

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the June 2002 question papers

0470 History

0470/1	Paper 1	[maximum mark 60]
0470/2	Paper 2	[maximum mark 50]
0470/4	Paper 4 (Alternative to coursework)	[maximum mark 40]

These mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. They show the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. They do not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

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.



CONFIDENTIAL
June 2002

INTERNATIONAL GCSE

MARKING SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK : 60

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT : 0470/01

HISTORY
Paper 1

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Marking schemes have been issued on the basis of ONE copy per Assistant Examiner and TWO copies per Team Leader.



CAMBRIDGE

INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

CONFIDENTIAL

Marking Scheme
IGCSE Examinations
June 2002

Page.....of.....
...

Syllabus	Comp
0470	1

1. ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 The paper will be taken on
- 1.2 The Co-ordination Meeting will take place.
~~at the~~ Hotel Peterborough commencing at 2ND JUNE, 10:30am.....
- 1.3 A small selection of scripts will be photocopied and sent to examiners as soon as possible after the examination. These should be marked and brought to the Co-ordination Meeting. They will be used during the meeting.
- 1.4 Examiners should also provisionally mark between 10 and 20 scripts before the meeting. These should cover as wide a selection of questions as possible. At this stage marking must be in black pencil.
- 1.5 At the meeting arrangements will be made for the despatch of co-ordination scripts, to the principal examiner.
- 1.6 Please observe the dates for the return of mark sheets and scripts given on the appointment sheet. Please allow two days for postage.
- 1.7 Any delay or possibility of delay, in the completion or despatch of work should be notified to the principal examiner and to the Syndicate.
- 1.8 Examiners are particularly requested to let their principal examiner know in advance any change of address (with telephone number) during the marking period.

2. INTRODUCTION TO MARKING

- 2.1 Apart from scripts sent to the Principal Examiner for co-ordination purposes and which should be marked in ordinary pencil, but revised in the light of comments made, all marking should be in RED.
- 2.2 Please show marks awarded for each part of an answer, but show the total for each answer clearly in the right hand margin. The total should be ringed and shown also on the grid at the front of the script.
- 2.3 For all questions the level awarded must be shown as well as the mark, e.g. : L3/5.
- 2.4 The total for the whole script should be ringed.
- 2.5 Please send your response on the marking to your Team Leader on the form provided.



UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
Local Examinations Syndicate

SPECIFIC POINTS

1. Half marks should not be used.
2. Marks must not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant answers
Unless the mark scheme asks you to do this.
3. Use the whole range of marks. Do not be afraid to award full or no marks.
4. Do not transfer marks from one part of a question to another.
5. Examples of responses which are given are not prescriptive and are only intended to act as a guide.
6. If there is a band of marks allocated to a level guard against settling for the middle of the range as many answers will need to be at the top or bottom.
7. For most questions there will be marks built in for factual substantiation and candidates must always be rewarded for using accurate and relevant detail to support an answer.
8. The marking scheme has been designed to assess the candidates' understanding of the key skills in the course and their ability to use background material to illustrate.
9. When marking a centre examiners are strongly advised to mark question by question to ensure that the same mark scheme and standard is used throughout.
10. **RUBRIC INFRINGEMENT.**
 - (i) Where a candidate answers more than the required number of questions ALL answers must be marked.
 - ii) In arriving at a total mark credit should be given for the best two answers in Section A and the best answer in Section B.
 - (iii) Please write RUBRIC at the top of any script where an infringement occurs.

SECTION A.

Q.1 (a) Describe the progress of the revolutions in Sicily and Naples in 1859-61.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. If only Sicily OR Naples is dealt with mark out of 4. 3-5

(b) Why did the events of 1859-61 lead to Victor Emmanuel being proclaimed King of Italy?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. Garibaldi handed over 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. the work of Cavour
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Description of events too limited to 2 marks if not tied in. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which brings out the background reasons and the way in which the way the events unfolded influenced things. 6-7

(c) How far was the unification of Italy due to the work of Cavour? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the career of Cavour without direct comment on unification. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will mostly describe what Cavour did and show that this helped in unifying Italy but will barely, if at all, touch on other factors. 4-6

Level 4 Candidates will demonstrate that they can compare the work of Cavour with other factors and thus reach a conclusion as to 'how far' unification was due to Cavour. 7-8

Q.2 (a) Describe the conditions in the South at the end of the Civil War.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. Answers which concentrate on only one aspect. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Answers need not deal with all aspects for full marks but there must be a minimum of two. 3-5

(b) Why were carpetbaggers resented so much by the South?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. the brought oppression 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. acted unfairly in eyes of South
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the work/methods of carpetbaggers alone can score 3 marks 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which will bring out the inherent dislike as well as that brought by their activities. All answers should show a good sense of context 6-7.

(c) 'Reconstruction after the Civil War brought more problems to the South than it solved.' Do you agree/Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the measures of reconstruction. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will probably concentrate on showing what Reconstruction did and what its results were. Better answers may point out that some problems were solved but others weren't. 4-6

Level 4 Answers should tie in the measures of Reconstruction with the problems that Existed and see how far they were solved or tackled. They should then see if new problems were thrown up by the activities and then proceed to evaluate which was the greater. Reward good attempts at a fairly difficult question. 7-8

Q.3 (a) What were the main points of the Treaty of Kanagawa in 1854 and the treaty of Edo in 1858?

Level 1 Gives vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate details. 1-2

Level 2 Gives fairly full and accurate details of both treaties. Details of one treaty may score up to 4 marks if well done. 3-5

(b) Why was the Meiji Emperor restored to supreme power in Japan in 1868?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. strength of support 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. political situation in Japan
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the restoration may score up to 3 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which brings together the political, social, military and economic strands and can fit those into the context of events of the time and the position of Japan. 6-7

(c) How successful was the modernisation of Japan by 1914? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes aspects of modernisation without relation to question. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will mostly dwell on the modernisation that had taken place and how it was transforming Japan or some results of the modernisation may be given. Answers will generally conclude that it was successful but not assess 'how successful'. 4-6

Level 4 Whilst answers will show the extent of modernisation and its effects the thrust of the answer will be to assess 'how successful' either by comparing what was achieved to aims or with the difficulties encountered. 7-8

Q.4 (a) Describe the agreements and alliances that France had with other countries by 1914.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description naming countries and the obligations or implications of the treaties and ententes, which may include military arrangements. 3-5

(b) Why did relations between Britain and Germany worsen between 1900 and 1914?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. naval rivalry 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. result of the European crises
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can show some degree of sophistication in dealing with this. Answers need to show an awareness that there were specific issues between the two countries but also background reasons and ones brought about principally by actions of other countries. 6-7

(c) To what extent did the system of alliances encourage European countries to act in a war-like manner before the events of 1914? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the system of alliances. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers may well deal with the crises involving the alliances and show how these nearly brought war. Or they may try to present a more general case to show that arms production, patriotic fervour, or political sensitivity may have been more important. 4-6
- Level 4 These will truly try to assess 'to what extent' – i.e. they will compare the effects of the alliances with other factors promoting belligerence in order to reach a conclusion. Reward those presenting a good overview argument without getting immersed in detail. 7-8

Q.5 (a) Which terms of the peace settlement of 1919 directly affected France?

- Level 1 Gives some aspects which may be only partially correct or lacking in detail. No credit for terms not directly affecting France. Allow reparations and German disarmament. 1-2
- Level 2 Correctly identifies and describes several terms. 3-5

(b) Why did some countries view with suspicion the setting up of the League of Nations?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. power in hands of few. 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. motives of Britain and France
Or rephrases the stimulus (2 marks only)
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the structure of the League may score up to 3 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which correctly focuses on the suspicions and can deal with these on an individual and group(international) basis. 6-7

(c) How far did the structural weaknesses of the League of Nations prevent it from being successful in the 1920s? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the structure of the League without pointing out weakness. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers will be able to show what weaknesses the League had but will not be able to link those effectively with any 'failures' in the 1920s. Some may show lack of success due to other factors. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates will need to show the importance of structural weakness but they must also decide whether the League was unsuccessful in the 1920s and then whether or not these weaknesses were the cause rather than anything else. Thus candidates have a complex path to tread here and you should reward those who make creditable attempts and not expect perfection. 7-8

Q.6 (a) In what ways did Hitler break some of the clauses of the treaty of Versailles between 1933 and the end of 1938?

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 'Ways' may be taken to mean *examples* or *methods*. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Best answers must link what he did with clauses of the Treaty or the treaty overall. 3-5

(b) Why did Britain and France follow a policy of appeasement with Germany in the 1930s?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. fear of war 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. moral and military unpreparedness for confrontation
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of examples of appeasement should be limited to 3 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which presents, coherently, the various sides to this. The collective and individual concerns of the two countries should be considered and also the general European and global scene at the time. 6-7

(c) 'Hitler was a gambler rather than a planner in foreign affairs.' Do you agree? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes Hitler's actions/policies. 2-3

Level 3 Emphasis will be on showing what Hitler did with regard to specific countries with some comment upon whether the result was due to Hitler's planning or other circumstances/factors, some may reach simple conclusions overall. 4-6

Level 4 Answers should try to take an overview of what happened rather than taking each incident in turn although if that is well done it may reach this level. There must a clear and coherent argument in reaching a conclusion. 7-8

Q.7 (a) What were the terms of the Yalta Conference in 1945?

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. 3-5

(b) Why were Western governments suspicious of the USSR in the period 1945-Feb 1948 (the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia)?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. Soviet occupation of Eastern Europe 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. extension of communism
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness
in the evidence submitted.
Interpretation of the cartoon on its own can score up to 3. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which examines the immediate and background
reasons and can draw these together to present some overall consensus. A
good familiarity with the events of the period should be shown. 6-7

(c) 'It was the attitudes of Truman and Churchill rather than that of Stalin which brought about the start of the Cold War? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is
not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes any East/West incident of the late 1940s. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers may well take one of two routes: (i) consider and describe factors
bringing about the Cold War thus showing that the leaders played only a part
or (ii) describe the actions/attitudes of the leaders and attach greater or lesser
importance to these as causes. A few may combine the two with some degree
of clarity. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates will demonstrate an ability to marshal facts and views about both
the causes of the Cold War and the leaders and thus proceed to a logical con-
clusion. There should be some balance between the two. 7-8

Q.8 (a) Describe the effects of the building of the Berlin Wall on the people of Berlin.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. We are looking for social, economic or political effects but they must concern the people rather than governments. Reasons for the building should be limited to 2 marks. 3-5

(b) Why was the Berlin Wall built in 1961?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. to stop East Germans going to the West in Berlin. 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. part of communist retaliation
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which brings together well the immediate and longer term issues. This is quite straightforward so look for a high quality answer here. 6-7

(c) 'There was never any real likelihood that either the Russians or the Americans would turn the Cold war into a 'hot' war in Europe.' Do you agree? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes 'boiling points' like the Berlin Blockade. 2-3
- Level 3 Most will describe the most serious incidents and show why they didn't erupt into war. Some may bring in other factors, like nuclear weapons, to supplement their answer and these could be worth slightly more. 4-6
- Level 4 There should be some attempt to look at the whole period and the basic issues rather than look at individual events. Events outside Europe e.g. Korea may well be referred to here but there should be no describing them. 7-8

DEPTH STUDIES.

GERMANY 1918-45.

Q.9 (a) What was the SA?

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. No marks for describing the SS. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Reasons for its growth and results of that can be accepted as part of the answer. 3-5

(b) Why did the Nazi party become popular between 1929 and 1932?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. unemployment/the Depression 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. failures of Weimar
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the rise to power during this period may score up to 3. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which reconciles the positive appeal of the Nazis with the particular circumstances of the time leading to the downfall of Weimar.
Look for answers which can give a rounded approach. 6-7

(c) To what extent was Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on Jan 30 1933 the result of his popularity? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes his appointment. 2-3

Level 3 Many may well repeat here what they put in (b) and show that the rise of the Nazi party led to Hitler's appointment, and as this is partly true it must get credit. Others may concentrate on showing just how he became Chancellor pinpointing the intrigue which went into that. 4-6

Level 4 Answers here will draw a comparison between the popular appeal of the Nazis and Hitler and political intrigues that led to Hitler's appointment. From here they will be able to make a conclusion about 'to what extent'. The focus should be on the issue of 'popularity'. 7-8

Q.10 (a) Describe the events of the Night of the Long Knives.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Reasons for the action may score up to 3 marks and results 2 marks BUT 3 marks max. for both. 3-5

(b) Why was Goebbels important to Hitler?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. in charge of propaganda 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. essential part of the government apparatus
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of Goebbels work/methods should be limited to 3 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which demonstrates ability to evaluate Goebbels' worth and is not just a catalogue of what he did to help Hitler. Answers should focus on 'importance to Hitler'. 6-7

(c) 'Hitler had removed all opposition to nazi rule within Germany by the end of 1935.'
Do you agree? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes measures against opposition simply. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers may well be based upon showing the measures taken against any opponents thus leading to the conclusion that most, if not all, opposition had been silenced, at least. Describing the measures with only minimal comment should only score 4 or 5. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates will show that they understand that opposition needs to be identified before there can be any assessment of whether or not Hitler had managed to remove it by the end of 1935. It is permissible to point out that events after 1935 may show that opposition or new opposition was able to surface at times. 7-8

RUSSIA 1905-41

Q.11 (a) Describe the events of the revolution of March 1917.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Reasons for the revolution must be limited to 3 marks and only 2 if given in isolation. 3-5

(b) Why did the provisional Government of Kerensky lose support in Russia?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. the war went badly 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. failure to satisfy groups
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness
in the evidence submitted. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can look at specific loss of support and also the composite. Some answers may challenge the idea that there was much actual support in the first place. The growth of opposition rather than loss of support should be mentioned. 6-7

(c) How far was the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917 a 'people's revolution'? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the revolution. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will undoubtedly largely be a list of causes with some emphasis given why the Bolsheviks came to power. Some may concentrate on the events of October 1917 to see the part played by 'the people' and these could get the highest marks. 4-6

Level 4 These should focus on the part 'the people' played in bringing about the Oct. revolution and their support for it. This should be compared with the importance of other factors (briefly mentioned) so that a conclusion about 'how far' can be made. 7-8

Q.12 (a) (i) Who were the kulaks and (ii) what was a kolkhoz?

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description, this can be just on one or both. 1-2

Level 2 A good description of just one can score up to 4 marks. Reasons for **either** may be accepted to a total limit of 3 marks. 3-5

(b) Why did Stalin introduce collectivisation?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. ideology: to increase production 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. to fit his economic plan
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the working of collectivisation should score up to 2 only. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can bring together the practical, ideological and personal reasons to give a good overview set into context. 6-7

(c) How far was Stalin's policy of collective farming successful? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes collective farming. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will tend to show its shortcomings without really assessing its successful points. Descriptions of the farming in action are admissible if they are used to illustrate good or bad points about it – e.g. they may pick up on the picture. 4-6

Level 4 The answers must try to assess 'how far successful' so they must show what the policy was trying to achieve and the difficulties confronting it to do this. Good answers will show that judgement may depend on standpoint and at what point in the policy the judgement is made. 7-8

THE USA 1919-41.

Q,13 (a) In what ways did prosperity show itself in the USA in the 1920s?

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description of ways. One described well may score 2 marks. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a full and accurate description of 2 or more ways. 3-5

(b) Why did agriculture not share in the prosperity of the 1920s?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. overproduction 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. production and climatic factors
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the state of agriculture should be limited to 2 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can place agriculture into the general context of the USA at that time and also the global context. Answers should show that not all agriculture had the same problems. 6-7

(c) How much change was there in the American way of life during the 1920s? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes aspects of life in the USA in the 1920s. 2-3
- Level 3 There will be plenty of description of the way life was changing and those aspects which were assisting change but no real assessment of the extent of change. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates will be able to compare life pre-1920s with what was happening during that period and thus come to some conclusion about 'how much change' there was, which is quite subjective anyway. Reward those who can put together a coherent and well-illustrated argument. 7-8

Q.14 (a) Describe the work of **two** of Roosevelt's 'alphabet agencies'.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially accurate description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. If only one is described the max. is 2 but where two are attempted one can go up to 4 if very well done. 3-5

(b) Why did Roosevelt meet with opposition to his New Deal policies?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. too centralised; natural opponents 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. the conservative element and dislike of state intervention
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the opposition or the policies score no more than 2 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which shows a clear understanding of the political and social attitudes prevalent in the USA at that time. Answers should bring out inherent opposition and that actually brought about by the working of his policies. 6-7

(c) 'Roosevelt was never able to achieve what he wanted because of opposition to the New Deal.' Do you agree? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the New Deal 2-3
- Level 3 Most will take this as asking whether or not the New Deal was successful and this is acceptable at this level. Some may follow the line of looking at the strength of opposition and seeing if that hindered Roosevelt to any great extent. These answers are worthy of the higher marks if reasonably done. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates must clearly show what Roosevelt was trying to achieve and if he failed in whatever degree to see whether that was mainly due to the opposition or to other factors. It is unlikely that any will make out a case that he was completely successful so the opposition was ineffective but if a well argued case is made, allow some credit at this level but if poor mark at level 2. 7-8

CHINA 1945-c.1990

Q.15 (a) Describe China's relations with the USSR in the 1950s and 1960s.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. If answer only deals with one of the periods mark out of 4. 3-5

(b) Why did Communist China regard the USA as her enemy during the 1950s and 1960s?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. different ideology; Korean War 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. US support for enemies of China
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can interrelate the ideological and propaganda reasons with those arising out of specific actions. Look for some maturity in the answer. 6-7

(c) To what extent had China become a superpower by the death of Mao in 1976?
Explain your answer

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the development of nuclear weapons. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers will mainly describe the advance in military strength, including becoming a nuclear power, and/or emergence into world affairs and thus conclude that she had become a superpower. 4-6
- Level 4 Emphasis must be on dealing with 'to what extent', so China's advances must be put into context with the global situation and the other powers. 7-8

Q.16 (a) Describe the rise and fall of the 'Gang of Four'.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably full and accurate description. Up to 4 marks may be given for dealing with one of the two aspects. 3-5

(b) Why did Deng introduce economic reforms in China?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. to increase prosperity 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. recognised failures of past
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the reforms should be limited to two marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Answers should point out the weaknesses of China at that time and then describe reforms to illustrate that they were needed to put things right.
Reward those which give the overall picture rather than those which go through each reform to show its need. 6-7

(c) 'Despite the economic changes of the 1980s and 90s, the Chinese way of life changed little from Mao's time.' Do you agree? Explain your answer

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the changes or the Chinese ways of life. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers may not be well organised but will show some reforms and how they changed or did not change life for the Chinese. Answers which give long accounts of the way of life or the reforms but with little comment should score at the lower end. 4-6
- Level 4 These will be distinguished by good organisation with the argument well illustrated by references to those reforms which brought change and those which had little effect. There must be a clear progression to a conclusion. 7-8.

SOUTHERN AFRICA.

Q.17 (a) Describe the events leading to the defeat at Majuba Hill in 1881.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a full and accurate account. Candidates may well believe that reasons for the event are required so no limit on them here. Descriptions of the actual 'battle' or the consequences may score up to 2 marks each. 3-5

(b) Why was Britain trying to expand her influence and territory in South Africa in the last quarter of the nineteenth century?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. for trade; to restrict Boers; 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. imperial ambitions; Rhodes
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answers but which contain inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of the expansion may score up to 3 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can see the immediate specific reasons and link these with the background ones or those stemming from the imperial attitudes of the late nineteenth century. Answers here should deal with both territory and influence. 6-7

(c) 'Britain followed the wrong policies in South Africa between 1880 and 1914.' Do you agree? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes some events or policies of the period. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers clearly will need to spell out what the 'policies' were and will then try to assess if they were right or wrong but this may be based on scanty evidence. Some may tackle it by working back from the war of 1899 and if this done with accuracy it can be very creditable. 4-6
- Level 4 Candidates should try to see what the results of policies were rather than just describing them and then assess whether these results were not the desired ones or backfired. Answers should try to look at the period as a whole. 7-8.

Q.18 (a) Describe three ways in which apartheid made life difficult for blacks in South Africa.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. One way well described may score 2 marks. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. 3 ways should be mentioned to score max. marks 3-5

(b) Why did the Nationalist government of 1948 introduce apartheid?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. belief in white supremacy 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. election policy supported
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of laws introducing apartheid should be limited to 3 marks. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which brings together the specific reasons for 1948 and the background reasons. Some answers may show that a form of apartheid existed before 1948 and thus explain the significance that that date had. 6-7

(c) How far was the application of the policy of apartheid the reason for white supremacy in South Africa?

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes apartheid laws in action/white supremacy in action. 2-3
- Level 3 Answers will probably describe how apartheid reinforced white supremacy rather than assess 'how far'. Some may follow the line of trying to show that white supremacy existed before apartheid thus *implying* that that policy was not the reason but not effectively dealing with 'how far'. 4-6
- Level 4 Answers will use material from the pre- and post- apartheid period to show any differences and thus proceed to an assessment of 'how far' white white supremacy was the result of apartheid. 7-8

Q.19 (a) Describe how South West Africa (Namibia) passed from German rule to South African rule.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. Some may think that this also includes the post-1945 takeover so allow that if there but it is not required. 3-5

(b) Why did South Africa want to take over Namibia in 1946?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. for her minerals. 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. so that she could exercise complete control over all affairs
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which interweaves the political, economic and social factors. This is very straightforward and so look for answers of some sophistication at this level. 6-7

(c) How well did South Africa fulfil the obligations of her mandate over Namibia? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the terms of the mandate. 2-3

Level 3 Will mainly describe South Africa's policies in Namibia and concentrate on showing that they were largely in the interests of South Africa rather than Namibia. Some may take the terms of the mandate as in the stimulus and try to show that they were not kept. 4-6

Level 4 These will reconcile what South Africa was supposed to do with what she actually did and then proceed to evaluate 'how well' she fulfilled her obligations. Some may want to show that she ignored them in essence, but paid lip-service. 7-8

ISRAELIS AND PALESTINIANS, 1945-c.1994.

Q.20 (a) Describe the events of 1947-48 leading to Britain's withdrawal from Palestine.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. Most will see reasons for withdrawal included in this and so allow up to 4 marks for that interpretation. 3-5

(b) Why did many Palestinians become refugees during the period 1948 to 1970?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. they lost their land. 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. Israel takes over Palestinian areas
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of refugees should score no more than 2 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which demonstrates familiarity with the issues involved and that the reasons were not all one-sided. Answers should cover the whole period although it need not be evenly balanced. 6-7

(c) How far was the Suez War(1956) a success for the Arabs? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the Suez war. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will probably describe some aspects of the war to show either Arab or Israeli success in the war. Better answers will go on to look at some of the consequences and so begin to assess 'how far'. 4-6

Level 4 Answers will be able to look at this in the short and long term and so bring the two together for an overview. There must be an assessment of 'how far'. 7-8

Q.21(a) Describe the part played by the USA in the Middle East in the 1970s.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. Reasons for her intervention may score up to 2 marks. 3-5

(b) Why was the Camp David agreement thought by many to be a great success?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. the leaders had made an agreement. 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. represented compromise
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Description of the agreement should be limited to 3 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which considers the agreement carefully in the context of the time and the issues in the Middle East. Better answers may examine or even challenge 'great success'. 6-7

(c) If the Camp David agreement was successful, why did tensions continue between Arabs and Israelis in the Middle East? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes example(s) of tension. 2-3

Level 3 The tendency will be to describe incidents showing continued tension and show why they occurred despite Camp David. Some may simply take the line of giving reasons for continued tension with little reference to Camp David. 4-6

Level 4 The thrust should be to show the deficiencies in the CD agreement and to explain why it could still be regarded as successful without preventing further problems. 7-8

Q.22 (a) What were the main causes of death in industrial towns in the nineteenth century?

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. If a list is given award 1 mark for each correct cause. Allow 2 marks for a good description of any cause. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. 3-5

(b) Why did some towns grow rapidly in the nineteenth century whilst others did not?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. new factories. 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. new employment prospects
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.
Descriptions of town growth should be limited to 2 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which brings together the positive and the negative Aspects e.g. the attractions of new industries and the loss of jobs in former 'domestic' industry areas. The availability of raw materials and transport should be included. 6-7

(c) To what extent did people benefit from moving from rural areas to industrial towns in the nineteenth century? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes an industrial town. 2-3

Level 3 Answers will tend to show the worst features of life in towns and the better features of life in the country, these should be marked at the lower end. Better answers, whilst still using similar material will try to show that the changes were not all the same everywhere. 4-6

Level 4 These answers will recognise that there were benefits for some but not for others
and this did not always depend upon moving but upon other factors. There will be a clear assessment of 'to what extent'. 7-8

Q.23 (a) Describe what the Tolpuddle Martyrs did and what happened to them.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. A good description of either part can score up to 4 marks. Reasons for their being brought to trial are likely to be included in the answers so no limit on these. 3-5

(b) Why was it difficult for workers to form trade unions in the first half of the nineteenth century?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. opposition of employers
1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. laws were unsympathetic
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which is able to bring together the inherent weakness of workers for banding together with the specific obstacles put in their way. Answers should show a good sense of context and keep to the first 50 years. 6-7

(c) How successful were working class movements in Britain from 1800 to 1880? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes any working class movement. 2-3

Level 3 Most answers will tend to describe the progress of movements, notably trade unions and make some conclusion about the success they had/did not have. Some may take the line of trying to show lack of success e.g. Chartists. 4-6

Level 4 The emphasis will be on showing what success movements had and then assessing the value/importance of that in the context of the time and the struggle to get better wages and working conditions. Keep to dates. 7-8

IMPACT OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM.

Q.24 (a) Describe the main types of trade carried on between European countries and their colonies in the first half of the nineteenth century.

- Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. If a list of trade types given award a mark for each correct. A reasonable description of one can score up to 2 marks. 1-2
- Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description of 2 or more types. Allow slave trade. 3-5

(b) Why did Britain have a large empire by the end of the nineteenth century?

- Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. conquest. 1
- Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. the imperial attitude
Or multi-causal at superficial level
Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted. 2-5
- Level 3 Developed multi-causal which is able to interweave the ambition as well as other factors – thus political, economic, diplomatic, military and social reasons can be brought in. Not all are necessary for a good mark. Allow credit for those who show that the British Empire was already large at the start of the century just the attitudes change. 6-7

(c) How far did imperialism benefit Britain more than it did her colonies? Explain your answer.

- Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1
- Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes British colonies or some benefits. 2-3
- Level 3 Most will show what the benefits to Britain were and try to compare those with the benefits/drawbacks of the colonies in order to reach a simple conclusion. 4-6
- Level 4 There will be some attention to the concept of 'imperialism' as well as consideration of benefits to either side. Answers must contain some assessment of 'how far'. 7-8

Q.25 (a) Describe Belgium's acquisition of the Congo.

Level 1 Gives a vague, fragmentary or only partially correct description. 1-2

Level 2 Gives a reasonably accurate and full description. 3-5

(b) Why was the Berlin Conference 1884-85 important?

Level 1 Simplistic reason lacking explanation e.g. it partitioned Africa 1

Level 2 Developed mono-causal as an explanation e.g. settled differences over Africa
Or multi-causal at superficial level

Or Level 3 concept answer but which contains inaccuracies or vagueness in the evidence submitted.

Giving the decisions of the Conference can score up to 4 marks. 2-5

Level 3 Developed multi-causal which can look at the effects on Africa, individual European nations, the imperial ethos and the balance of power and bring them together in a coherent whole with due emphasis on 'important'. 6-7

(c) How far is the term 'Scramble for Africa' an accurate description of the partition of Africa by European countries in the late nineteenth century? Explain your answer.

Level 1 Simplistic opinion supported by little valid or accurate evidence. 1

Level 2 Simplistic answer but supported by some valid evidence even if the answer is not well organised or contains inaccuracies
Or describes the 'Scramble'. 2-3

Level 3 Most will describe the 'Scramble' and then try to reconcile that with the way in which Africa was partitioned thus leading to a simple conclusion. 4-6

Level 4 The emphasis here will be on assessing 'how far' although the material approach will be similar to that for Level 3. Answers should show a sound knowledge of what happened and can place that into a good historical context. 7-8