

## **GCSE**

### **History B (Modern World)**

Unit **A012/01**: Aspects of international relations and Russia, 1905–1941

General Certificate of Secondary Education

### **Mark Scheme for June 2016**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

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 should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

---

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

<b>AO1</b>	Recall, select, use and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history.
<b>AO2</b>	Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context</li><li>• key features and characteristics of the periods studied and the relationships between them.</li></ul>
<b>AO3</b>	Understand, analyse and evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• a range of source material as part of an historical enquiry</li><li>• how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways as part of an historical enquiry.</li></ul>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message (viewpoint) and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>7</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>I think the cartoonist approves of the USA helping South Vietnam, by using bombing to stop Ho Chi Minh taking control. Ho is shown as an octopus, and his tentacles stretch all over South Vietnam, which was America's view that Ho was trying to take over by organising the Vietcong in the South. The US has the scissors of 'Air Strikes' in their hand, which is shown to be a simple way to combat the communists, by bombing their supply lines. In March 1965 the USA began Operation Rolling Thunder, in response to communist attacks on US airbases and the South Vietnam government. The cartoonist clearly approves of this action, because air strikes are shown to be a clean and precise way to target the communists, without 'cutting' or causing damage to the rest of the country. In fact bombing was neither clean nor effective, but as this is April 1965, the cartoonist is not aware of this yet.</i></p> <p><b>CV</b> = the approval of American bombing</p> <p><b>Main</b> = America's bombing is successful</p> <p><b>Sub</b> = Any focus on Ho Chi Minh / America is bombing / America is trying to stop Ho Chi Minh US bombing is not working (or anything negative). References to American 'involvement' or 'policy' do not relate to bombing and are credited as sub message.</p>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam in the 1950s under President Eisenhower.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam under President Eisenhower. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam under Eisenhower. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US involvement in Vietnam under Eisenhower.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>6-8</b></p> <p><b>3-5</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason the USA became increasingly involved was because it was convinced Ho Chi Minh was a communist and was afraid of the domino theory. At the time America was involved in a Cold War with the USSR, and desperately wanted to stop the spread of communism. Under Eisenhower, it became convinced that once one country became communist, others would follow, like a row of falling dominoes. Although Ho claimed to be a nationalist trying to liberate Vietnam from foreign interference, the US believed he was a communist, so feared the domino theory in South East Asia. It was concerned Ho would spread communism from North Vietnam to the South, and then on through Laos and Cambodia.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason it became involved was because after the French left Vietnam, the new leader Diem was weak. Diem was a Catholic in a Buddhist nation, and allowed his family to have lots of the best jobs in government. This led to resentment and he was unpopular with many. As his government was weak, the USA felt they needed to guide him and the country more, so sent more advisers and massive amounts of aid to try and increase his popularity.</i></p> <p><b>NB:</b> allow containment but must be advanced as a separate and distinct factor to the Domino Theory. Candidates must not be credited twice for the same material.</p>



## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: What was the Truman Doctrine?</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only. <i>'it was US policy towards communism'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a policy of the US government for limiting the spread of communism</i></li> <li>• <i>the idea that communism would not be allowed to spread</i></li> <li>• <i>containment</i></li> <li>• <i>it provided aid, money, equipment and advice to countries at risk of becoming communist (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>announced in 1947</i></li> <li>• <i>It was started after the Red Army occupation of Europe, in response to the risk that the communists would take over in Greece (1 only - as more cause than description of TD itself)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NB:</b> 'containment' and 'stopping communism spreading' are the same point and should not both receive credit</p>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks 6	Guidance
2 (b)	<p><b>Q: Why did Stalin fear the USA by 1946? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Stalin had reason to fear the USA and produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Stalin had reason to fear the USA and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about relations between the USA and USSR to 1946.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that Stalin feared the USA would try to crush communism now that the USSR had been weakened by war. He knew that the Americans hated and feared communism, due to its different political system, but during the war they were prepared to work with the Soviets to fight a common enemy. After the Nazis had been defeated, the mutual distrust re-emerged and was already clear at the Potsdam conference, where the two former allies found it difficult to agree. Stalin was afraid Truman's new hard-line approach compared to Roosevelt's meant that the US saw his country as an enemy.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was America's development of the atomic bomb. It had a devastating effect when it was used on Japan at the end of the war, and Stalin feared that the real reason for its development was to threaten the USSR. When Truman refused to share America's research with the USSR, and did not reveal its existence until after it was tested, Stalin was even more suspicious and afraid, so began his own nuclear programme to protect the USSR. The nuclear arms race had begun, which then itself increased tension.</i></p> <p><b>NB:</b> Care should be taken not to credit material after 1946, (such as Bizonia or the Truman Doctrine)</p>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: ‘By 1949, the USA had achieved more success in the Cold War than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the US successes <b>OR</b> the USSR’s achievements and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways I agree. The USA had success in the Cold War from the beginning. By 1947 they were alarmed at Stalin’s control in Eastern Europe, and in response came up with the Truman Doctrine: America would assist countries if they were at risk from communist takeover. As a result, they helped the King of Greece defeat the communists, which was a success for containment. Likewise, in Berlin the USA were successful. Stalin had tried to take control of West Berlin, run by Britain, France and the USA, by blockading it in 1948. The Allies successfully airlifted supplies for 11 months to save it. Stalin could do nothing, for fear of triggering a war, and eventually gave up humiliated. By contrast the Allies looked like the good guys ‘saving’ Berlin from being strangled by communism, another US success.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USSR also had some success. Stalin wanted a sphere of influence in Europe to act as a buffer zone of friendly countries to prevent future attack: twice in thirty years Germany had attacked Russia. By 1949, there were communist governments across the whole of Eastern Europe, meaning that Stalin had the security he wanted. He may have achieved this by encouraging election rigging, banning opposition parties and murdering opposition politicians, but he had achieved it no less. He had also got what he wanted with Germany. At Yalta and Potsdam he had been determined to punish Germany and get reparations to compensate for the terrible loss of life and hardship the USSR had experienced during the war. He got this, as dividing Germany weakened it, and he took reparations from his zone.</i></p> <p><i>However overall, despite some USSR successes, it was the USA who looked strongest by 1949. Although it may look like the USSR was in the driving seat, provoking reactions from the USA like the Berlin Airlift and Truman Doctrine, it was they who came off worst when the USA reacted, shown by having to end the Berlin Blockade achieving nothing. Other than getting their sphere of influence, they were only just catching up with where the USA already was in terms of their allies and atomic weapons, by 1949.</i></p>



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify successes for either side in the Cold War <b>AND/OR</b> describe these successes and events. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Cold War.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><b>NB:</b> Must give a specific example of the factor's success (for example Greece in the Marshall Plan or Czechoslovakia in Stalin's subterfuge in Eastern Europe)</p> <p><b>Guidance for Level 4:</b> Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7 Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9 One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</p> <p>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</p>



## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the USA's reaction to the Cuban Revolution of 1959.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example <i>'the USA was very unhappy'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>at first they recognised Castro as the new leader of Cuba</i></li> <li>• <i>encouraged US businesses in Cuba not to use USSR imported products</i></li> <li>• <i>Eisenhower authorised the CIA to investigate ways of overthrowing Castro</i></li> <li>• <i>sponsored the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961</i></li> <li>• <i>US trade embargoes on sugar, oil and guns (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>produced anti-Castro propaganda</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NB:</b> No more than two marks for the Bay of Pigs (or any other relevant factor)</p>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why did the Soviet Union become involved in Cuba ? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba, or events in Cuba 1959-61.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was because it was anxious to defend Cuba, the only communist state in the Western hemisphere. It had willingly become communist, rather than becoming communist as a result of invasion by the Red Army, and so was excellent propaganda for the USSR, especially as it was in Uncle Sam's backyard. At the same time, Khrushchev was aware that the USA was very unhappy about a communist state so close, and so Cuba was at great risk of invasion. He had to protect his weak new ally against the strength of the USA, to ensure its survival.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason is because of the nuclear arms race and the missile gap that had emerged. Khrushchev knew that Kennedy had more long range weapons than he did, and bases very close to the USSR in Western Europe and Turkey which made him feel vulnerable. By putting his own medium range missiles in Cuba he hoped to restore the nuclear balance, as these Cuban missiles would threaten most US cities. It would also give the USA a taste of their own medicine by making the US feel vulnerable, as they had placed missiles near the USSR, and the missiles themselves could be easily built and replaced.</i></p>

## Part 1: Section A - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q 'The USA gained more from the Cuban Missile Crisis than the USSR'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to argue that the USA OR the USSR gained more and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I definitely agree that the USA gained a lot. When Khrushchev put his missiles on Cuba, America had to react in some way, as this was a threatening and provocative act. Missiles could target most American cities within minutes. The blockade was a sensible option as it was not a direct act of war, and forced Khrushchev into the position of villain or weakling, if he caused a war or retreated. It led to the Russians backing down and the missiles were removed meaning the USA was safe and Kennedy's reputation was improved because he had stood up to Khrushchev. In that sense, America gained a lot. Kennedy also held his nerve when negotiating the removal of the bases: he waited for Khrushchev to change his negotiating position before agreeing a deal. That meant the US got to remove its missile bases from Turkey in secret, so it looked like only the Russians had backed down, another US win.</i></p> <p><i>That said, Khrushchev also secured his goal, so the USSR did well. In return for removing its missiles, the USA had to give a commitment not to attack Cuba, securing the survival of the regime to this day. One could argue this is why Khrushchev put missiles on the island in the first place, so in removing them, the USSR had lost nothing. It was a propaganda success for Khrushchev too outside the USSR, as the US had made no secret of its dislike of a communist country so close, but they could do nothing about it. The USSR also got the US missiles removed from Turkey, as part of the deal, meaning their people were less at risk from attack by America.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, I'd argue that the USA achieved more. Although both sides had gains, the USA's gains were more public and without the humiliation of retreating from the naval blockade and removing missiles in public. Their losses were also private. As the Cold War was about propaganda and appearances, this mattered more.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the outcomes of the crisis, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>NB:</b> The two 'sides' are the USA (success and/or failure) and the USSR (success and/or failure). Candidates must examine each 'side' in order to attain L4+. Allow references to Kennedy and Khrushchev. The establishment of the 'hotline' can be credited if validly integrated into a valid explanation or judgment. The 'cut off' for considering material is Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964.</p> <p><b>Guidance for Level 4:</b></p> <p>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7          Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9          One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</p> <p>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</p>

## Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message (viewpoint) and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7  5-6  3-4  2  1  0	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is saying that the USA is losing the war in Iraq and the President is being criticised for not having a better strategy for winning. The hole Uncle Sam is digging represents the difficult situation America is in now it has invaded, and the only way out the President suggests is to 'keep digging'. However, digging a deeper hole isn't an answer as it won't help him climb out, in other words doing more of the same kinds of actions won't help America win the war. By 2005 America had been at war in Iraq for over three years, but if anything the war seemed to be getting worse as the country had descended into chaos and civil war and an insurgency had set in attacking the government and American forces. The US government was being criticised for not having a plan to get out. Also in the cartoon, Uncle Sam is far from happy, showing the general frustration Americans were feeling that they seemed unable to end the war and bring their troops home.</i></p> <p><b>CV</b> = criticism that Bush's policies are not working</p> <p><b>Main</b> = criticism levelled at US not Bush / Bush's policies are not working (flat) / America should get out of Iraq / America is not happy with the President / America's policies have made things worse</p> <p><b>Sub message</b> = focus is on Iraq not the US / America cannot get out of Iraq / America is stuck in Iraq</p> <p><b>Do not credit</b> digging for oil, looking for weapons of mass destruction, 'America is digging its own hole'. The focus of the cartoon is the occupation of Iraq and not the invasion. Interpretation around invasion = sub message</p>

## Part 1: Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the multinational forces could not leave Iraq in 2003 after the Iraqi army had been defeated.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason they could not leave Iraq was that they left it too late to plan how to rebuild and run Iraq after Saddam Hussain was removed. They had a plan to conquer, but not to rule. For example, most major reconstruction contracts had not been signed when the war started and the coalition forces temporary government had no offices, telephones and computers when it was first set up. This left the military struggling to maintain the peace and govern a country where law and order had broken down and infrastructure was in tatters. The people felt that the government was ineffective and its foreign backers were only there to serve themselves so some joined rebel groups which made it difficult for Western forces to leave.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason they could not leave Iraq was the mistakes that were made by the people in charge. Bremer became head of the CPA in May 2003 but he had no experience of the Middle East. He immediately banned the Ba'ath party and all party members above a certain rank lost their jobs. This was a serious mistake, as the government lost 30,000 experienced administrators who could have helped to make the new government work. The Iraqi armed forces and security services were also dissolved. This put 300,000 armed young men out of work, and cut off the pensions of tens of thousands of ex-army officers. This was disastrous as many of these men were very bitter, and so they put their skills and weapons to the service of the insurgency, worsening the law and order situation.</i></p>



## Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe how Communist governments controlled people's lives in Eastern Europe after 1948.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'fewer civil rights'</i> or <i>'introduction of Soviet style communism'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>no freedom of speech/freedom to criticise the government</i></li> <li>• <i>ensorship of the press and media</i></li> <li>• <i>opposition groups/parties abolished and/or imprisoned</i></li> <li>• <i>use of informers</i></li> <li>• <i>limited freedom of religion</i></li> <li>• <i>brutal repression of strikes and protests against government policies</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NB:</b> Do not credit Cominform / Comecon / Warsaw Pact</p>



## Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in 1981</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in December 1981. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in December 1981 and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Polish government's actions towards Solidarity in December 1981.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason it acted against Solidarity is that the union had become too popular and well supported. By 1981 almost half of all workers had joined it. This strength meant it was a threat to the government. Jaruzelski's predecessor had agreed to many of its demands, which led to a massive increase in its popularity to over 9 million. After tense negotiations with Lech Walesa to form a 'government of national understanding' broke down, Jaruzelski clearly feared what the union would do next, so imprisoned over 10,000 of its leaders and suspended Solidarity.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for acting is that Jaruzelski was concerned about what the Soviet Union would do if he did not do something about Solidarity soon. The union had produced an 'open letter' telling workers in countries throughout the Communist bloc that they were campaigning for their rights too, and this made the Soviet leadership fear for the future of their control elsewhere. Brezhnev had already ordered the Red Army to carryout 'training manoeuvres' on the Polish border. Jaruzelski feared that if he did not act, the Soviet Union might extend this to invade to 'restore order', something he wanted to avoid.</i></p> <p><b>NB:</b> The focus is on the reasoning why the Polish government acted, not why the USSR wanted action. Explanations must link back to Poland.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p><b>Q: How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how Gorbachev's actions <b>OR</b> the USSR's economic problems led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Gorbachev's actions were very important. When he introduced glasnost and perestroika in the USSR, it allowed more open debate on government policy, including criticisms of it, and changes to the economy. As people in Eastern Europe saw this, they demanded similar reforms in their own countries. When they heard that Gorbachev was also planning on withdrawing Soviet troops from Eastern Europe, they realised that their leaders could not count on Soviet force, so they could be free of the worst aspects of communism. From May 1989 onwards, people rebelled against communist rule in Eastern Europe, and without the backup of the Red Army, communism collapsed. Without Gorbachev's actions, demand for change wouldn't have been so obvious, and Eastern bloc countries could also have relied on Red Army troops to deal with protesters.</i></p> <p><i>But economic problems were also important. This is why Gorbachev introduced many of his reforms. For years the Soviet economy had been very weak, spending too much money on weapons, and it was in need of major reform to improve the quality of industries and raise the standard of living for the Soviet people. Previous leaders had just buried their heads in the sand. Gorbachev wanted to change things. As a result, he introduced perestroika, which introduced market forces and private business, which inspired people in Eastern Europe to want these changes too, as their economies were also a shambles. Crucially, to save money, he also cut spending on defence, including deciding to remove the Red Army from Eastern Europe, removing the prop for unpopular communist governments. With this gone, their days were numbered.</i></p> <p><i>As I've explained, Gorbachev's actions were largely the result of economic problems, so you could argue that as they came first they were more important than him. But I don't agree. The economic problems had existed for a long time. It took a man who wanted to do something about them, and crucially, the way he did something about them that made all the difference.</i></p>



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how these factors led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Gorbachev's actions, the USSR's economic problems or the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><b>Guidance for Level 4:</b></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i></p> <p><i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i></p> <p><i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p> <p><b>NB:</b> <i>There must be an attempt to make glasnost / perestroika relevant to Eastern Europe in order for responses to be credited as explanation</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)	<p><b>Q: Describe the methods used by the Provisional IRA.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'attacked Britain and its government'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>attacks on the Northern Ireland police force (RUC) and British army</i></li> <li>• <i>planting bombs in Northern Ireland or on the British mainland</i></li> <li>• <i>attempting to kill members of the British Government including the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher</i></li> <li>• <i>attacks on loyalist politicians and organisations</i></li> <li>• <i>secret negotiations using their political wing, Sinn Fein</i></li> <li>• <i>the dirty protests by IRA prisoners</i></li> </ul>

## Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) used terrorism.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the PLO and its terrorist methods.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that direct warfare had failed to achieve the aims of Palestinian Arabs: to destroy Israel and create a Palestinian homeland. In 1947 the Zionists had declared the state of Israel to exist and despite neighbouring Arab states attempting to smash Israel, she survived by defeating them. When large numbers of Palestinians fled to refugee camps, some joined political movements against Israel, and by 1969 the PLO had appeared, an umbrella organisation led by Yasser Arafat. It used terrorism to make its voice heard, after open warfare continued to fail to defeat Israel.</i></p> <p><i>Terrorism was also a very effective weapon against a superior power. Israel was a rich country and often had backing from one of the world's superpowers, America. As a result it could afford the best and latest technology, and even built up secret nuclear weapons as well as defences. The Palestinians in comparison were small and had fewer resources. Terrorist activities like commando raids, artillery attacks on kibbutz and firing rockets at Israeli towns spread fear and got around Israel's military superiority.</i></p>

## Part 1: Section B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p><b>Q: ‘Nationalism is usually more important than religion in motivating terrorist actions’. How far do you agree? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how nationalism <b>OR</b> religion motivates terrorism and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I agree that nationalism may seem more important, but it’s often more complicated than that and difficult to separate the two.</i></p> <p><i>Nationalism has often been more important. Take for example the case of the IRA in Ireland. They and their supporters were almost always Catholics, and their opponents were almost always Protestants. But they weren’t fighting about religion, they were trying to achieve a united republic over the whole of Ireland, without British interference. That’s nationalism. The only way religion really came into it was that some of them may have wanted revenge for past injustices against people of their faith. The same is true of the PLO: they were and are mainly Palestinian Muslims fighting against Jewish Israelis, but religion isn’t the main issue, it’s that they are arguing over the same land which they believe should be a homeland for their nation. In 1947 Zionists declared the state of Israel to exist on Palestinian land. The Palestinians believe that land is theirs. As a result, they attack Israel and Israelis.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, religion does matter and can be the most important factor. Osama Bin Laden believed that the Islamic religion was under threat from enemies everywhere and that it was the duty of every Muslim to take part in jihad. His ideas formed the basis of Al Qaeda’s actions and resulted in them terrorising Western democracies, communist nations, the state of Israel and especially the USA. But at the same time, even Al Qaeda has nationalist influences, as it benefits from the idea that all Arabs no matter where they live are part of a single group united by their faith, and so it gets support from Arabs around the world. This support is crucial, as it funds them and provides activists prepared to commit terrorism.</i></p> <p><i>So the two are definitely linked, and because of that it’s difficult to argue that one is more important than the other: they are both equally important.</i></p>



## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. How useful is this source as evidence about Russia in 1905-6? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound understanding and evaluation of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a fully developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period to comprehend surface features of the source and to make basic claims about its usefulness.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source is very useful because it shows the anger that many felt about the way the Tsar was dealing with the protests of the revolution. The cartoon on the front shows the Tsar as a skeleton knee deep in blood, meant to represent the way he had caused the deaths of protesters in 1905-6, as his rosette says. In January 1905 on Bloody Sunday soldiers opened fire on Father Gapon and peaceful protesters and many were killed. Later in the year, the Tsar used the army to crush revolts in the countryside and close the soviets in the cities. This use of force is shown by the way the figure is carelessly juggling guns, a knife and a cannon ball. The source is also useful because before 1905 there had been political censorship in Russia. The fact that this was a magazine cover criticising the Tsar tells us that censorship was relaxed for a short time, and that he was prepared to give in to some liberal requests, in other words the revolution had some success.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, this does not represent the view of everyone in Russia, as not all felt this angry. The liberals were delighted at first when he offered them a Duma and freedom of speech and some peasants were appeased by the offer of financial help. He still had the loyalty of the army who crushed revolts when they returned from the front in Japan, so it is misleading to think that everyone felt like this cartoonist, who represents an extreme point of view, possibly a Social Democrat or revolutionary view. In a political magazine, it could also be exaggerating for effect. In 1906 the Tsar also reinstated strict censorship so magazines like this were closed, so gains were short-lived.</i></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> L4 = Evaluation of <b>both</b> useful and not useful L3 = Evaluation of <b>either</b> useful or not useful Relation must be made to <b>'use'</b> of the source to move above L2.</p>



## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source B. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the cartoonist's main message (viewpoint) and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, explain a valid sub-message and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit</p>	6  5  3-4  2  1  0	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is criticising the Tsar for allowing Rasputin to control him. Rasputin is playing some sort of pipe and the Tsar is dancing to the music, as if he is being directed by it. He seems to be doing one of those famous Russian dances, but he looks silly, as if the cartoonist is making fun of him. Rasputin playing the pipe music could be referring to the rumours that spread around that he was using mystical powers on the royal family, after he successfully treated their son with hypnosis. At this time in 1916, the Tsar had gone off to lead the country's armies at war, leaving the Tsarina in charge. However members of the government and the aristocracy were very worried about Rasputin's influence on decisions. They thought he was a fraud, and a dangerous character, but the Tsar did not seem to care. This cartoon was clearly from before Rasputin was murdered by a group of aristocrats, and the cartoonist disapproves of the royal family's relationship with him and the influence he has over them.</i></p> <p><b>CV</b> = '<b>Critical</b> of the Tsar for being controlled by Rasputin' or '<b>Critical</b> of Rasputin for controlling the Tsar' Focus on <b>criticism</b>.</p> <p><b>Main</b> = 'The Tsar was controlled by Rasputin' or 'Rasputin controlled the Tsar'. Focus is on <b>control</b>.</p> <p><b>Sub</b> = Focus on Rasputin being evil or the Tsar being weak.</p>

## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p><b>Q: 'The Tsar was to blame for the March revolution in 1917.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that the Tsar was to blame for the March revolution.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that the Tsar was to blame for the March revolution.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that the Tsar was to blame for the March revolution.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>In many ways the Tsar was to blame. He had made some big mistakes and had to deal with the consequences. In the source Kerensky says that people were 'blaming' Duma ministers, but in fact the problems were the Tsar's fault, so he should be removed. One of these mistakes was putting himself in personal command of Russia's armies at war. He wasn't a very good commander, and by giving himself this role, he would also be blamed for anything and everything that went wrong in the war. And he was. By the end of 1916 people were very unhappy and blamed the Tsar for Russia's humiliations in battle and food shortages. Because of this, they were desperate to get rid of him, and many supported the Bolsheviks.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, Kerensky would say that. He was one of the senior ministers in the Duma, and is obviously not going to blame himself for what is going wrong in the country and war. Many of the politicians in the Duma were also resentful that the Tsar had taken away the powers given them in 1905, so want his power limited. Criticising him could achieve that. Also, it could be argued that the war wasn't going well even before he got so personally involved. The Russian army was made up of conscripts and was no match for the German army. They were poorly supplied with weapons and ammunition from industries back home, and they were badly led and poorly treated by their aristocratic officers. No matter how good the Tsar had been he couldn't have made up for these weaknesses, so Russia was always going to face a hard war.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, the Tsar wasn't totally to blame, but it's true that he could have dealt with the problems he faced better.</i></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <p><i>Answers must look at why the Tsar was to blame, and why he was not to access L3.</i></p> <p><i>For L4 there must be evaluation of the source through provenance or CK.</i></p>

## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe Trotsky's role in the success of the Bolsheviks between 1918 and 1922.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>leader and organiser of the Red Army/led the communists to victory in civil war</i></li> <li>• <i>brilliant public speaker and motivator</i></li> <li>• <i>travelled around the Red Army at the front by train, boosting morale</i></li> <li>• <i>ensured loyalty of Tsarist army officers by taking their families hostage</i></li> <li>• <i>enforced harsh discipline and ruthless policies on ordinary Red Army soldiers.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <p><i>Be wary of students discussing the takeover of power in 1917 – this is not applicable to the question.</i></p>

## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why Lenin introduced the New Economic Policy in 1921.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Lenin introduced the NEP in 1921. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Lenin introduced the NEP in 1921. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the NEP.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The NEP was introduced because Lenin realised that he needed to win back the support of the people. War communism had brought a lot of hardship as the government took over factories and enforced harsh discipline, even shooting strikers. In 1921 some of Lenin's strongest supporters, the Kronstadt sailors, mutinied. Lenin realised that he needed to do something different if even they were losing heart.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for it was that production had fallen so much and it needed to be restored. Peasants had refused to cooperate in producing more food under war communism, as the government simply took it away. This led to terrible food shortages and starvation. Under the NEP, peasants were allowed to sell their extra grain for a profit, and were taxed on what they grew, rather than the government just taking their crop. This would help improve production levels and morale.</i></p>

## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p><b>Q: The following were equally important reasons why the Bolsheviks were able to seize power in October 1917:</b></p> <p><b>(i) the unpopularity of the Provisional Government;</b></p> <p><b>(ii) the leadership of Lenin.</b></p> <p><b>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>7-9</b></p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The unpopularity of the Provisional Government was definitely important. They got off to a bad start by continuing the war. They tried to launch a big offensive against the Germans in June 1917, but the army fell apart as the Germans retaliated and many soldiers deserted, especially when they heard that peasants were seizing land back home, and they didn't want to miss out. The war was already unpopular in the Tsar's time, now the Bolsheviks could blame the new government for losses. In July things got even worse when Kerensky used soldiers to crush a rebellion led by the Bolsheviks which did not please the Petrograd Soviet as it was led by the Bolshevik Trotsky. Many in the army didn't like the government either, and it was only saved from Kornilov and his men by using the Bolsheviks against them. As prices went up, support went down, and the Bolsheviks grew in confidence that they could seize control. When they did, the unpopularity of the government meant there were no demonstrations.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the leadership of Lenin was also crucial. He was a strategist and it was his brilliant theses of 'Peace, Bread, Land' which was what the people needed at a time when they hated the war, when peasants wanted land and when there were food shortages. He led the 'July Days' rebellion against the Provisional Government, and convinced the other communists to act quickly in October 1917 to make the most of Kerensky's weakness and the Kornilov attack. His charismatic speaking also attracted mass support for the Bolsheviks. Unlike other parties at the time, the Bolsheviks were not split, and that was because of Lenin's leadership.</i></p> <p><i>So overall, I agree, both were equally important. Without Lenin, the party would have been more split and less able to make the most of the Provisional Government's weakness. But if the Government hadn't been weak in the first place, and had chosen better policies, then support wouldn't have grown for the Bolsheviks during 1917, and they wouldn't have had a successful revolution.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the unpopularity of the Provisional government <b>OR</b> the leadership of Lenin and <b>explain one side of the argument</b>. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	5-6	<p><b>Guidance for Level 4:</b></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i>  <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i>  <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they describe the leadership of Lenin <b>AND/OR</b> the weaknesses of the Provisional Government. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	3-4	
	<p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Lenin's leadership <b>OR</b> the weakness of the Provisional Government.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p>	1-2	
	<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	0	

## Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Who were the Kulaks?</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>rich peasants</i></li> <li>• <i>peasants who owned their own farms and animals</i></li> <li>• <i>peasants who resisted Stalin's collectivisation</i></li> <li>• <i>peasants who did well from the reforms of Stolypin or the NEP</i></li> <li>• <i>Stolypin had encouraged them to buy the land they lived and worked on so that yields would improve</i></li> <li>• <i>peasants who increased their land by buying out the land of their neighbours.</i></li> </ul>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain how Stalin modernised the USSR.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain how Stalin modernised the USSR. They produce a response that explains more than one method, and demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain how Stalin modernised the USSR. They produce a response that explains one method.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Stalin's modernisation of the USSR.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Stalin did this by introducing the Five-Year Plans to industry. These set very ambitious targets for the major industries needed to modernise the country, for example, coal, iron and oil. Every worker knew exactly what he had to achieve, and there were fines for not meeting targets and punishments for mistakes. Propaganda encouraged the workers to work even harder and foreign experts were brought in to help exploit the USSR's natural resources, for example, building steel mills in remote places. All of this helped build a strong foundation for later growth, and although targets weren't always met, historians think the achievements of the plans were amazing.</i></p> <p><i>This was the same in agriculture. To modernise the country farming had to be brought up to date. So Stalin introduced collectivisation. This meant that the small farms of kulaks were taken over by the government, and farmed together, sharing seeds and machines. The aim was to improve the efficiency of farming, so more food could be grown and sold abroad to fund the Five Year Plans, and also provide enough food for workers in the cities. Although there was a lot of opposition from Kulaks, by 1941 the process was complete.</i></p> <p><b>Guidance:</b> <i>It is acceptable to explain what Stalin did to modernise the USSR: e.g. Changes in Education, the Five Year Plans, Collectivisation</i></p> <p><b>And</b> also how Stalin achieved modernisation: <i>e.g. Use of propaganda, use of slave labour</i></p>



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)		10	
	<p><b>Q: How far do you agree that the Soviet leadership benefited more than ordinary people from Communist rule in the 1930s? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain the impact of Communist rule on its people. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain the impact of Communist rule on its people. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one side of the argument about whether the Soviet leadership or ordinary people benefited more from Communist rule. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways I agree because the leadership benefited hugely. For example some policies the Communists introduced like the Five Year Plans were very successful: massive quantities of mineral resources were mined, new cities were built, railways, roads and canals improved the transport network. All of this meant that Russia became a modern industrial country far more quickly than would have been possible without dictatorship and this made the leaders look good and so secured them in power. It also provided money for the country, and began to provide more products for people like its leaders, who could afford to buy any foreign imports that were available. Having said that, there were obvious downsides to being too close to Stalin and those in a leadership position were the first in line to be purged in the 'show trials'. After 1934, many leading figures were purged as Stalin removed opponents, real or imagined, in the Party. In that sense, a leadership position did not mean you were personally secure.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, ordinary people were also massively affected by the purges: it is estimated that by 1937 over 18 million people had been sent to labour camps, many others executed. They were also affected by terrible working conditions and an appalling accident rate: over 100,000 died constructing the Belomor canal alone. The concentration on heavy industry also meant there were few consumer goods for workers to buy. Yet they did benefit from Communist rule in some ways. Although there was harsh discipline in work places workers benefited from industrialisation: by the late 1930s, unemployment was practically non-existent, and many ordinary Soviets had improved their standard of living by getting well paid skilled jobs, and earning bonuses for meeting targets. The money the industries made also meant that there was free education, health care and lots of training schemes available, which improved the quality of life and ordinary people's opportunities.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, it's a mixed picture, as I've shown. That said, many ordinary folk definitely had more physical and economic hardship to endure than the leadership. However, the most surprising thing is probably that the leadership were just as likely as ordinary people to end up in the hands of the NKVD: ultimately no one was safe under Communist rule.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe how the Soviet leadership or people benefitted from Communist rule.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Communist rule.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><b>Guidance for Level 4:</b></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i>  <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i>  <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid for use with questions 2c and 3c, OR 5c and 6c.

<b><i>High performance 5-6 marks</i></b>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.
<b><i>Intermediate performance 3-4 marks</i></b>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.
<b><i>Threshold performance 1-2 marks</i></b>
Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2016

