



Cambridge IGCSE™

HISTORY

0470/23

Paper 2

October/November 2021

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

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

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

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **15** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks																																
19th Century topic																																		
1	<p data-bbox="304 315 639 344">Study Sources A and B.</p> <p data-bbox="304 383 1315 448">How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="292 465 1342 1854"> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 483 408 512">Level 5</td> <td data-bbox="1286 483 1305 512" style="text-align: right;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 551 1225 616">Compares big messages – In Source A Bismarck did not plan war with France, in Source B he did.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 647 408 676">Level 4</td> <td data-bbox="1254 647 1305 676" style="text-align: right;">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 714 1038 743">Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 781 408 810">Level 3</td> <td data-bbox="1254 781 1305 810" style="text-align: right;">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 848 1018 878">Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 916 651 1010">Agreements: The French wanted war France blundered into war</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1048 1321 1279">Disagreements: Source A says after 1866 Bismarck had no plan for unification, Source B says after 1866 Bismarck was planning unification Source A says Bismarck was content to leave the south of Germany alone, Source B says he wanted to united north and south Source A says the French, and not Bismarck, were prepared for war, Source B says Bismarck was prepared for war</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1317 408 1346">Level 2</td> <td data-bbox="1286 1317 1305 1346" style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1384 1225 1449">Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other or states that the sources are about the same subject.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1487 352 1516">OR</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1554 847 1583">Compares the provenance of the sources</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1621 408 1650">Level 1</td> <td data-bbox="1286 1621 1305 1650" style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1688 1046 1718">Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1756 408 1785">Level 0</td> <td data-bbox="1286 1756 1305 1785" style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1823 1182 1852">No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question</td> </tr> </table>	Level 5	7	Compares big messages – In Source A Bismarck did not plan war with France, in Source B he did.		Level 4	5–6	Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages		Level 3	3–4	Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages		Agreements: The French wanted war France blundered into war		Disagreements: Source A says after 1866 Bismarck had no plan for unification, Source B says after 1866 Bismarck was planning unification Source A says Bismarck was content to leave the south of Germany alone, Source B says he wanted to united north and south Source A says the French, and not Bismarck, were prepared for war, Source B says Bismarck was prepared for war		Level 2	2	Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other or states that the sources are about the same subject.		OR		Compares the provenance of the sources		Level 1	1	Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison		Level 0	0	No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question		7
Level 5	7																																	
Compares big messages – In Source A Bismarck did not plan war with France, in Source B he did.																																		
Level 4	5–6																																	
Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages																																		
Level 3	3–4																																	
Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages																																		
Agreements: The French wanted war France blundered into war																																		
Disagreements: Source A says after 1866 Bismarck had no plan for unification, Source B says after 1866 Bismarck was planning unification Source A says Bismarck was content to leave the south of Germany alone, Source B says he wanted to united north and south Source A says the French, and not Bismarck, were prepared for war, Source B says Bismarck was prepared for war																																		
Level 2	2																																	
Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other or states that the sources are about the same subject.																																		
OR																																		
Compares the provenance of the sources																																		
Level 1	1																																	
Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison																																		
Level 0	0																																	
No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question																																		

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Study Source C.</p> <p>What is the cartoonist's message? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p> <p>Level 5 7–8</p> <p>Explains point of view of cartoonist – must contain explicit criticism of Napoleon for bringing about a war of death and destruction.</p> <p>Level 4 5–6</p> <p>Explains big message – Napoleon has brought about a war of death and destruction.</p> <p>Level 3 3–4</p> <p>Sub-message(s) explained</p> <p>Sub messages: Many were killed in the war There was much destruction in the war Napoleon admits his guilt Napoleon was a poor leader Napoleon caused many deaths Napoleon caused the war</p> <p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Plausible misinterpretations</p> <p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Surface description of the source</p> <p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Study Sources D and E.</p> <p>How far does Source D make Source E surprising? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge.</p>	8
	<p>Level 6 7–8</p> <p>Answers based on the disagreements between Source D and Source E and evaluation of at least one of them to support conclusion about whether E is surprising.</p>	
	<p>Level 5 5–6</p> <p>Answers based on the disagreement(s) between Source D and Source E to argue that E is surprising</p>	
	<p>Level 4 4</p> <p>Answers that evaluate Source E but fail to make valid use of Source D to reach conclusion about surprising.</p>	
	<p>Level 3 3</p> <p>Answers based on agreement(s) between Source D and Source E to argue that E is not surprising</p>	
	<p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Explains a reason for being surprised/not surprised but never states whether surprised</p>	
	<p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions</p>	
	<p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Study Source F.</p> <p>Why was this source published in France in 1867? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p>	8
	<p>Level 6 8</p> <p>Uses message of source to explain purpose of publication in context.</p> <p>Context: The defeat of Austria by Prussia in 1866 and the consequent strengthening of Prussia</p>	
	<p>Level 5 6–7</p> <p>Uses message of source to explain purpose of publication.</p>	
	<p>Level 4 5</p> <p>Explains big message of source as reason for publication.</p> <p>Big message: There is a danger of Prussia becoming too powerful</p>	
	<p>Level 3 3–4</p> <p>Explains context only as a reason</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Explains sub-message as a reason</p>	
	<p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Interprets source or describes the context but not used as a reason for publication.</p>	
	<p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions</p>	
	<p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Study Source G.</p> <p>How useful is this source as evidence about the Franco-Prussian War of 1870? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p>	7
	<p>Level 5</p> <p>Evaluates claims of source through its purpose – useful for Bismarck’s attempt to shape his legacy.</p>	7
	<p>Level 4</p> <p>Contextual knowledge or cross-reference to check the claims made in the source to decide if useful.</p>	5–6
	<p>Level 3</p> <p>Accepts source as useful because of uncritical acceptance of its content.</p>	3–4
	<p>Level 2</p> <p>Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance</p>	2
	<p>Level 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions</p>	1
	<p>Level 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.</p>	0

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Study <u>all</u> the sources.</p> <p>How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that France was to blame for the war with Prussia in 1870? Use the sources to explain your answer.</p> <p>Award up to 2 bonus marks for evaluation of sources (no more than 1 per source).</p> <p>Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance or by direct quote. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how this supports/does not support the statement.</p> <p>Use a ✓ in the margin for each source use in support of the statement and a x for each source use rejecting the statement.</p> <p>Agree (✓): A, C, D, F</p> <p>Disagree (x): B, E, G</p> <p>Level 3 7–10</p> <p>Uses sources to support and reject the statement</p> <p>Level 2 4–6</p> <p>Uses sources to support or reject the statement</p> <p>Level 1 1–3</p> <p>No valid source use</p> <p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	12

Question	Answer	Marks																														
20th Century topic																																
1	<p data-bbox="304 315 639 344">Study Sources A and B.</p> <p data-bbox="304 383 1315 448">How far do these two sources agree? Explain your answer using details of the sources.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="292 465 1342 2022"> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 481 408 510">Level 5</td> <td data-bbox="1299 481 1315 510" style="text-align: right;">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 548 1235 613">Compares big messages – Source A is not criticising the League, while Source B is – must be supported from source.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 647 408 676">Level 4</td> <td data-bbox="1267 647 1315 676" style="text-align: right;">5–6</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 714 1042 743">Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 781 408 810">Level 3</td> <td data-bbox="1267 781 1315 810" style="text-align: right;">3–4</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 848 1018 878">Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 916 826 1146"> <p data-bbox="304 916 596 945">Agreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 949 826 1146">Japan had a right to be there There was support/sympathy for Japan US did not support intervention The League did nothing/not much/failed Britain did not want to act The Japanese invasion caused a crisis.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1184 639 1214">Disagreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1218 1315 1485">Source A doesn't see it as an invasion, Source B does OR Source A sees Japan's actions as legal, Source B says illegal. Source A says League could not do anything, Source B says League should have done more. Source A says Britain didn't act because its military is weak, Source B says it didn't act because Japan was a friend. Source A says information about events in China were slow to get through, Source B says news arrived quickly.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1520 408 1550">Level 2</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1520 1315 1550" style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1588 1106 1617">Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1655 352 1684">OR</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1722 975 1751">States that the sources are about the same subject</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1789 352 1818">OR</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1856 847 1886">Compares the provenance of the sources</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1924 408 1953">Level 1</td> <td data-bbox="1299 1924 1315 1953" style="text-align: right;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="304 1991 1046 2020">Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison</td> </tr> </table>	Level 5	7	Compares big messages – Source A is not criticising the League, while Source B is – must be supported from source.		Level 4	5–6	Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages		Level 3	3–4	Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages		<p data-bbox="304 916 596 945">Agreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 949 826 1146">Japan had a right to be there There was support/sympathy for Japan US did not support intervention The League did nothing/not much/failed Britain did not want to act The Japanese invasion caused a crisis.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1184 639 1214">Disagreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1218 1315 1485">Source A doesn't see it as an invasion, Source B does OR Source A sees Japan's actions as legal, Source B says illegal. Source A says League could not do anything, Source B says League should have done more. Source A says Britain didn't act because its military is weak, Source B says it didn't act because Japan was a friend. Source A says information about events in China were slow to get through, Source B says news arrived quickly.</p>		Level 2	2	Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other		OR		States that the sources are about the same subject		OR		Compares the provenance of the sources		Level 1	1	Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison		7
Level 5	7																															
Compares big messages – Source A is not criticising the League, while Source B is – must be supported from source.																																
Level 4	5–6																															
Agreement and disagreement of detail or sub-messages																																
Level 3	3–4																															
Agreement or disagreement of detail or sub-messages																																
<p data-bbox="304 916 596 945">Agreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 949 826 1146">Japan had a right to be there There was support/sympathy for Japan US did not support intervention The League did nothing/not much/failed Britain did not want to act The Japanese invasion caused a crisis.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1184 639 1214">Disagreements include:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1218 1315 1485">Source A doesn't see it as an invasion, Source B does OR Source A sees Japan's actions as legal, Source B says illegal. Source A says League could not do anything, Source B says League should have done more. Source A says Britain didn't act because its military is weak, Source B says it didn't act because Japan was a friend. Source A says information about events in China were slow to get through, Source B says news arrived quickly.</p>																																
Level 2	2																															
Identifies information that is in one source but not in the other																																
OR																																
States that the sources are about the same subject																																
OR																																
Compares the provenance of the sources																																
Level 1	1																															
Writes about the sources but makes no valid comparison																																

Question	Answer	Marks
1	Level 0 No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Study Source C.</p> <p>What is the message of the cartoonist? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p>	8
	<p>Level 5 7–8</p> <p>Explains point of view of cartoonist – criticising Japan/Japan is wrong for invading or breaking international treaties.</p> <p>Must be supported from source, otherwise Level 3</p>	
	<p>Level 4 6</p> <p>Explains big message of the source – Japan is breaking international treaties by invading Manchuria/China OR something needed to be done about Japan, it needed to be stopped</p>	
	<p>Level 3 3–5</p> <p>Explains sub-message (3 marks if no support, more than one unsupported = 4 marks, one supported = 4 marks, one of each = 5 marks)</p> <p>Sub-messages</p> <p>International treaties/agreements are being broken/are weak Japan is being aggressive/Japan is powerful China is being attacked The international treaties/agreements were useless Japan is ruthless Japan cannot be trusted Japan is acting illegally</p>	
	<p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Plausible misinterpretations</p>	
	<p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Surface description</p>	
	<p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Study Sources D and E.</p> <p>How far does Source D mean that Source E cannot be trusted? Explain your answer using details of the sources and your knowledge.</p> <p>Level 5 7–8</p> <p>Answers based on the disagreements between Source D and Source E and evaluation of at least one of them to support conclusion about whether Source E can be trusted</p> <p>Level 4 5–6</p> <p>Answers based on the disagreements between Source D and Source E</p> <p>Source D claims that Japan has been successful in Manchuria and is creating order and bringing stability to an area where there was disorder – an ‘oasis in a desert of Chinese misrule’. The invasion is therefore justified.</p> <p>Source E, on the other hand, criticises the Japanese for using ‘threats and force’. It argues that violence should not govern relations between states and that the stability of the world is being threatened by the invasion. It is not justified.</p> <p>Level 3 3–4</p> <p>Answers that evaluate Source E but fail to make valid use of Source D</p> <p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance, e.g., Source D disagrees with Source E but they are both from the same newspaper, therefore it cannot be trusted or used to prove that Source E cannot be trusted. They are from different dates, events might have changed and so there is no reason why the disagreements between them mean that Source D shows that Source E cannot be trusted.</p> <p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions.</p> <p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Study Source F.</p> <p>How useful is this source as evidence about the Japanese in Manchuria? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p>	7
	<p>Level 5</p> <p>Answers based on the purpose of the source – useful for understanding how Japan was promoting its actions in Manchukuo or that Manchukuo or the Mukden incident was important to Japan.</p>	7
	<p>Level 4</p> <p>Contextual answers of how source is not useful because it is biased or because of its purpose</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Cross-references to argue it is useful because it was like this (probably from Background Information or Source D)</p>	5–6
	<p>Level 3</p> <p>Answers based on impressions given of Japanese happiness in Manchuria, showing Japan was succeeding there.</p>	3–4
	<p>Level 2</p> <p>Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Uses surface detail, e.g., useful for how they were dressed</p>	2
	<p>Level 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions/answers failing to address useful/answers based on misinterpretations</p>	1
	<p>Level 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	0

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Study Source G.</p> <p>Do you find this source surprising? Explain your answer using details of the source and your knowledge.</p>	8
	<p>Level 7 8</p> <p>Uses content and provenance to make an informed explanation of Hoover's purpose – to defend US policy or his own record.</p>	
	<p>Level 6 7</p> <p>Explains why it is surprising that the US or Hoover is sympathetic or supportive towards the League in Source G.</p>	
	<p>Level 5 5–6</p> <p>Checks claims about the failure of the League through contextual knowledge or cross-reference.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Explains why it was surprising/not surprising that Hoover was disappointed over the League.</p>	
	<p>Level 4 4</p> <p>Everyday empathy used to comment on content of Source G</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Uses contextual knowledge/cross reference to check minor detail in Source G</p>	
	<p>Level 3 3</p> <p>Answers based on undeveloped provenance – e.g., identifies reason but no explanation; e.g., it is surprising an American is sympathetic towards the League.</p>	
	<p>Level 2 2</p> <p>Identifies what is/isn't surprising but no valid explanation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Valid reason explained but no statement about whether surprised</p>	
	<p>Level 1 1</p> <p>Unsupported assertions</p>	
	<p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Study all the sources.</p> <p>How far do these sources provide convincing evidence that the League was justified in doing little about the Japanese invasion of Manchuria? Use the sources to explain your answer.</p> <p>Award up to 2 bonus marks for evaluation of sources (no more than 1 per source).</p> <p>Source use must be reference to a source by letter, by provenance or by direct quote. There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how this supports/does not support the statement.</p> <p>Use a ✓ in the margin for each source use in support of the statement and a x for each source use rejecting the statement.</p> <p>Agree (✓): A, D, F</p> <p>Disagree (x): B, C, E, G</p>	12
	<p>Level 3 7–10</p> <p>Uses sources to support and reject the statement</p> <hr/> <p>Level 2 4–6</p> <p>Uses sources to support or reject the statement</p> <hr/> <p>Level 1 1–3</p> <p>No valid source use</p> <hr/> <p>Level 0 0</p> <p>No evidence submitted, or response does not address the question.</p>	