

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A016/01**: Aspects of international relations and End of Empire
c.1919–1969

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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 2017

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning of Annotation
	Blank page
	Point has been noted, but no credit has been given (big)
	Not Relevant
	Level 5
	Level 4
	Level 3
	Level 2
	Level 1
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	
	Evaluation
	Development
	Unclear

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) 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>Level 3 (SM+CK) 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>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 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>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>The message of the cartoonist is that the Nazis pose a significant threat to Central Europe now that they have taken over Czechoslovakia. The vultures cast a dark and evil shadow over the land suggesting that the cartoonist believes there is bloodshed and danger ahead for this part of Europe. The swastika shape of the vultures shows who is behind the threat: the Nazis. Since the cartoon was published on March 22 1939, it is a reaction to the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia earlier in the month. Hitler had already demanded and taken the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia in October 1938, and now went further and invaded the whole country. The cartoonist is clearly implying that this is a very dangerous development that puts at risk the whole of Central Europe. Up until then Hitler's gains of territory could be justified as self-determination - he gained land where there were many Germans living. However, the invasion of Czechoslovakia could not be justified this way and showed that Hitler was simply after expanding the German state and thus threatening the rest of Central Europe.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist's message: CV: Nazi/German ambitions in Central Europe are a significant threat to Europe.</p> <p><i>NB- need focus on Nazi/Germany/Hitler, on Central Europe/Czech and the candidate needs to push the sense of threat, its imminence, dangerousness or significance.</i></p> <p>Main Message: MM: Nazis are targeting/threatening/menacing/taking over Central Europe.</p> <p><i>Needs focus on Nazis/Germany and Central Europe.</i></p> <p>Sub message: SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • war is coming/tension • Nazis are a threat (no place) • critical of Nazis • Central Europe is unstable/ • critical of appeasement and Britain and France <p>NB Note the CK needs to support message level, and is only valid if Feb 1938 onwards</p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938. 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>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938. They explain to produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Hitler's actions and the Anschluss with Austria.</p> <p>Level 0 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 he was able to achieve <u>Anschluss with Austria</u> was because there was <u>already</u> a strong Nazi party in Austria, and much support for the idea. <u>Many people were attracted to union with Germany</u> as they saw themselves as German and were attracted to the possibility of economic recovery at a time when Austria was much weaker than Germany. Hitler also used the <u>Austrian Nazi Party</u> membership to his advantage, encouraging them to <u>cause trouble</u> for their government by holding demonstrations demanding union with Germany. This put a lot of pressure on the Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg, eventually resulting in him calling a plebiscite. Once he had done this, the door was open for Hitler to send in troops to make sure the vote was 'trouble-free', and there was little surprise when the public 'willingly' voted for the union.</i></p> <p><i><u>The attitude of the Allies</u> was also a crucial factor. When Schuschnigg turned to them for help to resist Hitler before the plebiscite, they did not want to get involved. Many British people and politicians felt that Germany and Austria naturally belonged together, and that the Treaty of Versailles had been wrong to forbid a union. If Schuschnigg had had more support from stronger powers, he may have been able to stand up to Hitler and may not have made the mistake of calling for the plebiscite.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hitler moved his troops to the border - Hitler arrested 80,000 opponents within Austria - because of appeasement - used a plebiscite - League a failure - pressured to include Nazis in government (Seyss-Inquart) - support from Austrians - pressurised Schuschnigg - Mussolini now an ally - economic reasons- unemployment in Austria <p>NB this question is how, not why the Anschluss happened, in other words, what factors facilitated it, as opposed to what Hitler's motives were. Be careful with this.</p>



Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: What were Woodrow Wilson's 'Fourteen Points'?</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>Wilson's aims at Versailles</i>'</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>General point to be used instead of a genuine point on the right, not in addition to.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wilson's ideas for maintaining world peace</i> • <i>Wilson's ideas for ending the war fairly</i> • <i>a set of principles he wanted all countries to agree to at Versailles</i> • <i>included freedom of the seas (1) and setting up a League of Nations (2)</i> • <i>included no more secret treaties (1), reduction of armaments in all countries (2)</i> • <i>a speech made to the US Congress</i> <p><i>Allow 4 marks for 4 different terms.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why did the Germans react angrily to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Germans reacted angrily to the Treaty of Versailles. 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>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Germans reacted angrily to the Treaty of Versailles. They produce a single causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the German reaction to the Treaty of Versailles.</p> <p>Level 0 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 is that they were <u>appalled by the 'war guilt' clause</u>. This said that they were responsible for causing the war and should therefore pay reparations. For many Germans, this was totally unacceptable: they at the very least felt blame should be shared, and many believed that their enemy Russia was more responsible for war as they had mobilised first. The idea of paying reparations was also hated. Although the sum to be paid had not yet been agreed, the German economy was majorly damage by war, its people were starving and they feared reparations would cripple them.</i></p> <p><i>Another source of anger was the <u>loss of 10% of its land</u> to benefit its enemies. This was a major blow to its pride and economy. Both the Saar and Upper Silesia were important industrial areas; in total Germany lost 16% of its coalfields and almost half of its iron and steel industry. Many people reasoned that reparations would be unpayable after these losses, and that the German economy would take years to recover from the blow. The Treaty seemed outrageous.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible:</u></p> <p><i>reduction in size of armed forces</i></p> <p><i>destruction of Reich- loss of colonies</i></p> <p><i>unfairness of not being allowed self-determination</i></p> <p><i>did not follow Wilson's 14 Points</i></p> <p><i>diktat</i></p> <p><i>they had already conceded a new democratic government</i></p> <p><i>reparations were too high</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 		16	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How far were ‘the Big Three’ satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles. 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles. They produce a developed response explaining both sides of the argument and demonstrate 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied OR unsatisfied with the agreements made at Versailles, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</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 of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways, the European allies were satisfied, as they got a lot of what they wanted. For example the military restrictions gave both the French and British security, which were aims of Clemenceau and Lloyd-George. By reducing the German army to 100,000 men, the French border would be much easier to defend, and their enemy much less likely to attack. The British got the naval restrictions they wanted; reducing the German navy to only six battleships and no submarines meant the British had massive naval superiority. Likewise, the French were pleased that the Germans lost use of industrial lands such as the Saar as this weakened their economy and meant a revenge attack was less possible The French were also pleased that the principle of reparations had been agreed: they badly needed this money for rebuilding, as the war had done most damage to their land, not Germany’s.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, Wilson had less to be pleased about. He had gone to the conference intending not to punish Germany harshly, and wanted to ensure peace in the future through a League of Nations. Although he got his organisation, he believed the Treaty was too harsh, and would make Germany vengeful in the future. For example losing territory like the Polish corridor cut Germany in two and went against the idea of self-determination. Having said that, he had some small victories: he and Lloyd-George acted as a brake on Clemenceau’s more extreme ideas, for example of dividing Germany into separate states. Equally, the European allies were not totally satisfied, for example Clemenceau had to agree to the Rhineland’s demilitarisation, even though he truly wanted this border region to be an independent buffer zone between France and Germany.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, although it may seem that they were all more satisfied than not, because all got some of what they wanted, ultimately I feel they were more unsatisfied, as all had to compromise. Most importantly all left with big concerns about future security, Wilson and Lloyd George feeling the Treaty’s harshness could provoke war from Germany, Clemenceau worried that France was still not safe as the Treaty was not harsh enough. As a result the feeling was largely one of dissatisfaction.</i></p> <p><i>The two sides in this question are Satisfied and Unsatisfied.</i> <i>If only one member is mentioned, bottom level only- all levels.</i> <i>L1- aims and general statements about harshness ‘WW thought too harsh’ etc</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance					
<p>2 (c) </p>	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (ID or desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify how far 'the Big Three' were satisfied AND/OR unsatisfied and produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (gen/ltd response) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the agreements made at Versailles and the leaders' reactions to them.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1137 248 1608 288"><i>Pleased/Satisfied</i></th> <th data-bbox="1608 248 2074 288"><i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 288 1608 587"> <p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1608 288 2074 587"> <p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Pleased/Satisfied</i>	<i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i>	<p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p>	<p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p>
<i>Pleased/Satisfied</i>	<i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i>							
<p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p>	<p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p>							



Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the work of the League of Nations for workers and slaves.</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>“tried to improve their lives”, “tried to control things”</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"> • <i>the ILO (1) tried to improve working conditions throughout the world (2), for example banning white lead in paint (2),</i> • <i>ILO (1) tried to introduce a 48 hour working week, (2) 8 hour day (2)</i> • <i>the ILO brought together employers, governments and workers representatives (1), once a year (2).</i> • <i>the ILO collected statistics and information on working conditions in member states (1) and persuaded member states to use its rulings, but could not force them (2).</i> • <i>the Slavery Commission (1) worked to abolish slavery around the world bringing about the freeing of 200,000 slaves in Sierra Leone (2).</i> • <i>the Slavery Commission organised raids against slave owners and traders in Burma</i> • <i>Reduced use of forced labour on Tanganyika railway and reduced numbers from 50%-4%.</i> <p><i>4 marks possible for one group only.</i></p>

Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. 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>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one reason why the Japanese invaded Manchuria.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Manchurian invasion and the reasons for it.</p> <p>Level 0 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 why the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931 was because of the <u>world economic depression</u>. The Depression hit Japan hard, as the <u>USA</u> was one of its <u>leading trading partners</u>, and it put <u>tariffs on Japanese imports</u>. The collapse of the American market put the Japanese economy in crisis, and Army leaders felt that the answer to their problems was to build an own overseas empire to trade with. This was why they took advantage of the Mukden incident to invade.</i></p> <p><i>The <u>Mukden incident</u> was the trigger for the invasion. The Japanese had built and owned an important railway running through Manchuria. This helped them sell Japanese goods to Manchuria and China, and brought in valuable raw materials which their own country lacked. In September 1931 the Japanese claimed that Chinese soldiers had sabotaged the railway: this was the Mukden incident. In retaliation, the Japanese took control of Manchuria, throwing out all Chinese forces and setting up their own government 'to restore order'. Many believe this incident was a set-up, as Japan had ambitions to build an empire.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>desire to build an empire</i> - <i>army acted independently</i> - <i>secure raw materials</i> - <i>secure a market for Japanese products</i> - <i>opportunism- weakness of League</i> - <i>Manchuria in chaos</i> - <i>KMT threatening to take back railway</i> - <i>Underlining above indicates other possible ids</i>

Part 1: Section A -The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939

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>Q: ‘The causes of the League’s weakness in the 1930s were already clear in the 1920s’. How far do you with this statement. Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the causes of the League’s weaknesses in both decades 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the causes of the League’s weaknesses in both decades 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the League’s weaknesses in both decades to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</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 of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some senses this is true. One cause of weakness was the lack of the USA as a member. If it had been a member in the 1930s, Mussolini may have been more reluctant to invade Abyssinia in 1935, because the League would have had more credibility and authority to act with the USA in the Council. The League’s sanctions would also have been more effective with the US on-board. Italy’s invasion could have been stopped if oil sanctions had been applied. However as the US was the world’s largest supplier and was not in the League, it was not applied, for fear the US would ignore it. This weakness had also been clear in the 1920s. When Italy bombed the Greek island of Corfu in response to the Tellini incident, it was Greece that ended up paying compensation to Italy, because Mussolini threw his weight around with Britain and France. If the USA had been a member, again, Mussolini may have been more reluctant to use force in the first place, and would have found the other Council members harder to influence with the USA behind them.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, the League had successes in the 1920s, unlike later when little went right: this suggests that something had changed in the 1930s. That something was the economic situation. The Great Depression which started in America made the leaders of the League much more concerned with their own self-interest. Britain and France could have applied economic sanctions to Japan in 1932, following the invasion of Manchuria, but they were more concerned with their own trade continuing, and preoccupied with sorting out their own and not world problems. This was not the case in the 1920s, when they showed more decisive decision-making over Corfu and the Bulgarian crisis, condemning first Italian and then Greek action. Countries also listened to the League in the 20s, Sweden and Finland in the Aaland islands, and Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. In the 1930s in Manchuria and Abyssinia, Japan and Italy just ignored it.</i></p> <p><i>The League had many weaknesses in its lifetime but these were not all clear in the 1920s. This is shown by the fact that at the start its leading members were able to act reasonably decisively and be successful. It was the added challenges of the 1930s economy which was the real source of its decline.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
<p>3 (c)</p>	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (ID or desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the causes of the League’s weaknesses. 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>Level 1 (gen/ltd) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the League’s weaknesses and its issues in the 1920s and 1930s.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Ideally answers will focus on the Leagues’ weaknesses and use an example of how one was a problem in the 20s and 30s and then explain another factor that was a problem in the 30s to explain that actually there are new problems which have appeared:</i></p> <p>Also as L2 any narrative or explanation of a failure in the 20s and 30s without relating it to the question (ie an incident explained).</p> <p>Also as L3 answers which do not focus on the causes but focus on a slight misreading of the question: ‘Was the League a failure from the 20s’. Cap at L3/5.</p> <p>Expect to see specific examples of incidents/events explained at L3.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1137 571 2067 852"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1137 571 1603 603">Yes</th> <th data-bbox="1603 571 2067 603">No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 603 1603 651">Failure to apply any/enough sanctions</td> <td data-bbox="1603 603 2067 651">Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 651 1603 699">Failure to use military force/no army</td> <td data-bbox="1603 651 2067 699">Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 699 1603 746">US not a member</td> <td data-bbox="1603 699 2067 746">Aby</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 746 1603 794">British and French self-interest</td> <td data-bbox="1603 746 2067 794"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 794 1603 852">Dealing with larger powers</td> <td data-bbox="1603 794 2067 852"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Failure to apply any/enough sanctions	Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch	Failure to use military force/no army	Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-	US not a member	Aby	British and French self-interest		Dealing with larger powers	
Yes	No														
Failure to apply any/enough sanctions	Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch														
Failure to use military force/no army	Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-														
US not a member	Aby														
British and French self-interest															
Dealing with larger powers															

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) 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>Level 3 (SM+CK) 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>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7 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's message is mainly one of criticism of the two Presidents who allowed the Cuban Missile Crisis to get so bad that a nuclear war could have happened, although there is also a hint of optimism and approval that they are now working together to prevent it in the future. In this Crisis both leaders could have caused a nuclear war, Kennedy by reacting with aggression to the USSR placing missiles on Cuba, and Khrushchev by forcing his way through the US naval blockade. How close they got is shown by the fact that the huge hand is almost out of the box, and this implies a criticism that the leaders did not act sooner to negotiate and prevent the risk of war. They seem relieved and exhausted by the effort of 'shutting war down' in the cartoon which highlights the last minute and quite desperate attempts to negotiate by letter and even using the President's brother.</i></p> <p><i>Yet the cartoon also shows some approval and optimism that the future will be less dangerous. Both leaders are shown working together and agreeing that together they must prevent war in the future by finding 'a lock' for the chest. As it was produced only a month after the crisis ended the cartoonist is aware that both sides made concessions and agreements to prevent war breaking out, and he clearly believes this air of cooperation will continue.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist Message: criticism of the leaders for risking nuclear war, OR praising the leaders for preventing nuclear war Main Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev have worked together to prevent nuclear war <i>in the CMC</i> OR Kennedy and Khrushchev risked nuclear war Sub Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev are working together/nuclear war is a terrible thing/nuclear war almost got out of control/neither President wanted a nuclear war</p> <p>NB: CK needs to support the message given NB: Do not credit the 'hotline' as CK NB: All relevant description of the October 1962 crisis can be credited</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. 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>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</p> <p>Level 0 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 the USA took action was that they were concerned at the changes Castro was making in Cuba. When he seized power from Batista he nationalised US-owned agricultural businesses and gave away their land to his peasant supporters. This created powerful opposition to Castro in the USA and the government responded by banning sugar imports from Cuba, which was vital to Cuba's economic survival. The whole situation escalated when Castro nationalised US-owned oil refineries without compensation, so the US responded with a full scale trade ban. The USA wanted to disrupt Cuba's trade to weaken its economy and in turn, weaken Castro's hold on power, which they saw as dangerous to its own economic and political interests.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason they took action was that they were concerned about the developing relationship between Khrushchev and Castro. When he first came to power it was not clear that Castro was a communist, however by the summer of 1960 he had allied Cuba with the Soviet Union and signed a trade deal. This worried the USA very much, as they felt threatened by a Soviet satellite 'in their backyard'. The Cold War was hotting up, and any advance of communism could damage the USA, so Kennedy broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba in January 1961. He also gave the go-ahead for the Bay of Pigs invasion with Cuban exiles in an attempt to remove Castro from power.</i></p> <p>NB: Explanations are likely to identify what Castro and/or the USSR did and show why that worried the US</p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	<p>Q: What disagreements were there between the leaders at the Potsdam Conference in 1945?</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>'future of Europe'</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"> • <i>how Germany should be treated, harshly or leniently</i> • <i>how much reparations to take from the defeated Germany</i> • <i>details about the boundaries between the different zones of occupation in Berlin and Germany</i> • <i>Soviet influence in eastern Europe (1). Stalin showed no signs of wanting to remove his Red Army from eastern Europe and Truman suspected his intentions (2)</i> • <i>future of Poland (1): Stalin had arrested the Polish government in exile, the so-called London Poles (the non-communists) to prevent them taking power (2)</i> • <i>Stalin wanted a foothold in the Mediterranean and Japan (1), but Truman rejected this (2)</i> <p>NB: credit what disagreements there were and not why there were disagreements (for example do not credit personality clashes or the circumstances around the US atomic bomb programme)</p> <p>NB: supporting detail <u>can</u> include the reasoning behind the disagreement</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why Berlin was a cause of tension between East and West from 1945 to 1949.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. 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>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Berlin between 1945 and 1949.</p> <p>Level 0 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 Berlin was deep in the heart of Soviet controlled East Germany and Stalin resented that a large part of it was being run by the Western Allies. Berlin had been split into sectors at the end of the war in the same way that Germany had been split into zones, as it was the capital city. Stalin disagreed with the West's ideology of democracy and free-market capitalism, and did not want people in his zone to be attracted by the fruits of capitalist system. It would also make his own exploitation of East Germany more evident, as the West was not stripping its zones of resources as reparations for war.</i></p> <p><i>Berlin was also a cause of tension because of the Berlin blockade. In retaliation to the West unifying its zones and reforming the currency in 1948, Stalin prevented the Allies accessing West Berlin by land and sea. He closed off all roads, canals and railways forcing the Allies to come up with a plan to resource their 2 million people. They did, the Berlin Airlift, but the blockade massively raised the tension between the two sides and meant that one aggressive move could have resulted in military conflict.</i></p> <p>NB: do not credit material focussed on Germany as a whole (e.g. currency changes, Bizonia, etc.) NB: do not accept splitting of Berlin into 4 unless it is connected with its geographical position in the Eastern zone</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(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>Q: The following were equally to blame for increasing Cold War tensions in Europe before 1950:</p> <p>(i) Soviet expansion in eastern Europe;</p> <p>(ii) the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid.</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War before 1950 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1950 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>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</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 USSR increased Cold War tensions by expanding Soviet control into eastern Europe. Stalin had been allowed a 'sphere of influence' in Europe according to the Yalta conference, and he was determined to surround the USSR with 'friendly' countries. He interpreted this as countries that were under his influence, and from 1945 to 1948 he made sure that these countries were run by communists. At times communists seem to have won elections honestly, at other times they gained power with the helping hand of the Red Army and underhand methods. Whichever way, the West was shocked and alarmed that eastern Europe should fall so completely under Stalin's influence, which is what motivated their actions in introducing containment. Stalin's desire for control and security frightened the USA and increased tension massively.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USA did not have to respond in the way it did, and you could argue that the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid provoked Stalin. In 1947 President Truman announced that the USA would help any country at risk of a communist takeover. This was the Truman doctrine and was the start of the US policy of containment. The government did not keep this policy a secret and it not surprisingly raised tensions with the USSR who saw it as a direct attack on their ideology and threat to their security. Stalin could see that it worked too, as it led to the communists losing the civil war in Greece because the Americans funded the monarchists. Equally, when the USA offered money for rebuilding Europe through the Marshall Plan Stalin was suspicious, as he felt that the USA was trying to buy loyalty and discredit him to his allies because he had nothing to offer. The US attitude was provocative and bound to antagonise the Soviets, increasing tension.</i></p> <p><i>It is very difficult to argue one of these is more important than the other as both were motivated by the same reasonable goal of achieving security for a nation and way of life, but both knowingly made the other side feel threatened. Both sides were also acting out of mutual suspicion: as neither of</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of Soviet expansion OR the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid, explaining one side of the argument. 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>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify events that show Soviet expansion AND/OR describe the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid. 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>Level 1 (general points) 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>Level 0 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><i>them trusted the other, they suspected and were suspicious of each other's actions, making both factors equally to blame.</i></p> <p>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</p>

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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the anti-Vietnam War protest movement in the USA after 1965.</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>campaigned in many cities</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"> • <i>included many civil rights campaigners (1) opposed to the money spent and so many blacks being drafted (2)</i> • <i>supported by famous singers and celebrities (1) including Muhammad Ali (2)</i> • <i>included student groups (1) opposed to the draft (2) (maximum of two marks for groups included)</i> • <i>reached its height in 1968-70</i> • <i>protests often involved burning the US flag</i> • <i>protests often involved violent clashes with the police (1) for example at Kent State University 4 students were shot dead (2)</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: How was the Tet Offensive a turning point in the Vietnam War? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of how the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War. They produce a response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, offering more than one explanation.</p> <p>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one way in which the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Tet offensive and/or how it can be seen as a turning point.</p> <p>Level 0 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 way it was a turning point was that after the Tet Offensive the government decided to negotiate for peace and withdraw its troops from Vietnam. Until that point, it had told the people of America that it was winning the war in Vietnam, and would continue to fight until the Vietcong were crushed. However, the Tet Offensive showed that the VC was still strong enough to attack in more than 100 places at the same time, and this convinced the government that the war was unwinnable. As a result, Johnson decided to negotiate and make plans to withdraw troops.</i></p> <p><i>Another result was that the media seems to have turned against the war. Before Tet, when most newspapers and the TV reported the war they concentrated on US successes and what they were being told by the military. However, Tet seems to have changed that because it showed that the war was not going as well as official sources said. This made journalists less willing to believe what they were told by the military, and made them more critical, concentrating on more negative aspects of the war. This then influenced the public mood, and even government, after Tet.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<p>6 (c) ✍</p>		10	<p><i>✍</i> 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>Q: 'The Cold War was the main reason the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam 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>	10	<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 Cold War was an important reason. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the USA was involved in a Cold War against the USSR, in an attempt to prove its superiority and contain the spread of communism. Anywhere there was a risk of the spread of communism, the USA saw it as its duty to help the anti-communists. It was worried about a domino theory happening, and believed that after China had become communist in 1949 that there was a real risk of South East Asia falling too. As a result, throughout the 1950s it helped the South Vietnam government led by Diem, as he tried to crush communist rebels.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, it was not just about the Cold War. US Presidents had their reputation to think about, and they knew that if they appeared tough on communism, then that would get them a lot of support and votes from the US public. Kennedy in particular talked tough on communism in his election campaign and increased US involvement massively. There were also lots of short-term triggers in 1964 and 1965, which led to Johnson increasing involvement. For example in the Gulf of Tonkin incident the US believed their ships were fired on by a North Vietnamese patrol boats, which allowed Johnson to pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to increase involvement. In 1965 a US airbase at Pleiku was attacked, which was the final straw for Johnson, and led to him sending in the first ground troops.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, neither of these short-term triggers would have happened if the USA had not been involved in Vietnam already, helping the South against the communists, because of the Cold War. Also, the political gain for the Presidents if they talked tough on communism only gained votes because of the Cold War at the time. As a result, I have to conclude that the Cold War was the most important reason.</i></p>
	<p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam 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>	7-9	
	<p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to argue that the Cold War OR another factor was the main reason the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	5-6	<p>NB: Do not credit support for France NB: Candidates might use information for either side but it must not be credited for both</p>

6 (c) 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (Ids/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the reasons the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam, 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>Level 1 (general) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the war in Vietnam and the USA's involvement.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</p>
--	--	--------------------------------	--

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) 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>Level 3 (SM+CK) 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>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 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>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>The cartoonist's message is criticising the leaders' approach to Berlin as it is a very dangerous situation yet neither President seems prepared to back down. Both are shown as determined to get what they want, arguing with their fists clenched. The danger is clear from the thoughts they are having about bombing the other with nuclear weapons, shown by the mushroom clouds in their thoughts. The caption makes it seem as if they are putting each other to the test to see who will give in, which is exactly what was happening at the time. Berlin was a city still divided between the capitalist and communist powers which was creating huge tension as many East Germans were using it as an escape route to the capitalist West. Khrushchev was under pressure from the East German leader to use force to prevent this movement, and at the same time thought he could bully the young new US President and prove his and communism's superiority. As a result, he insisted that the West withdraw US troops from the city. When Kennedy refused, tension grew, shown clearly in the cartoon, and there was a risk that the crisis could escalate and result in military aggression. The cartoonist believes that they are acting irresponsibly, and that they should be more aware of the risks they are running by confronting each other in this way.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist Message: criticism of leaders +MM (must relate to Berlin) Main Message: risk of war over Berlin as neither leader was prepared to back down; tensions are rising in Berlin; tensions may lead to war in Berlin (place important). Sub Message: leaders are arguing; Berlin is causing problems for them, mocking the leaders (no place), Berlin is at the centre of the Cold War, leaders are fighting over Berlin</p> <p>CK: The USSR had concerns over the number of people leaving East Germany via Berlin; at the Vienna Summit Khrushchev issued an ultimatum about the future of Berlin; the two leaders started to fallout at the Vienna Summit in June 1961; in the dispute over Berlin, Kennedy announced he was going to increase US preparedness for war.'</p> <p><i>NB Do not credit CK about building of wall as that was August 1961; the cartoon is about the build-up of tension. Do not credit blockade/airlift as too long ago.</i></p>

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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. 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>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the reason it was crushed.</p> <p>Level 0 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>The main reason the USSR crushed it was because they were concerned that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact. This was a military alliance just created in 1955 which would help protect the Soviet Union should they be attacked by the West. The Soviet Union could not allow a hole in their protective frontier of buffer states so stepped in when it became clear that the new Hungarian leader Nagy wanted to remove his country.</i></p> <p><i>Another important reason is that Khrushchev wanted to send a message to Eastern Europe that there were limits to the changes the Soviets were prepared to accept. Since Khrushchev himself had attacked Stalin's memory earlier in the year, there had already been demonstrations against the Soviet-backed government in Poland. Next in Hungary popular uprisings led to the fall of two communist leaders. When Nagy came to power he wanted much greater political freedoms, including free elections. It would be very dangerous for the Soviets to allow this, for fear they would lose control over the government, and it would also encourage other East European countries to demonstrate for similar freedoms.</i></p> <p>Other IDs possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagy liberal reforms • Nagy abolished the one party state • Nagy announced freedom of speech in Hungary • Nagy announced freedom of religion. • Cardinal Mindszenty, leader of the Catholic Church was released. • The Western powers were involved in the Suez Crisis. • They knew the Americans weren't going to stop them • It was getting out of control as there were many Hungarian protestors on the streets • The power and dominance of the Red Army <p>NB This question is about WHY the Soviets crushed the uprising, not HOW they did. The answer must be connected to the reasons behind the response.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by Al Qaeda and its supporters.</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>'attacks on US', 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'terrorism'</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"> • <i>use of suicide bombers</i> • <i>attacks on US military (1) for example October 2000 attack on USS Cole (2)</i> • <i>attacks on US embassies (1) in Kenya and Tanzania (2)</i> • <i>attack on World Trade Centre (Twin Towers) in New York (1) and the Pentagon (1) after hijacking four aircraft (2). Max 2 marks.</i> • <i>attacks on Western tourists</i> • <i>Madrid train bombing in 2004</i> • <i>Hi-jacking</i> • <i>Kidnapping (1) with Boko Haram (2) (or Al Shabab)</i> • <i>Truck bomb attack on World Trade Centre in 1993 by Ramzi Yousef</i> • <i>Attack on USS Cole in Yemen</i> • <i>London bombings- 7/7</i> • <i>Use of social media/internet</i> • <i>Create 'Cells'</i> • <i>Radicalisation (1) through the use of the media/teachings/fundamentalist Islam (1)</i> <p><i>NB: 'Bombing', 'shooting', 'terrorism' and 'propaganda' are just general points and need to be qualified</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why have some people resorted to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why some people resort to terrorism. 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>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one reason why some people resort to terrorism.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why some people resort to terrorism and terrorism in general.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>NB: This question is about why terrorists ‘resorted’ to terrorism. Not just why people supported the cause.</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>Many of the people who resort to terrorism do so because they feel they do not have a voice. They feel powerless and have concluded that no one will listen to them unless they use force. For example, the Provisional IRA believed that even though they lived in a democratic country, the government was biased against them. As Catholics Republicans were also in a permanent minority in the North compared to Protestant Unionists they also felt the electoral system did not represent them. As a result the British government would not listen to their demands for an independent, united Ireland, and the Northern Irish government would not listen either because it was full of Unionist politicians. They saw violence as the way to get what they wanted as it would get the attention of the governments and pressurise them.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons the PLO resorted to violence was because of the strength of their enemies. They were fighting against Israel for control of a homeland in the Middle East, but the USA was supplying Israel with weaponry, so the PLO had little chance of success in a conventional war, even though it was supported by Arab states. As a result some Palestinians turned to terrorist attacks as a way of weakening their enemy, disrupting their lives and business because they were too strong to defeat in any other way. Bitterness and resentment against the Israelis was also bred in the poverty of the refugee camps the Palestinians lived in while they were trying to regain land Israel had claimed. This anger was channelled by the PLO who gave idle and restless refugees status and recognition if they joined their ranks.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <p><i>a) PLO are aggrieved because they have lost land b) The IRA felt they were powerless c) Al Qaeda feel they are opposed by an over mighty enemy.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Al Qaeda terrorists did not ‘resort’ to terrorism in the same way as PLO and IRA so can accept that they thought this would buy them a route to Jannah/Heaven as they had been radicalised.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (c)		10	<p> 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>
	<p>Q: How successfully have governments responded to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to analyse how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. 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. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. 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. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how governments have OR have not successfully responded to terrorism, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. 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>Often governments have not dealt successfully with terrorism. In 1971, the British government introduced Internment in Northern Ireland to disrupt IRA activities. This meant they could arrest and hold anyone suspected of terrorism without charge. Not only did it fail to catch the IRA's key leaders, it also increased support for the IRA in Ireland and the USA, because it was only used against nationalists and was often accompanied by torture. This was a massive own goal. Equally, when Israel got tough with the PLO they often created bad publicity for their own cause. In 1982 they launched a full scale invasion of Lebanon to destroy the PLO's bases there, which they achieved. However, there were around 19,000 civilian casualties, including a massacre in 2 refugee camps, which massively damaged support for Israel around the world, even with their ally the USA.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand at times they have successfully limited terrorist's freedom of action. For example in 1985 the British signed an agreement with the Republic of Ireland to increase co-operation between the two countries' security forces. This made it much more difficult for the IRA to move people, arms and equipment between the North and Republic of Ireland. The USA has also had success against Al Qaeda, destroying their training camps and heavy weapons in Afghanistan, finding and targeting Bin Laden and setting up Special Forces bases all over the world to target the organisation. Even in the Middle East, the Israeli government's 'Get tough' approach may be considered to be part of the reason Arafat was willing to compromise some of the PLO's aims in the Oslo Accords.</i></p> <p><i>Terrorism is very difficult for governments to handle effectively as the terrorists are often versatile and skilled propagandists, and governments are criticised for negotiating with them. That said, they have had some success. However the main reason for this is usually more to do with changes in the terrorist organisations themselves, eg the emergence of Sinn Fein as the political wing of the IRA, rather than because they have successfully prevented terrorists actions. As a result, I conclude that overall they have not always responded well enough.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The British Government tried to starve the IRA of publicity • Internment • Good Friday Agreement and other significant attempts to sort out Irish issue- Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1994 meetings with John Major



	<p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. They produce a basic response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of governments' responses to terrorism. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>NB: If only one terrorist group is mentioned- bottom level only- All levels</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Covert operations such as informers</i> • <i>Working with the government of Eire</i> • <i>Secret talks with IRA</i> • <i>Israel launched a full scale assault on PLO bases in the Lebanon in 1982.</i> • <i>Commando raids on Tunis in 1998.</i> • <i>Oslo Talks</i> • <i>'War on Terror' in Afghanistan</i> • <i>Use of intelligence – spy satellites and bugging against possible Al Qaeda sympathisers.</i> • <i>Guantanamo Bay detention camp</i>
--	--	--------------------------------	--

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by the Americans and British against the Iraqi insurgency of 2003 to 2006.</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 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'counter-insurgency'.</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"> • <i>laser guided air strikes to target key insurgents</i> • <i>ground war to retake lost land (1) for example, Fallujah (2)</i> • <i>cordon and search operations</i> • <i>use of informants to identify weapons stashes</i> • <i>speeded up transfer of power from coalition forces to an Iraqi government</i> • <i>raids on suspected insurgents</i> • <i>Use of high tech weapons to target insurgency groups</i> • <i>Engagement with the Mahdi Army at Najaf</i> • <i>Internment at Abu Ghraib</i> • <i>Operation Sinbad - Basra 2006</i> • <i>Operation Iron Hammer 2003 – using US air force</i> • <i>Operation Phantom Fury- Fallujah, 2004</i> <p><i>NB: Do not accept Operation Phantom. This was in 2007</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They produce a response explaining multiple impacts that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They explain one consequence.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 0 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 international impact was the damaged reputations of both America and Britain. Many suspected the motives of the Bush Administration in getting involved in the war, and when it became clear that most of the big rebuilding contracts went to US or non-Iraqi firms it made it even easier to criticise Western involvement in Iraq as being self-serving. The coalition also seemed unable to control the insurgency, which made it look weak and made people question US military might, damaging its reputation further.</i></p> <p><i>A connected and equally important consequence was that the war increased support for militant Islam around the world. To many in the Arab world the war seemed to be a Crusade against Muslims and the large loss of civilian life was evidence of the West's careless attitude. Terrorist cells and attacks in the US and UK often claim to be revenge for Western involvement in Iraq, and Intelligence reports believe the Iraq war has had a key role in increasing the threat of terrorism in the West.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created a humanitarian crisis with refugees • Soured relations between the USA and some European nations • Altered US approach to foreign policy • Helped Obama win US presidency • Led to the rise of Isis • Rise in Oil Price • Ruined international reputation of Blair/Bush

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (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>Q: “The main reason for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was because Saddam Hussein refused to co-operate with UN weapons inspectors.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to agree OR disagree with the statement, explaining one side of the argument. 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 believe this was the pretext for the invasion, but not the root cause. After the First Gulf War in 1991 the Iraqis were forced to accept UN inspections to ensure they had destroyed all chemical weapons and other weapons sites. However, Saddam Hussein resented this because he did not want to appear to be pushed about by the USA and the West, or appear weak to his enemy Iran when the inspectors confirmed no WMDs, so in the late 1990s and 2001 he refused access to these inspectors. The USA and the UK pushed the UN Security Council for a resolution on the issue, so they could take action, because they were concerned about the growing threat Saddam represented. He treated his own people brutally, and there was a strong chance that he had WMDs, intelligence sources said. After all, if he didn't have them, why was he refusing to allow the inspectors in? When they got this resolution they convinced themselves they had the right to take action against Saddam, and coalition forces invaded.</i></p> <p><i>However, if this is all Saddam had done, it is unlikely there would have been an invasion. Just as important was the leadership of the USA at the time, and what had happened in September 2001. George W Bush was the son of the President who had led the USA during the first Gulf War, when Saddam led Iraq to invade Kuwait, and many felt he wanted to complete his father's 'unfinished business' in the region by removing Saddam from power. He was impatient that Hussein was still in power, despite all US efforts to undermine his support in the years that followed the first war. He was also surrounded by neo-cons who believed in regime change in Iraq to secure US access to Middle Eastern oil and support their ally Israel. Without this leadership which already had Iraq in its sites, it is much less likely Iraq would have been invaded. After 9/11 this became even more likely, as there was a suspicion or excuse that Iraq was involved with Al Qaeda's actions, and as the war on terror had had such early success in Afghanistan, the USA was confident of success in Iraq. It was this which encouraged it to push for the UN resolution.</i></p> <p><i>Saddam's lack of co-operation with the UN gave the US the excuse they wanted to ask the UN for a resolution to take action against Iraq. But in reality, Saddam's lack of co-operation was only the final straw, and the opportunity for the invasion. The war had much deeper roots, and most of them lay in the USA and with its leaders.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to agree AND/OR disagree that the main reason for the invasion of Iraq was because of Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors. They produce a basic response, only identifying or describing factors.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq or Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There was a strong anti-Saddam lobby in the USA</i> • <i>Saddam had suspected links with Al Qaeda</i> • <i>Saddam's human rights violations</i> • <i>Iraq's oil wealth</i> • <i>To bring democracy to the Middle East</i> • <i>Establish a long term military presence in the Middle East for the USA</i> • <i>Pressurise Saudi Arabia over its links with terrorism</i>

Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. 'General Dyer was justified in acting as he did in Amritsar on 13 April 1919.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that General Dyer was justified in acting as he did in Amritsar.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that General Dyer was justified in acting as he did in Amritsar.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that General Dyer was justified in acting as he did in Amritsar.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 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>I do not agree with this interpretation although in Source A General Dyer does justify his actions. He says that his job was to keep law and order which would have collapsed if he had not fired because he was faced with a revolutionary army. He also makes the point that he had to set an example to other Indians otherwise there would have been more trouble in other parts of India and a 'rebel army' would have gained support and caused further bloodshed. He is claiming that he put down a rebellion. Of course he was trying to defend what he did but his actions were supported by the Viceroy of India who even imposed martial law on Amritsar because of the threat. It is true that there was a lot of unrest because of the Rowlatt Act and there had been attacks on railways and other forms of communication. It is also true that there were about 25,000 people in the crowd in Amritsar so Dyer had good reason to think there might be an uprising.</i></p> <p><i>However, despite all this Dyer's actions were not justified. He did not warn the crowd to disperse, he blocked the exits from the Jallianwala Bagh and ordered his men to fire. They fired for ten minutes and about 1,000 people were killed. Many of them were pilgrims and merchants who were not there to cause trouble. The Hunter Commission found that he should have given the crowd an opportunity to disperse and that he was not justified in firing for so long, nor was there was a conspiracy to overthrow British rule as he claimed. This undermines Dyer's arguments and shows that his actions were not justified.</i></p>

Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (b)	<p>Q: Study Source B. Why was this cartoon published in 1931? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (P+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the situation around 1931. They interpret the purpose of the cartoon being published to produce a response explaining its intended impact on the intended audience.</p> <p>Level 3 (M+CK) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the cartoon and produce a response explaining why it was published.</p> <p>Level 2 (CK or M/P) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the broader context, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the cartoon OR they explain the message or purpose without setting it in the context of c.1931.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</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 cartoon was published in 1931 because this was just after Gandhi's salt marches. These were non-violent protests against the salt tax imposed by the British authorities, although they were also a way of protesting against British rule and for self rule for India. Millions of Indians took part and soon there was mass civil disobedience across the country. Thousands were imprisoned. When Lord Willingdon became Viceroy in 1931 he took a hard line against the demonstrators. He ordered Gandhi's arrest and suppressed the civil disobedience. The cartoon is pointing out the problem he had and the pointlessness of what he was doing. He may have imprisoned Gandhi but the cartoon shows that there were millions still supporting him (shown by the fact that they all look like Gandhi). Willingdon was trying to isolate Gandhi from his followers but the cartoon is showing that this could not work. Putting Gandhi in prison did not solve the problem. The cartoon was published in a nationalist newspaper and was clearly designed to put pressure on the British authorities in India to release Gandhi and to grant India self rule.</i></p>

Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (c)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. How useful is this source as evidence about Indian reactions to the Government of India Act of 1935? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 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>Level 3 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>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period to comprehend surface features of the source and to make basic claims about its usefulness.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</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 some ways this source is very useful evidence about reactions to the Government of India Act. It certainly tells us about one of the main Indian reactions. - that by Congress. The Act gave a lot of self rule to the provinces of India and increased the number of people who could vote. However the self rule had important restrictions on it with the British authorities able to take back control whenever they wanted. The Act also planned for a Federation of India with a federal parliament. This source shows that members of Congress were against the Act because it gave no real powers to the central parliament. It would not have control over crucial areas such as finance and foreign policy. All the powers had gone to the provinces or would be kept by the British. This was a long way short of the independent India that they wanted.</i></p> <p><i>The source is not useful for other reactions to the Act. The princes were in favour of the power given to provinces but did not like the idea of a federation because they thought they would lose their power in their own princely states. Because of this, the federation was never created. Nor does it tell us that many people in Congress were also against the idea that the princes would choose the people to go to the federation parliament. They would not be elected. The princes were regarded as allies of the British and this would help support British power. Finally the source is not useful for Jinnah's reaction - he was ready to accept the provincial powers because they would ensure Muslim control of the Muslim provinces.</i></p>

Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the circumstances and content of Harold Macmillan's 'Wind of Change' speech in 1960.</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"> <i>it was given to the Parliament in South Africa after Macmillan had visited British colonies in Africa (2)</i> <i>context of rise of nationalism and fear of spread of communism (2)</i> <i>the British Conservative government had halted the movement of decolonisation started by the Labour government</i> <i>national consciousness was growing in Africa and could not be ignored</i> <i>African colonies should be given their independence</i> <i>he criticised apartheid in South Africa</i>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain the impact of the Second World War on the British Empire.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the impact of the Second World War on the British Empire. They explain 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>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain the impact of the Second World War on the British Empire. They produce a single-causal response.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</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 Second World War had an impact on the British Empire because it gave great hope to nationalist movements. The Atlantic Charter of 1941 between Britain and America suggested that arrangements about territory after the war must be in line with the wishes of the people in the areas affected. Britain was mainly thinking of Europe but people in British colonies thought that this applied to them as well as to the people of occupied areas in Europe so this gave them hopes of independence. In fact during the Second World War there was a general change in opinion around the world about colonialism</i></p> <p><i>Another way it had an impact was that the Japanese military success against the British in the Far East had destroyed the idea of white racial superiority which had been an important factor holding up imperialism. Britain had been</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the impact of the Second World War on the British Empire.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>driven out of parts of its empire and this gave local nationalist groups a chance to develop. They often fought the Japanese. This meant that when the war ended, nationalist groups, like the one in Malaya, were strong and demanded independence rather than the return of the British.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(c)	<p>Q: The following contributed equally to the decline of the British Empire: (i) the attitude of the USA towards empires; (ii) the victory of the Labour Party in 1945. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the importance of the attitude of the USA and the Labour victory to the decline of the British Empire 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>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the importance of the attitude of the USA and the Labour victory to the decline of the British Empire to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</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 attitude of the United States was an important factor. The US was opposed to imperialism and put pressure on Britain to quit its colonies. The Suez Crisis saw Britain acting as an imperial power and the US condemned Britain's involvement. This damaged relations between the US and Britain and made Britain less enthusiastic about keeping its empire. Another reason why the US wanted Britain to get rid of its empire was that this would give the US access to new markets and resources. Also, after 1960 the US wanted to speed up decolonisation in Africa to prevent communism from becoming more attractive to nationalist movements seeking international support. However, the position of the US was not straightforward. During the Cold War and the US needed to support its allies in Europe. These countries argued they needed the trade and resources of their empires to help them recover and fight communism. This reduced the pressure the US put on European countries to get rid of their empires. In fact the United States even urged Britain to slow the pace of decolonisation where it looked as if an independent territory would turn communist.</i></p> <p><i>The Labour Party's victory in 1945 was also a factor in the decline of empire. It had always had a tradition of being against imperialism. It also had the reputation of being on the side of the underdog and so could be expected to support people struggling for their independence. Many in the Labour Party</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>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>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the decline of the British Empire to explain the importance of the attitude of the USA or the Labour victory to the decline of the British Empire explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify ways in which the attitude of the USA and the Labour victory were/were not important to the decline of the British Empire. They produce a basic response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the decline of the British Empire. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 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><i>also thought the Empire was run for the benefit of big business. When Labour came to power in 1945 it was determined to focus on building a welfare state in Britain rather than try and support an empire. The Labour government had a big impact on the Empire in Asia and gave countries like India independence. However, the importance of the Labour government can be questioned because there was little alternative to giving India independence. It is also true that there was not any decolonisation in Africa during the period of Labour rule.</i></p> <p><i>Labour was important to the decline in Asia but not elsewhere. The important period of decline in the British empire was in the 1960s and the Labour victory in 1945 had little to do with this, therefore the US attitude was more important. Although the US position was not straightforward it did on the whole have the effect of encouraging Britain to decolonise and the results of this can be seen in the 1960s which could be seen as the most important period of decolonisation, especially in Africa.</i></p>

Part 2: End of Empire c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (a)	<p>Q: Describe the lifestyle and power of the British settlers in Kenya from 1919 to 1945.</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>		<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>many lived in Happy Valley (1)</i> • <i>decadent lifestyle - drugs, sex and murder (2)</i> • <i>other settlers such as officials and tradesmen disapproved and did not share their lifestyle (2)</i> • <i>some settlers owned vast coffee and tea plantation estates (2)</i> • <i>the economic power of settlers led to political power (1)</i> • <i>the settlers banned African farmers from growing coffee and introduced a hut tax to protect their interests (2)</i> • <i>the settlers had a voice on the Legislative Council but prevented others from being represented (2)</i>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12(b)	<p>Q: Explain why there was a Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya in the 1950s.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why there was a Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya in the 1950s. 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>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why there was a Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya in the 1950s. They explain one reason.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Mau Mau rebellion.</p> <p>Level 0 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 cause of the rebellion was the issue of land ownership. The Kikuyu, who made up most of the Mau Mau was the poorest, and most exploited, group in Kenyan society. Land ownership was the clearest example of where they were exploited. The white settlers, who were a tiny percentage of the population owned 20% of the best land in Kenya, while 1 million Kikuyu owned much less. They were deprived of their land, especially the most fertile, so they had to work as labourers on the big estates. They lived as squatters and were treated as a pool of cheap labour. Others were pushed into reserves and camps where they suffered from congestion, starvation and diseases like typhoid, cholera.</i></p> <p><i>A second reason for the rebellion was that the Mai Mau wanted to throw off British rule which was regarded as racist and cruel. The Mau Mau was a nationalist movement. This can be see by their slogan which was 'Let the foreigner go back home'. They thought that the Kenyan African Study Union was achieving little in its campaigning. Young members decided that they had to turn to violence to achieve anything. They had no say in the governing of their country. Many had fought in the Second World War and had seen there that whites were not necessary invincible. This encouraged them to fight for independence.</i></p> <p>Other causes include: identity cards, female circumcision, low wages.</p>

Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1965


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12(c)		10	
	<p>Q: How important was Jomo Kenyatta in Kenya winning independence?</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the importance of Kenyatta and other factors 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>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the importance of Kenyatta and other factors 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>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the importance of Kenyatta or other factors explaining one side of the argument. 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>Kenyatta was very important to the achievement of independence. He was clearly the leading figure all the way through the struggle to gain independence. He began campaigning for independence in the late 1940s and was president of the Kenya African Union which was the main independence organisation. He was a charismatic figure who won the support of the Kenyan people for his cause. He was imprisoned in 1952 for being a member of the Mau Mau and not released until 1960 when over a million signatures demanded it. He became the head of KANU and as its head went to London and negotiated the terms of independence. It is clear that all the way through Kenyatta was at the head of the campaign for independence.</i></p> <p><i>Kenyatta used peaceful methods and it is doubtful whether these methods would have been totally successful in putting pressure on the British to force them to grant independence. It could be argued that the Mau Mau was important in doing this. The British had already had to use force, including torture, massive prison camps and moving thousands of people to deal with the Mau Mau. By 1960 the British government had decided that keeping control of Kenya would have involved even more force which the British public would not have supported. This shows that the violent methods of the Mau Mau, although terrible, had just as much impact as Kenyatta. In fact without the Mau Mau it is doubtful if Kenyatta's peaceful methods would have achieved independence by themselves. Of course, other factors like the general move at the time towards decolonisation would have been important but the Mau Mau forced the British to begin to think about independence. Even though the Mau Mau had been defeated by 1956, it was the fear of their return that had the greatest impact.</i></p>


	<p>Level 2 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify or describe the importance of Kenyatta or other factors. 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>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Kenyatta.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	
--	--	---	--

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

<i>High performance 5-6 marks</i>
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.
<i>Intermediate performance 3-4 marks</i>
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.
<i>Threshold performance 1-2 marks</i>
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.

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	SPaG	Total
1/4 (a)	1	2	4		7
1/4 (b)	4	4	0		8
2/3/5/6 (a)	4	0	0		4
2/3/5/6 (b)	3	3	0		6
2/3/5/6 (c) 	4	6	0	6	16
7 (a)	1	2	4		7
7 (b)	1	2	3		6
7 (c)	1	2	4		7
8/9 (a)	4	0	0		4
8/9 (b)	3	3	0		6
8/9 (c)	4	6	0		10
Totals	30	30	15	6	81

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

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 2017

