. [2–4]

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Mao's illogical schemes and refusal to take advice was squandering money and resources. Mao demanded nuclear arms and secrets – could he be trusted? Rivalry between Khrushchev and Mao. Leadership of world communism issues etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, it was all death, famine and purges. [1]

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

Ben. Could argue that Chinese society was more united than ever before; improvements in laws helping women, education and health; for much of the time there was a more just society; increasingly noted as a world power and/or an alternative leader of communism; resolution of land issues etc.

Lack. Failures of the Great Leap Forward in production, planning, loss of Soviet support; famine, death, purges, insecurity etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of benefit OR lack of benefit, with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

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

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

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Radical and willing to negotiate; wished to end State of Emergency; realistic; worried by breakdown of law and order; determined not to be intimidated; still distrusted opposition etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Tries to argue/persuade groups to start talking by removing their prohibition; wants a cessation of violence as a means of beginning rapprochement etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes De Klerk and Mandela in agreement – represented the majority; de Klerk accepted democracy and the end of the National Party dominance; Mandela's inclusive message; ANC won so many votes etc.

No Serious violence still evident – 53 deaths; Inkatha and ANC dispute; ANC only got 62% of the vote etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is from de Klerk's speech and the other is from Mandela's 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]

(b) (i) One mark for each correct link e.g. Mandela – Xhosa; Buthelezi – Zulu. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies actions e.g. Careful and partial reduction of elements that made apartheid so offensive and divisive. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes actions. Award an extra mark for any action described in additional detail e.g. abolished the Pass Laws compelling Blacks and Coloureds to carry identity cards; conceded limited Coloured and Indian (though not Black) representation in Parliament; Also conceded the idea of Namibian independence in 1988 – achieved 1990 etc. [2–4]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Many blacks could not believe a National Party leader could be sincere; early 1990, de Klerk was still publicly rejecting black majority rule; support for police actions; government fuelling ANC/Inkatha divisions; many whites felt betrayed; Conservative Party still supported strict apartheid, no negotiations with terrorists; c.200 paramilitary groups formed, largest AWB under Terre Blanche; moderates afraid of escalation of violence in the future etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, foreign countries would not trade with South Africa. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of external factors OR internal factors, single factor given e.g.

Ext. Economic sanctions weakened economic growth – fell from average 7% in 1970s to 1.5% in 1980s; white average income fell; international condemnation of apartheid and calls for Mandela's release; black states gaining independence from 1960s; OAU; 'front line states' used as bases for guerrilla action; collapse of USSR reduced fear of communism in South Africa etc.

Int. Above factors not that effective; economic sanctions were limited and South Africa developed its own arms industry; BOSS success against guerrilla leaders; increasing support for ANC, United Democratic Front; violence spreading from townships, army could not control; strikes, boycotts paralysing cities; began under Botha (see Qu.(b) (ii)); de Klerk more radical, released Mandela; 1989 worst ever election results for National Party; power sharing a fraud; Joe Slovo's compromise proposals; 1992 referendum – 67% whites supported negotiation for new Constitution; de Klerk's 'calling from God'. [2]

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

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Begin's plan is not a real plan; Begin is playing the Arabs off against one another etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference, with reference to the source e.g. Begin's plan is crafted in such a fashion that the Palestinians cannot accept; Egypt supports the Palestinians and will never allow the West Bank to be ceded to Israel etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes Sadat believed that the area could not sustain war indefinitely; peace has to begin somewhere; let the question lie dormant for a while etc.

No Proposals were unacceptable; Israeli settlements will continue; water regulated from Jerusalem; any deal like that would not receive Arab approval etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is Egyptian 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]

(b) (i) One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two e.g. Land conquered and possessed by another country and run by them. In this case Sinai, Golan Heights etc. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies the weapon. Threaten the West over oil supplies. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes weapon. Award an extra mark for each aspect that is described in additional detail e.g. Arab countries belonged to OPEC and threatened to cut production as a means of undermining the West and Israel, hoping that the West would influence Israel to negotiate etc. [2–4]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Sadat was establishing better relations with the USA at the expense of USSR; he wanted his oil fields back from Israel; he had reopened the Suez Canal and was therefore in a position to negotiate with Israel; he did not want Egypt undermined by yet another war etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
No, he was assassinated by his own guards. [1]

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

Yes Five year plan for withdrawal of Israeli troops from Gaza and West Bank; some development of Palestinian self-government in those areas. Israel agreed to withdraw from Sinai within 3 years; Israeli shipping guaranteed free passage thought the Suez Canal and Straits of Tiran etc.

No No mention of agreement of the futures of Golan Heights or East Jerusalem; June 1979 onwards some negativity appeared between Egypt and Israel; Jordan refused to take part in the promotion of autonomy for West Bank Arabs; still huge divisions between Israel and Egypt, between Israel and the Arab world and also between Egypt and the Arab world etc. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of success OR lack of success, with multiple factors given. 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 success AND lack of success must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. The textile industry is changing and there are more poor workers than there used to be etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. The textile industry has changed with the coming of power so that the small clothiers and family have been replaced by a few mill owners; many adults have to live on the earnings of their children; implies the change is for the worse etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes Employers alarmed at the results of the 1833 Act and now try to resist shortened working day; Strutts acknowledged as 'good' employers willing to debate a shorter day with the Commission etc.

No Strutt argues that the 12 hour day gives the workers food and clothing; any reduction would reduce wages, thus food etc and so the workers would be less receptive to 'improvement'; some emphasis on losses to employers etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is from a person giving evidence to a Parliamentary Commission, the other is from a factory owner, 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) One mark for each valid example to a maximum of two e.g. Flying Shuttle; Spinning Jenny; Crompton's Mule; Whitney's 'Gin'; Accept steam power and steam engines. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies features. It offered rules to protect workers. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes features. Award an extra mark for features described in additional detail e.g. It applied to all textile mills except silk; disallowed the employment of children under nine; reduced working hours for 9–13 years old to nine hours a day; aged 13-18 to twelve hours a day; no night work for under-18s; employers to provide two hours' education for children; breaks for meals to be one and a half hours a day; inspectors appointed to check the Act was being respected etc. [2–4]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. The development of power systems; human and horse power replaced by water and steam power; thus, there was a need to be near running water and later to be near water and coal; shortest distance the power source travelled the less cost; driven by profit and the belief that it was easier to move people than commodities; Lancashire for cotton and sea ports; canal growth; railways etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, they all lived in awful conditions. [1]

Level 2 Explanation of negative results OR positive results, single factor given e.g.

Neg. Long hours, poor working conditions; safety; housing and lack of drainage in mill towns often led to overcrowding and sickness; smoke; underfoot conditions; child labour meant that sometimes adults could not find work; grinding poverty in places etc.

Pos. Regular work and wages; sometimes housing supplied; brought population closer to systems of transport; led to cooperation between workers; self help groups, later leading to cooperative and union movements among others. [2]

Level 3 Explanation of negative results OR positive results, with multiple factors given. 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 negative results AND positive results must be addressed. [6–8]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

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

Level 2 Makes valid inference(s), unsupported from the source e.g. Imperialism is more than money and selling; it is about giving back something; Imperialism can be a civilising experience etc. [3–4]

Level 3 Makes valid inference with reference to the source e.g. Imperialism is more than opening markets, it is about education and justice being given to ignorant and barbarian peoples etc. [5–6]

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

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

Yes Gains made by USA, Germany and Belgium are threatening our traditional markets; closure of new markets in foreign acquired territories; having to fight to acquire new territory and markets etc.

No Prepared to fight for new outlets; prepared to expand GB empire to new, tropical and populated areas; use of both diplomacy and armed force to gain new territories etc. [3–5]

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

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

Level 2 Useful/not useful – One source is from a Frenchman, the other is from an Englishman 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 more than one source. [6–7]

(b) (i) One mark for each valid colony to a maximum of two. BUT one must be German and the other Belgian e.g. Germany – East Africa, Kameroon, SW Africa (Namibia), Togo, Belgium-Congo. [1–2]

(ii) Level 1 Identifies system. Method of controlling colonial territories. [1–2]

Level 2 Describes system. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail e.g. The idea of Lord Lugard and used in many colonial areas. Local rulers must acknowledge British control, and must deliver justice to their peoples and taxes to GB. In return GB will largely leave the local chiefs in control of their areas as long as they deliver as required. French used Direct Rule. [2–4]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net

www.dynamicpapers.com

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

Level 2 Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained e.g. Difficult and expensive to wage wars in far off places (cf. problems of British fighting Boers and Zulus); places not usually worth a major war; disputes settled by negotiation, diplomacy and treaties; Berlin Conference etc. [2–6]

(iv) Level 1 Simple assertions.
Yes, they all had rich empires. [1]

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

Ben. Can certainly claim that some European states and, therefore their peoples, gained from control of India, for example. Individuals gained huge fortunes from India and Rhodes from South Africa. Benefits of expanded experience, service, climate, new life. Huge numbers of examples of benefit.

Lack. Some colonies drained the Exchequer, involved countries and soldiers in wars; diseases; prison colonies; poor missionaries; heat; and many more negative aspects. **Be prepared for local knowledge** [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]

© UCLES 2008

www.xtremepapers.net