

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(a)	<p>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (7 marks) 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. Establishes criticism, must be critical of Kennedy, Kennedy is the target. Examples of cartoonist's main message: criticising Kennedy's handling of the invasion, and decision to invade, a personal attack.</p> <p>Level 4 (5–6 marks) 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. Criticising US foreign policy (a British cartoon), the Bay of Pigs was a failure, humiliating, embarrassing.</p> <p>Level 3 (3–4 marks) 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>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>I think the cartoonist was making fun of, but also criticising, Kennedy. This cartoon is about the Bay of Pigs in 1961. It was an attempt by the American government to use Cuban exiles to invade Cuba and to overthrow Castro and his communist regime. The attempted invasion was a fiasco and within three days the Cuban armed forces had defeated the invaders who got no further than the beaches. Kennedy had only been President for three months and this was an enormous embarrassment for him and a terrible start to his presidency. The cartoonist is showing all this. The CIA had been planning to kill Castro with an exploding cigar and the cartoonist is using this as a symbol of the failure of the Bay of Pigs. It is exploding in Kennedy's face, not Castro's, to show it was a disaster for Kennedy. The fact that the cartoonist only shows Kennedy says that he holds Kennedy personally responsible for the fiasco and not the CIA or others. The message is that Kennedy should not have even attempted the invasion and it has blown up in his face making him look stupid.</i></p> <p>Examples of sub messages that candidates may put forward: Cuba was a problem. The Cuban situation was dangerous.</p> <p>Must have sound contextual knowledge to get to L4.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response. Simply describe the cigar blowing up in his face.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully. 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. Two developed explanations or four explanations.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully. They produce a single-causal response. Developed explanation: 5 marks Standard explanation: 4 marks (default). Limited explanation: 3 marks</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<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 Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully was the existence of nuclear weapons which was what the crisis was all about. These weapons were enormously destructive as had been seen at Hiroshima at the end of the Second World War. By the time of the crisis they were even more powerful. The Soviet Union was putting missiles into Cuba which would be able to destroy most major US cities. At the same time the USA had missiles based in Turkey which could reach many Russian cities. Because of their destructive power neither side wanted to use them. They were there for deterrence. This is why the crisis ended peacefully - because neither side were willing to use the missiles because of the dreadful results. Each side could destroy the other as a nuclear war could result in mutually assured destruction.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was Kennedy's decision to blockade. This was a turning point in the crisis. Some of Kennedy's generals were advising him to launch a nuclear attack on Cuba. Kennedy knew this would be disastrous. By ordering the blockade, stopping Russian ships delivering the missiles he stopped them coming into Cuba but also gave Khrushchev a chance to get out of the crisis without losing face. The Russian ships turned back and this then gave Kennedy and Khrushchev a chance to find a solution. It was the crucial point in the crisis.</i></p> <p>NB. A mutual agreement (removal of missiles from Turkey for missiles from Cuba) is part of the same explanation.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe what happened during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-9.</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>Stalin cut off road and rail links between West Berlin and the rest of Germany (2 marks – 1 point and support)</i> • <i>people in Berlin left without any supplies</i> • <i>the western powers decided on an airlift of crucial supplies</i> • <i>hundreds of thousands of trips were made</i> • <i>In 1949 Stalin called off the blockade</i> <p>Allow bullet points.</p> <p>Credit from start of blockade only.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why were there disagreements at the Potsdam Conference in 1945? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why there were disagreements at Potsdam. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there were disagreements at Potsdam and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why there were disagreements at Potsdam. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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 of the main reasons is that Roosevelt had died and was replaced by President Truman. He was much more anti-communist than Roosevelt and he decided to get tough with the Russians. He felt he could do this because America had just tested an atomic bomb. He was also annoyed by the fact that the Soviet Union had already started to install puppet governments in countries in eastern Europe. All this persuaded Truman to take a hard line with the Soviets.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason there were disagreements was Germany. The two sides had completely opposite views about what should be done here. Stalin wanted to stop Germany from recovering so that it was never a threat again. He wanted to strip Germany of anything valuable and take it back to Russia to help Russia's economic recovery. Truman wanted Germany to be able to recover so that it was a defence against communist Russia. He did not want to repeats the mistakes of Versailles and leave Germany with grievances for the future. He also wanted to hold democratic elections in Germany but Stalin was opposed to this.</i></p>

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

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 the final pages to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: 'The Marshall Plan was an attempt by the USA to control Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the motives behind the Marshall Plan 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the motives behind the Marshall Plan in order 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 (5–6 marks)</p>	16	<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>It can be argued that the Marshall Plan was designed to help the people of Europe. After the Second World War Europe was in a terrible state especially the economies of the European countries. There was rationing and many people were starving. When Marshall introduced the plan he said it was to end poverty and hunger and it was offered to all parts of Europe, even to communist countries. It was not America's fault if Russia turned the offer down and made other communist countries reject it. The fact that it was offered to them shows that America was genuinely interested in helping the people of Europe. The US had not suffered like European countries in the war and it was in a position to help.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Russians thought it was all a trick to make European countries slaves to the US and to capitalism. If they accepted the aid they would become dependent on the US giving the US enormous power over them. The plan meant that European countries had to run their economies in a way that was good for America and it ensured that all these countries would be capitalist like America. They would have to buy American goods providing an enormous market for American industries. The Soviets believed that the offer of the plan to communist countries was just a trick to make it look good. The Americans knew the communists would not take them up on the offer.</i></p> <p><i>The truth is probably somewhere in the middle. America did genuinely want to help Europe - it cost America billions. However, it realised that this would also benefit Americans. Helping Europe to recover would also have the effect of helping to sell American goods and of creating a capitalist anti-communist bloc. So both sides of the argument are</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the motives of the Marshall plan in order to explain 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify motives behind the Marshall Plan 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the motives behind the Marshall Plan.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>true. It was designed to help Europe but it was also designed to be anti-communist and to give America great influence over Europe.</i></p> <p>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3		4	
3 (a)	<p>Q: Describe how the USA fought the war in Vietnam.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail. Maximum of one mark for supporting detail per point.</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>large scale bombing over North Vietnam (Operation Rolling Thunder) and other countries such as Cambodia</i> • <i>use of napalm</i> • <i>traditional military tactics based on heavy armaments</i> • <i>moving villages to new sites behind barbed wire</i> • <i>defoliation using Agent Orange</i> • <i>Vietnamisation</i> • <i>incidents such as My Lai</i> • <i>bombing</i> • <i>huge numbers of troops</i> <p>Allow bullet points.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement in Vietnam.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased America's involvement. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why Kennedy and Johnson increased America's involvement. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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>When Kennedy became President he realised that if America was going to achieve anything in Vietnam, it needed to be much more involved. Otherwise communism would spread right across the region. It was also clear that the UN would not agree to be involved. Kennedy also had something to prove. He had failed in the Bay of Pigs and some Americans thought he should have acted more strongly in the Cuban Missile Crisis. He started by sending more equipment and advisers but it soon became clear that this was not enough against the Viet Cong. The only thing that would work, it was thought, was direct American involvement in the fighting. And so the number of American troops was significantly increased.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons why Johnson increased America's involvement in Vietnam was the Gulf of Tonkin incident. This was when Vietnamese ships attacked a US warship in 1964. No serious damage was done but it gave Johnson, who was a bigger supporter of the war than Kennedy, the opportunity to persuade Congress to give him more power over the war so he could react quickly. This allowed him to take much more military action in Vietnam. He had decided that a full-scale war was needed if America was to be effective. This led to an enormous campaign of bombing North Vietnam and more troops being sent.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		16	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on the final pages to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: Do you agree that the reporting of the Vietnam War by the media was the most important reason why the USA eventually withdrew its troops? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from 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> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam in order 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</p>	16	<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 think that the media reporting was the crucial factor. To explain why, I first need to look at other reasons for US withdrawal. One was that the Americans were not winning the war on the ground. The Viet Cong were using much more effective tactics despite the Americans having more powerful and sophisticated weaponry. The North Vietnamese used guerrilla tactics which meant that there were no big set piece battles where the US weapons would have been powerful. Instead the Viet Cong used surprise hit and run tactics and would then disappear back into the jungle where they mixed with the ordinary peasants. The Americans could not tell between ordinary villagers and the Viet Cong and when they destroyed villages they lost the support of the Vietnamese people. It is also true that the Vietnamese were fighting for their own country and people and were far more determined than the American soldiers many of whom just wanted to go home. In 1968 the North Vietnamese launched the Tet Offensive attacking dozens of American targets and cities. This proved to be disastrous for the Americans. Ultimately US forces were not having enough success against the VC and NVA, thus the Nixon looked to withdraw US forces to extricate the USA from the unwinnable war.</i></p> <p><i>Public opinion in America was also important. The American people were horrified by incidents such as My Lai where innocent civilians were massacred and they just got fed up with the long war and the increasing numbers of American dead. People could see that they were not winning. There were large demonstrations all over America and this made Johnson decide not to run for president again. The</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<p>3 (c)</p> 	<p>very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam in order to explain 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify reasons for US withdrawal from 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge (generalised assertion) of the reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>American people did not share his support for the war. When Nixon became president it was clear he would have to end the conflict because support for the war was disappearing.</i></p> <p><i>However, none of these reasons would have been enough by themselves. What mattered was the media reporting of it all. The media reported the Tet Offensive as if it was a defeat for the US, when it was not. It was the media who brought the horrors of the war like My Lai and the number of young Americans dying into people's living rooms. If the media had not done this, then the American people would not have turned against the war so quickly.</i></p> <p>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</p>

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

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 (7 marks) 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 (5–6 marks) 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. Main message: IRA killing civilians, increasing bombings.</p> <p>Level 3 (3–4 marks) 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 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p>	7	<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 cartoonist is criticising the IRA. He is saying that they are brutal murderers who have no compassion. The cartoon was published in 1971 and this was when the IRA campaign of violence was reaching a climax. The Northern Ireland government introduced internment and this made the IRA resort to more extreme tactics. By 1971 it was all out war. The IRA launched a major bombing campaign. They targeted the army and Protestant shops, businesses and pubs where British soldiers went. This is why the IRA man is warning babies not to use pubs used by British troops. This is making a mockery of IRA warnings not to go to these pubs. The cartoonist is suggesting that the IRA don't really care how many innocent people they kill. All the gravestones represent the people they have killed and the gun he is holding also refers to this. The cartoonist is saying the IRA don't care who they kill in their campaign against the British.</i></p> <p>Examples of sub-messages: IRA committed terrorist acts, IRA carrying out bombings.</p> <p>Contextual knowledge – general awareness of pub bombings, short warnings provided by IRA terrorists, influx of British soldiers into Ireland. Must be based on events in Ireland. The mainland terror campaign did not begin until 1974, although the first attack was in 1972 (non-civilian). Anything to do with events in Ireland gets credited for CK.</p>

	<p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		
--	--	--	--

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4		8	
(b)	<p>Q: Explain why terrorism has often failed in achieving its aims. You must refer to at least one terrorist organisation that you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why terrorism has often failed. 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. Two developed explanations or four explanations.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why terrorism has often failed. They produce a single-causal response. Developed explanation: 5 marks Standard explanation: 4 marks (default). Limited explanation: 3 marks</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why terrorism has often failed.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<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>Terrorism often does not work. The PLO discovered that the use of violence can often be counterproductive. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the PLO, using its base in Jordan, used terrorist methods such as hijacking planes. This did not help the organisation keep the support of King Hussein of Jordan. In 1970 the terrorists forced three planes to land at Dawson's Field in Jordan. They demanded that terrorist prisoners be released. When the Israelis refused they blew the planes up. This angered King Hussein who was trying to negotiate for a settlement of the refugee question. This ruined his efforts and he used his army to drive the PLO out of Jordan. By 1973 Yasser Arafat realised that terrorism was not working and he denounced the terrorists and began concentrating on peaceful methods.</i></p> <p><i>The IRA in Ireland found something similar. The violence used by the IRA through the 1970s, 80s and 90s certainly brought the issue of the treatment of Catholics in Northern Ireland to everyone's attention. However, it also brought decades of bombings, murders, British troops in Northern Ireland and internment. The Omagh bombing of 1998 lost them a lot of support especially when the people of Northern Ireland voted for the Good Friday Agreement. People like Gerry Adams realised that terrorism could not achieve anymore and he began to support peaceful negotiations. Through these talks the Catholics have achieved a share in running Northern Ireland, something that terrorism by itself could never achieve.</i></p> <p>NB: Compromise is a valid id. The same factor for two different groups can constitute a multi-causal response.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact on Berliners.</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>barbed wire barricades put up without warning overnight in 1961, a more substantial wall built later (3 marks)</i> • <i>it divided the city in half</i> • <i>built by East Germany under instructions from the Soviet Union</i> • <i>it stopped East Berliners emigrating to the West for a better life</i> • <i>it divided families</i> • <i>many were unable to go to work</i> • <i>East Berliners who tried to cross were shot</i> <p>Allow bullet points.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)	<p>Q: Why did the Polish government find it difficult to deal with Solidarity? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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 government found it hard to deal with Solidarity for several reasons. First, it was very well organised. It had a committee, spokespeople and a newspaper which was printed on the shipyard printing press. They also had a charismatic leader, Lech Walesa. They were also organised enough to have a clear set of demands. All of this made them very different from earlier movements in Hungary and Czechoslovakia that were not nearly so well organised. This level of organisation meant it could win and use support all over the country which made it hard for the government to silence and defeat.</i></p> <p><i>It also won support in vast numbers far more than earlier protestors in eastern-bloc countries. This made it difficult to deal with. The reason for its support was that its demands were national ones that people from all over the country could support. The movement also won support because it was very careful not to use violence and in the early years never set itself up as an alternative to the Communist Party. So people could join it but still be loyal to the Party. Walesa was also enormously popular. He was a devout catholic which helped and he was regarded as an ordinary worker who could be trusted.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		16	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on the final pages to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: 'The Hungarian Uprising in 1956 and the Prague Spring in 1968 were very similar.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the</p>	16	<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 think there are many ways in which they are similar. They were both caused by resentment towards Soviet rule, and the communist regimes in the two countries. In both the people wanted more political freedom and a better standard of living. Both wanted an end to censorship and more freedom of speech. The Soviet Union was very worried about both events because it saw them as threats to its control over Eastern Europe. In both events the hated Communist leader was replaced. In Hungary Nagy was appointed to carry on reforms and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was appointed to do the same. Both countries had a short period when the new government introduced the reforms that people wanted. Both risings ended in failure because of the Soviet Union. In both cases the Soviet army moved in to crush the risings. In Hungary Nagy was executed and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was dismissed.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were also differences. In Hungary the rising was led by the people. Students started demonstrating and were joined by workers and soldiers. But in Czechoslovakia it was the leadership of Dubcek that started it, with the people following. Another difference was that Dubcek insisted he was loyal to the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union while Nagy was opposed to them. He said Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and he appealed to the UN for help. In Hungary the rebels fought the Soviet soldiers but this did not happen in the Prague Spring.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think the similarities are fundamental while the differences are details. Both events were against Soviet rule and for more freedom and in both the Soviet army put them down. This makes them fundamentally the same because differences such as having different types of</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Prague Spring in order to explain 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of similarity and/or difference between the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>leadership, did not change the fundamental similarities which were more important.</i></p> <p>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6		4	
(a)	<p>Q: Describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq.</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>he was a dictator, President and in charge of the army, he tried to copy Stalin's methods</i> • <i>use of censorship, indoctrination in schools</i> • <i>he used purges and terror against opponents or anyone he saw as a rival or threat</i> • <i>he tried to unite the country and ran a ruthless campaign against the Kurds using mustard gas and cyanide. Many were killed, displaced or fled</i> • <i>he dealt with Shiite revolts brutally</i> • <i>attacked the Marsh Arabs and their marshes</i> • <i>used a personality cult</i> • <i>modernised the economy e.g. electrification, social improvements such as more schools and hospitals</i> <p>Allow bullet points.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6		6	
6 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why there was opposition around the world to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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 many people did not believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. This was one of the major reasons that Bush and Blair used to justify the invasion. They claimed that these weapons posed an immediate threat to the West. UN weapons inspectors went into Iraq to find them but could not find any. They were ignored by the US and Britain who claimed they were there. None were found during or after the war. This showed that the war had been fought on a lie and this upset a lot of people given the numbers of lives that were lost. They suspected that the real reason for the invasion was to get American control of Iraq's oil.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that many people did not accept Bush's claim that the Iraqi government had been working with Al Qaeda which was responsible for the attacks on New York on 9/11. The US Secretary of State told the UN Security Council that Iraq was protecting a terrorist cell. The Americans claimed that because of this terrorist connection Iraq had to be disarmed. Most people simply did not believe that Saddam was harbouring terrorists. They did not accept that there was any connection between Iraq and 9/11 and so there was no justification for the invasion. They did not accept that the invasion was part of the war on terrorism. In fact some argued that invading Iraq would make matters worse and would increase radical Islamists around the world.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		16	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on the final pages to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: Do you agree that the international consequences of the Iraq War were more important than the consequences inside Iraq? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order 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>	16	<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 results of the war inside Iraq were disastrous for many Iraqis. Although the terrible regime of Saddam Hussein had ended, the war caused chaos and instability. After the war there was an insurgency using guerrilla tactics against the Americans which caused more violence. The war itself had led to about 2 million people being displaced within Iraq and about 2 million fled to other countries. The instability caused by the invasion and the fighting led to massive unemployment and about one third of the population lived in poverty. For many people their normal lives disappeared with schools, hospitals, drinking water and electricity all becoming rare. There was also a breakdown in law and order with no police force for a long time. Rivalries between Sunni and Shiite led to much fighting and the Kurds were more or less ruling their own region. It was clear that the invading forces had given no thought about what they would do after the invasion was completed and they had also made a dreadful mistake of disbanding all the Iraqi forces of law and order hence the elections of 2005 were problematic.</i></p> <p><i>The international consequences of the war were that the US and Britain were viewed as occupiers of Muslim land by many Arab states and became very unpopular. In particular it led to hatred among 'home grown' Islamists in Britain and America who have committed terrorist acts. It also led to more terrorist acts around the world. The destruction of Iraq as a major power in the area has also increased Iran's power in the area leading to a dangerous imbalance of power in the region. This is particularly worrying to Israel because of Iran's threats against it.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order to explain 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the consequences of the Iraq War</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>I think that the international consequences were more important because they affected the whole world and have had an impact on people in the USA, in Britain and right across the Middle East. They have also made the West be more cautious about intervening in the Middle East. However, they are connected with the consequences in Iraq. These were dreadful for the Iraqi people but also meant Iraq became a breeding ground for terrorism which affected the whole world. So the two cannot be separated.</i></p> <p>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id. Credit both positive and negative consequences.</p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7		7	
(a)	<p>Q: Study Source A. Why was this poster published in 1930? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the policy of collectivisation. They interpret the purpose of the poster to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the policy of collectivisation. They interpret the message of the poster and produce a response explaining why the poster was published.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge of the policy of collectivisation, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the poster or they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates use surface details of the poster and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<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 poster was published in 1930 when Stalin announced his new Five Year Plan and the policy of collectivisation. This was where peasant's lands, animals and equipment were put together to share. Most peasants hated it because they wanted to keep their own land that they had worked for. They didn't want to be told what to do by a committee and they didn't want to sell their produce for low prices to the state. Stalin thought this way of farming would be more efficient and that more food would be produced. This was important because there was a food crisis. Stalin was desperate to feed the industrial workers so industrial output would be increased. He suspected peasants were hoarding food so he resorted to collectivisation. He was in a hurry because of the desperate need for food and planned to do it all in four years. This was why posters like Source A were needed. As the peasants were not keen on the change they needed to be forced or persuaded to move to collectivisation. This poster is trying to persuade them. It shows two peasants who were happy to change and they want others to join them. The word 'comrade' is used to try and make the peasants think they have a duty to join their fellow peasants because they should all be working together in a socialist state.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source B. How is this source useful as evidence about the Soviet Union in the 1930s. Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period and of collectivisation to evaluate the source for utility. Sophisticated inferences are made to explain the usefulness of the source and produce a fully developed response.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period and of collectivisation to evaluate the usefulness of the source. A developed response is produced.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period and of collectivisation to comprehend surface features of the source, and to make basic claims about usefulness.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source is very useful. It seems to be telling us that the peasants rose up against the kulaks. These were peasants who were a bit better off than poor peasants. They might own a few animals or some machinery. Stalin was desperate to have a class enemy that he could base his policy of collectivisation around. If the peasants thought there were rich peasants then they might support pulling their farms into collectives. The Communists invented the idea of kulaks because there certainly were not many rich peasants around at this date. This source was part of the indoctrination given to school children. It is useful because it shows the authorities trying to brainwash the children against the kulaks and for collectivisation. It shows us the opposite to what it was meant to show. The fact that a source like this had to be used shows that the authorities were having problems with the kulaks, that peasants were not willingly turning against them and that collectivisation was not going well. Some peasants did denounce others as kulaks but usually under enormous pressure from the authorities.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. 'Stalin's industrial policies were a success.' How far do you agree with this interpretation?</p> <p>Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that Stalin's industrial policies were a success.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that Stalin's industrial policies were a success.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that Stalin's industrial policies were a success.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<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>Stalin knew that Russia was decades behind other major countries in terms of industrial development. His Five Year Plans were designed to let Russia catch up. Targets were set nationally and then these were passed down to local factories. Source C is about Magnitogorsk which was a show piece city that Stalin had created to show what other cities should be like and how hard everyone should work. In other words we would expect this city to show Soviet industrialisation off at its best. The source can be trusted as it shows nothing working very well – times was wasted, the work was not being done properly and the workers were living and working in terrible conditions. It was written by an American so it might be biased. However, he was a communist sympathiser who had volunteered to work there so we would expect him to write a glowing account. The source suggests that things were not as good as Stalin wanted to tell everybody. However, there were achievements. The production of coal, steel and oil rose enormously and railways were built. By 1940 Russia was producing 20% of the whole output of the world!</i></p> <p><i>However, it was all achieved at a cost. Huge propaganda campaigns were launched to persuade people it was their patriotic duty to work hard in the factories. Much of the labour was forced, the conditions were often dreadful and many man died. Those who slacked were sent to labour camps. But despite all this I would have to agree with the statement. Russia had caught the rest of the world up and this was demonstrated when its industrial strength was shown in the Second World War. Many workers agreed with what they were doing and thought they were building a better society for their children.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p>Q: What promises did the Tsar make in the October Manifesto in 1905.</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>a Duma elected by the people</i> • <i>rights like freedom of speech</i> • <i>the right to form political parties</i> • <i>newspapers that were not censored</i> • <i>in the future, the vote for all men</i>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain the importance of the Tsar taking control of Russia's war effort in 1915.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Tsar taking control of the war effort was important. 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 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Tsar taking control of the war effort was important. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the Tsar taking control of the war effort was important.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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 Tsar taking control of the war effort was very important. The war was going disastrously and by taking direct control of the army he linked himself personally to the disasters. The war left people starving and demoralised. It also showed up clearly the weak leadership of the Tsar. All could see that his decision making was awful and he was now also responsible for the dreadful way the war was going.</i></p> <p><i>It was also important because it meant he was no longer in Petrograd to run the country. This was left to the Tsarina and Rasputin. She depended on his advice and they both became very unpopular. She made some dreadful decisions like sacking all the able ministers and appointing her friends instead. There were all kinds of wild rumours circulated about him and her. It was said they were plotting a peace with Germany. They just made the Tsar's regime even more unpopular than it had been. He was hated and in 1916 a group of noblemen murdered him to try and help the Tsar but it was too late. By 1917 there were riots in Petrograd.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)		10	
	<p>Q: 'How well did the Tsar govern Russia between 1905 and 1914? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the period 1905 to 1914 to explain how well the Tsar governed Russia. 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period 1905 to 1914 in order to explain how well the Tsar governed Russia. 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period 1905 to 1914 to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</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>There were some good aspects to the way the Tsar ruled in this period. His appointment of Stolypin was a good move. He understood that Russia had to modernise its agriculture and that there should be some reforms. The peasants were not producing much food because their methods were so old fashioned. They were often stopped from using new methods by the mir. The Land Law of 1906 set up a land bank to help peasants buy more land. This encouraged them to farm privately so that they could introduce new methods and farm better. The Duma that the Tsar had promised also did some good work – the number of primary schools was increased and there was better health care. There was also a big increase in industrial production with factories using up-to-date methods.</i></p> <p><i>However, much of the Tsar’s rule was poor. He issued the Fundamental Laws which stopped the Duma having too much power. It was soon packed with his own supporters, not the representatives of the people. This lost him the support of the middle classes. He also introduced more repression. Any dissent was stamped on. Over a thousand people were hanged. The Okhrana also imprisoned many people. The workers did not benefit from the increase in industrial production. Wages did not go up and there were many strikes. All of this created dissatisfaction and meant he was losing the support of the workers.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I do not think the Tsar ruled well in this period. There were many wasted opportunities. He could have passed more reforms and won a lot of support, but he did not. There were some reforms but not nearly enough and the Tsar had really gone back on his word about the Duma. There was still a lot of unrest and many problems were left unresolved. The Tsar passed some reforms and managed to stay in power but under</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the period 1905 to 1914 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the period 1905 to 1914.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>the surface there were real problems. It would take the war to bring them out into the open.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe how Stalin used a cult of personality.</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>huge parades in Red Square</i> • <i>statues and paintings everywhere</i> • <i>posters glorifying Stalin in the workplace, the street, at home</i> • <i>shown as a god-like figure</i> • <i>paintings showing him with workers</i> • <i>paintings and doctored photographs showing him with Lenin</i> • <i>places were named after him</i> • <i>shown with children in many posters</i>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR after Lenin's death.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Trotsky failed to become leader. 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 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Trotsky failed to become leader. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why Trotsky failed to become leader.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<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 for this was Trotsky's personality. People found him arrogant. He was an intellectual and his colleagues suspected his cleverness. He didn't really bother trying to win support. He refused to criticise Stalin, while Stalin was plotting against him. He do not try to win alliances or to get people on his side. This can be seen at the Party Congress after Lenin's death. Stalin allied with other leaders to defeat Trotsky and packed the Congress with his supporters. As a result Trotsky lost all the votes</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was to do with Trotsky's ideas. He was more of a pure communist and believed in spreading communism across the world. However, most communists favoured Stalin's ideas of 'Socialism in one country'. He believed that the most important things was to consolidate communism into Russia first. Most of the communist leaders thought this made sense. They preferred Stalin's more moderate ideas to Trotsky's extreme ideas which they thought might split the Party. They were also suspicious of Trotsky because he had not joined the Bolsheviks until 1917.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Q: How far did the purges benefit the Soviet Union? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain how far they think the Purges benefited Russia. 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain how far they think the Purges benefited Russia. 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>	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>In many ways the Purges did not benefit the Soviet Union. The Purges started in 1934 and carried on until 1938. In this period over half a million people were executed. It was not just top Party officials who suffered but towards the end of the period it was also many ordinary members. It meant that everyone lived in fear. The armed forces were also purged with many top army officers being killed. 90 per cent of the generals were removed, greatly weakening the army. This became very serious at the beginning of the Second World War. Stalin stopped the Purges because even he could see they were pulling Soviet society apart. By 1939 over 20 million Russians had gone to labour camps. This was an enormous loss of talent and labour for Russia.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is another way of looking at the Purges which is that they were necessary to transform Russia into a modern industrialised state and make it strong enough to stand up to Germany. Stalin was worried by the increasing strength of Germany and thought that Russia had to be modernised quickly. This meant it could only be done by one person making all the decisions. However, in 1934 there were people who disagreed with his ideas. They were especially against the single-minded drive to industrialisation. They wanted to improve relations with the peasants. There was even talk of replacing Stalin as leader. Stalin thought that this type of intrigue just got in the way of modernising Russia. He also thought that anyone who tried to stop him achieving his great task for Russia was a traitor and deserved to be shot. It was therefore crucial to have the purges to enable Russia to be modernised. Many people suffered in the purges but by the end Stalin had created a Party and a country where nearly everyone was loyal to him. That meant he could get on with his great task of modernising Russia. The country as a whole benefited from this so you could say the Purges did benefit</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Purges to explain 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the Purges and 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Purges. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<i>Russia as a whole although individual people suffered.</i>

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid***High Performance 5-6 marks***

Candidate spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. When required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

Intermediate Performance 3-4 marks

Candidate spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. When required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Threshold Performance 1-2 mark

Candidate spell, punctuate and use the 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.

0 marks

0 Marks should be awarded when;

The candidate writes nothing.

The candidate's response bears no relation to the question.

The candidate's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.

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 2015

