UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2006 question paper

0470 HISTORY

0470/04 Paper 4, maximum raw 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*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the Report on the Examination for this session.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2006 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Depth Study A: Germany 1919-1945

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from the source e.g. The Nazis wanted everyone to like them etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Wanted more than tacit acceptance. Must have conviction and support 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, reached every corner of the Reich. No, not all German people so easily persuaded to believe 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 is from Goebbels and the other is from an American ambassador 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. Beatings, imprisonment, camps, execution etc. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies feature e.g. censorship, propaganda etc. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes features. Award an extra mark for each feature described in additional detail e.g. Foreign journalists' scripts checked and edited; anti-German scripts, films, music etc not permitted. Pro-German censorship – Wagner etc. **[2-4]**

(iii) Level 1 – A single reason. One for the reason, one for the explanation e.g. The medium of information, accessible to all, cheap radios, control of what people heard, outdoor/indoor broadcasts. Fascinated by this new technology etc. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Multiple reasons – One for each reason, one for each reason explained. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Repression, the Germans were scared of being beaten up. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of repression OR propaganda. Single factor given e.g.

Repression: Gestapo, SA/ SS, camps, disappearances, informers etc.

Propaganda: All media controlled, 'big lie' theory, only Nazi versions allowed.

N.B. Accept arguments which deny either and say that people wanted to support the Nazis, approved of their policies etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of repression OR propaganda, multiple factors given. Allow single factor 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 repression AND propaganda must be addressed. **[6-8]**

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941.

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. The Bolsheviks and their supporters can do what they like etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Even bloodshed is permissible in the cause of revolution etc. **[5-6]**

(ii) Level 1 – Agrees OR disagrees, with no support from the source e.g. He always looked strange etc. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, single-mindedness, professional revolutionary, "one of us". No, appearance, "small tradesman" 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 is from Lenin himself, the other is from a British newspaper 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. Mensheviks, Social Revs. Cadets, Tsarist officers. USA, GB, France, Japan, Czech Legion, Poles. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies elements. One for each factor to maximum of two e.g. Campaign of intimidation, imprisonment, murder, execution etc. by the Cheka to establish the Bolshevik regime, get rid of opponents, impose War Communism etc. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each element described in additional detail. **[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. Diverse nature/ambitions of Whites. Little co-operation or shared plans. Foreign troops made it a war in support of Mother Russia. Central position, control of food, transport and factories by Bolsheviks. Leadership of Trotsky. War communism measures etc. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, he was a hero. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of success OR lack of success. Single factor given e.g.

Yes: Brains and driving force behind the movement and revolution; establishment of communist state; War Communism helped win war; NEP re-established some prosperity. Figurehead etc.

No: Increasing bad health meant much was left to others; War Communism upset many peasants; NEP upset party colleagues; still many who would have preferred another form of government; still Tsarists; Work of Trotsky and others etc. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success, 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 success AND lack of success must be addressed. **[6-8]**

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. Unfair, people bitter, resented having to beg etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. When he was needed he was ready, dream of glory has burst, resented standing in line for handouts etc. **[5-6]**

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

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, unemployment had risen dramatically, all areas were affected. No, variable from one area to another, only some areas mentioned. 75 per cent still had work etc. **[3-5]**

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 is a song, 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. Shanty towns that grew up around many cities; inhabited by unemployed/homeless; bitterly named after the President. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies measures. One for each measure to a maximum of two e.g. Attempts to cut government spending; lowers some taxes; 1930, Hawley-Smoot raised tariffs to record levels; loans to Europe withdrawn; federal Home Loan Bank; 'Give a Job' scheme; 1932, Reconstruction Finance Corporation; some agricultural surpluses bought up, loans for seeds and fertilisers; some public works. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes measures. Award an extra mark for each measure described in additional detail. **[2-4]**

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for the reason explained e.g. Unexpected, unprecedented; economists thought that traditional market forces would overcome; balanced budget sacrosanct; rugged individualism; blamed other nations; Hoover a prisoner of his own party etc. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason, one for each reason explained. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, Roosevelt had a better campaign. No, Hoover's economic policies had failed. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of Roosevelt's OR other factors e.g.

Roosevelt: New Deal promises; success as Governor of New York; personality; had united Democrats for once.

Other: Roosevelt's ideas no more radical than Hoover's, and vague; Hoover's measures totally inadequate; anyone was preferable; Republican campaign ineffective. **[2]**

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

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate Balanced but Brief) **[3-5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.

BOTH sides Roosevelt And other factors must be addressed. **[6-8]**

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.

(a)(i) Level 1 – Describes material seen in source, no inference made. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. They were all peasants; the work is boring etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Quotes detail from the photo to show that the work was simple, primitive, labour intensive, uses young workers 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, Too quickly established, lack of training, experience etc. No, could not predict weather, Russian's leaving was only partly China's fault 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 a photograph, the other is American so they could both be limited/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 based 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 difference to a maximum of two e.g. Co-operatives introduced earlier, 30-40 families, peasants still owned land. Collectives later, larger and land owned by state. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies elements. One mark for each valid element to a maximum of two. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes elements. Award an extra mark for each valid element described in extra detail e.g. Marriage Law 1950 abolished child marriage, infanticide, bigamy and other marital inequalities. Maternity benefits and equal pay. 'Women hold up half the sky'(Mao). Rural areas – little change. **[2-4]**

(iii) Level 1 – Single reason. One for the reason, one for explaining it. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Multiple reasons. One for each reason one for each reason explained e.g. Campaign an attempt to bring support for Socialism from intellectuals by allowing constructive criticism. Slow to start, Mao repeated invitation, criticism of Socialism and Party members grew to a flood in speech and print. Government was being undermined, Cadres were attacked, Mao under threat. Mao had got his critics to reveal themselves. Campaign replaced by an anti-Rightist vendetta etc. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, they took all their money with them. **[1]**

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

Withdrawal: Russian withdrawal after argument between Mao and Kruschchev was a huge political, financial, psychological blow. Removed money, expertise.

Others: See source B. Poor management, insufficient training, backyard furnaces, weather, bad harvests and famine (c.20m died). Poor industry and canals, roads etc took workers from the land etc. **[2]**

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

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. They needed more African workers etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Pass Laws made easier so that African labour can be more easily exploited, unplanned African housing etc. **[5-6]**

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

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, employers feared strikes; actual strike brought goldfields to a halt etc. No, Four years to produce report, went back to work at gunpoint etc. **[3-5]**

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 is South African, 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 term to a maximum of two e.g. 1952 Abolition of Passes Act consolidated into one pass book; all blacks outside rural areas had to carry this; Native Affairs Dept. had to endorse any changes; passes to be carried by women in certain areas. Used to direct labour; failure to produce was a criminal offence. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects. To classify races; must carry documents. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes aspects – Award an extra mark for aspects described in additional detail e.g. to define groups into white, black, Asiatic, Coloured; all South Africans to carry classification; to enforce apartheid in mixed marriages, residence, basis to abolish Coloured suffrage in Cape. **[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. Preserve white racial purity, strengthen Afrikaner economic interests, add support for National Party. Keep Africans from towns and deny Africans residence and property outside reserves. Control migrant labour. Groups Act segregated Indian and Coloured residential areas. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions. Yes, it gained publicity. No, it was called off. **[1]**

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

Success: ANC & Indian Congress worked together. Peaceful protest gained world publicity. Roles of Mandela and Sisulu. Achieved the arrests (8000), refused to pay fines and clogged up prisons. ANC went from 7k to 100k in 6 months. UN set up commission on apartheid.

Failure: Only first stage completed – no nation-wide protest; Govt. did not change apartheid laws; by Oct/Nov '52 violence. ANC leaders in prison or banning orders; disputes in ANC. Called off early '53. New Govt emergency powers. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of success OR lack of success with multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH side 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]**

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from the source e.g. They hated the Israelis etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Makes valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Publicity seeking action; hints at wider Arab state support; exchange of hostages etc. **[5-6]**

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

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, both sides attacked one another's civilians to achieve results, no other tactic considered in source. No, both saw it as justified self-defence with the other side being terrorists 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 – Both sources are from British writers 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 group to a maximum of two e.g. Stern Gang, Irgun etc. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies help. Aid, world platform etc. **[1-2**

Level 2 – Develops aid. Award an extra mark for aid described in additional detail e.g. Aid – food, shelter, schools, medical services in Egypt, Gaza, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan. Political – gave Arafat opportunity to speak, UN platform and resolutions 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. Israel did not accept UN resolutions re refugee repatriation or compensation; did not heed Security Council; unwilling to negotiate peace; continued to damage Arabs in occupied territories; deliberately discriminated against Arab workers; Israel not considered a legitimate representative of the Palestinians in UN etc. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, they just could not stop fighting etc. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of peaceful intent OR lack of peaceful intent with single factor:

Peace: Both wanted peace on their own terms and with their own advantage. Palestinians and Arabs wanted the state of Israel destroyed; both sides asserting self-defence; freedom fighters/terrorists. Both appealed to UN and/or USA for help and protection but listened only when it suited them. Both sides said peace was the only option but at what cost?

Lack of peace; Damage to Palestinians (wherever they lived) was done by Israeli army etc for the most part. Israel attacked by various Palestinian groups and allies. Palestinians hope for further support from Arab states – oil weapon perhaps etc. **[2]**

REWARD DETAILED EXAMPLES.

Level 3 – Explanation of peaceful intent OR lack of peaceful intent 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 peaceful intent AND lack of peaceful intent must be addressed. **[6-8]**

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inferences, not supported from source e.g. The strike caused much turmoil etc. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. Comments on the movement, intimidatory atmosphere and noise etc. **[5-6]**

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

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from the source e.g. Yes, it details peaceful protest and strike. No, it shows organisation. Allow comments on provenance here. **[3-5]**

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 is from a letter to the Times, another is from a strike leader and the third is from a book so they could all be biased/unreliable. **[2]**

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

Level 4 – Choice made on the grounds of reliability.

Discussion of utility must be made on valid evaluation of source(s) in context. Include at this Level answers that cross-reference between A, B and C to show reliability.

6 marks for one source, 7 marks for more than one source. **[6-7]**

(b) (i) One mark for each valid aspect to a maximum of two e.g. Striking workers at entry to place of work to attempt to persuade others to join them – no threats allowed. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies aspects. Growth of unskilled workers' organisations. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes aspects. Award an extra mark for aspects described in additional detail e.g. Converted the trade union movement from one that looked after the interests of skilled workers, to a wider field of workers' wages, rights, conditions. Links with politics. **[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. Uneducated, lack of organisers/organisation, short of wages and so little money to start up unions, communications, no precedents until Match Girls and Dockers strikes. Little association with political groups. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

Yes, lots of case law after prosecutions. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of law OR employers' actions with single factor given e.g.

Law: Legislation, some helpful, some very restrictive. Nevertheless trade unions had more protection and rights by 1914 than they had in 1850.

Employers: Tried various means to combat growing trade union power – Hornby vs. Close 1871 (Financial regulation) led to 1871 TU Act. Taff Vale Case 1901(Compensate employers for losses). Also lock outs, blackleg labour, intimidation, victimisation – did limit growth in the short term but not long term. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of law OR employers' actions, multiple factors given. Allow single factors with multiple reasons.

OR Undeveloped suggestions on BOTH sides of the argument (annotate BBB – Balanced but Brief). **[2-5]**

Level 4 – Answers that offer a balanced argument.

BOTH sides of law AND employers' actions must be addressed. **[6-8]**

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

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

Level 2 – Makes valid inference, not supported from source e.g. All were trying to help the people. **[3-4]**

Level 3 – Supports valid inference(s) with reference to the source e.g. a multi-racial expedition, set upon improving the lot of the 'natives'. **[5-6]**

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

Level 2 – Agrees OR disagrees, supported from source e.g. Yes, hardly any protection, humanity, law and order to kill Africans. No, there is a semblance of order and law. The Europeans are there, in the heart of Africa. **[3-5]**

Level 3 – Agrees AND disagrees, supported from 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 is from a British newspaper, the other is from a native 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 example to a maximum of two – one from each e.g. Germany – SW Africa (Namibia), Tanganyika, Togo. Cameroon etc. Portugal – Mozambique, Angola. **[1-2]**

(ii) Level 1 – Identifies system. Government of colonies to reduce costs. **[1-2]**

Level 2 – Describes system. Award an extra mark for additional description of the system e.g. Developed by Lord Lugard to allow local chiefs to continue to rule their areas but under British principles. **[2-4]**

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

Level 2 – Multiple reasons – One for the reason, one for the reason explained e.g. Non-Imperial nations becoming anxious to gain 'place in the sun'; to resolve claims, navigation of rivers and spheres of influence in West and Central Africa concerning Britain, Germany, France and Belgium. **[2-6]**

(iv) Level 1 – Simple assertions.

No, they were always horrible to the Africans. **[1]**

Level 2 – Explanation of good government OR bad government, single factor given:

Good: Laws, protection, trade, education, civilisation, medical care etc. NB. Be prepared to reward 'good' when seen from a European view.

Bad: No respect for local culture, laws, customs, exploitation, blacks seen and treated as inferior etc. NB. Be prepared to reward 'bad' when seen from an African perspective. **[2]**

Level 3 – Explanation of good government OR bad government, 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 good government AND bad government must be addressed. **[6-8]**