

## **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 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

## Part 1: Section A - The Inter-War Year, 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><b>Level 5 (7 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoon's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub–message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	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 cartoonist is worried about whether the League will be able to stand up to powerful aggressive countries. This is shown by the God of War threatening the members of the League. The members of the League look scared while the peace plans on the table seem to be ignored. Mussolini is smiling at all this. This is because the cartoon was published just after Mussolini's occupation of Corfu. He was trying to get compensation for Italians who had been killed by Greeks. The Council of the League was too scared to condemn Italy and made Greece apologise and pay compensation. This was a disaster for the League as is shown in the cartoon. The cartoonist believes the League has given into force and has therefore failed in its duty. It is a criticism of the League and of its leading members.</i></p> <p>Focus of main message must be the League of Nations</p> <p>Contextual knowledge must relate to Corfu 1923</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the League of Nations had some successes in the 1920s.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (6–8 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the League had some successes in the 1920s. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the League had some successes in the 1920s. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the League had some successes in the 1920s.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 of the reasons why the League had some successes in the 1920s was that many of the disputes it had to deal with involved less powerful countries who were ready to accept the authority of the League. They were not powerful enough to stand up to the League. This can be seen in the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands. They both claimed them and asked the League to judge who they belonged to. When the League said they belonged to Finland, Sweden accepted the judgement and so the League had a success.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason the League was successful was that a lot of its work was to do with humanitarian work that did not involve disputes between countries. For example, the League was very effective in getting refugees back to their homeland after the First World War. The League was successful in stamping out cholera and dysentery in the refugee camps in Turkey. It also did useful work reducing malaria and against slavery. These were issues that simply benefited people and did not involve rivalries between countries who were happy to let the League get on with the work.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe how Austria was punished in the Treaty of St Germain.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a new, much smaller, Republic of Austria created</i></li> <li>• <i>land from the former Empire transferred to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy and Romania</i></li> <li>• <i>Union between Austria and Germany not allowed</i></li> <li>• <i>Austria to pay reparations</i></li> <li>• <i>Austria's army limited to 30,000</i></li> </ul>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain the role played by Lloyd George in the peace negotiations at Versailles.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain the part played by Lloyd George at 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the part played by Lloyd George at Versailles and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Lloyd George's role at Versailles.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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>Lloyd George was expected to ally with the French in the peace negotiations but in fact he supported a moderate peace settlement and tried to persuade Clemenceau not to be too harsh on Germany. One reason for this was that he was looking after Britain's interests and this meant Britain's future economy. This depended on economic revival in Europe which depended on the German economy recovering. Germany had been Britain's most important customer before 1914. If Clemenceau got his way and Germany lost the Rhineland where much of its industry was, then it would not have enough money to buy British goods. This is why Lloyd George acted as a moderating influence on Clemenceau.</i></p> <p><i>However, Lloyd George also had to worry about public opinion in Britain where many people wanted Germany to be punished. This led him to be a balance between Wilson and Clemenceau. Wilson wanted a fair peace that would last. He wanted to base it on his Fourteen Points which did not include reparations. Clemenceau, however, wanted high reparations to punish Germany for war damage and to weaken Germany in the future so it could not threaten France again. Lloyd George was in the middle. He knew people in Britain wanted to punish Germany 'until the pips squeak' but he did not want to create resentment in Germany that would leave it with grievances in the future. He managed to persuade Clemenceau to accept a lower figure for reparations but it was more than he really wanted.</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><b>Q: 'At the time, most people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the different reactions to the peace treaty in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the different reactions to the peace treaty 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of reactions that claimed the peace treaty were too harsh, or reactions that claimed it was not harsh enough, in order to explain how far they agree. 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>I agree that some people thought the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh but there were others who thought the opposite. The Germans thought it was too harsh. They were very angry about the war guilt clause and the reparations because they did not think they had caused the war, so why should they be punished for this. They also did not believe they had been defeated. The war had ended in an armistice not a surrender. This made it difficult to accept the fact that they were not involved in the discussions and that the whole peace settlement was a diktat. They had thought that the peace settlement would be based on the Fourteen points but they now found that self-determination was not being followed because many Germans would now be living under foreign rule. This led to trouble in Germany with several rebellions and putsches and with the people who agreed with the treaty being called the 'November Criminals'.</i></p> <p><i>However, the reaction in other countries was different. In Britain Lloyd George got a very good welcome when he returned. Massive crowds turned out to cheer him. Many people, especially those that had lost loved ones in the war, thought that Germany deserved to be punished harshly. However, by now Lloyd George was worried that the peace treaty was too harsh and would cause resentment in the future. Keynes thought the peace was a disaster because it did not allow Germany to recover economically. He argued this would cause problems in the future. Many people in France thought Germany had been dealt with too leniently. Many thought that France's eastern border should have been the Rhine. In 1920 Clemenceau gave up trying to be president and resigned as Prime Minister because he was unpopular. Wilson was disappointed because it was too harsh. Many people in America agreed with him Congress refused to approve the Treaty.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think that most people did not think that it was too harsh. While leaders like Lloyd George and Wilson believed that the harshness of the</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify reactions to the peace treaty that claimed it was too harsh and that it was not harsh enough, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of reactions to the peace treaty.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>treaty would lead to problems later, the vast majority of people in France and Britain strongly felt that Germany deserved to be punished harshly as it has caused the war and also much devastation in France. Indeed, many of them would have punished Germany even more harshly.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe how Germany's position in Europe became stronger in 1935.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the Saar votes to rejoin Germany, a great propaganda success for Hitler (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Hitler announces the Luftwaffe</i></li> <li>• <i>Hitler introduces conscription</i></li> <li>• <i>the Anglo-German Naval Treaty allows Germany to build up its navy (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Ineffectiveness of League in relation to Abyssinia</i></li> <li>• <i>Rearmament rally in Germany.</i></li> </ul>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in the 1930s.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why Britain followed a policy of appeasement. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Britain followed a policy of appeasement and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why Britain followed a policy of appeasement.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 why Britain followed a policy of appeasement was that it believed Germany had been treated badly in the Treaty of Versailles. When Hitler started to demand that Germany should be able to defend itself with a good size army and navy, this looked like a reasonable request. Also when Hitler started to argue that Germans had the right to live under German rule, this also sounded reasonable. Why should Germans in parts of Czechoslovakia be forced to live under foreign rule as the Treaty of Versailles had dictated.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was Britain was afraid of communism, and in particular the Soviet Union. In fact, British politicians feared communism much more than Nazism. This was because communism seemed to be the opposite to the way people lived in Britain. Britain needed a strong anti-communist country in the middle of Europe to defend the rest of Europe from communism. Hitler's Germany with its anti-communist ideas was the answer. If Germany became even stronger through Hitler's demands, this would create an even stronger obstacle for communist Russia. This was why Britain was willing to give in to many of his demands.</i></p>

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

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 page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: Which was more important in bringing about the Second World War, the failure of Britain and France to act over the remilitarisation of the Rhineland or the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement in order to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and</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 think the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was key. It had been made a demilitarised zone by the Treaty of Versailles. This was to give the French security from a German attack. However, for Hitler it was a reminder of the way Germany had been humiliated at Versailles. Hitler's constant and clear aim was to destroy all the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. He sent troops into the Rhineland in 1936. The army he sent in was much smaller than the French army and it had no air support. If the French or the British had acted, the German army would not have stood a chance. However, they did nothing. Many people in Britain thought it was reasonable for the Germans to have troops in the Rhineland to defend themselves. The League of Nations did nothing because of the Abyssinian crisis. All this told Hitler that the western powers would not stand up to him and that he could get away with more if he adopted an aggressive foreign policy.</i></p> <p><i>The Munich Agreement, where Chamberlain agreed that Germany could have the Sudetenland, was meant to guarantee 'peace for our time'. In fact, it did the opposite. The promises Hitler made that he would not touch the rest of Czechoslovakia were worthless. Munich taught him that Britain and France were not strong enough to fight him and they did not have the will do so. You can argue that Munich made the fall of the rest of Czechoslovakia inevitable. His invasion of Czechoslovakia was the first act Hitler had followed that could not be justified by self-determination. It showed that he was actually after the domination of Europe. This made war inevitable because Britain and France would have to stand up to this aim eventually. On the other hand, this is all brought about by the failure to stop Hitler in the Rhineland. This was his first use of force and the western powers were strong enough to stop him. When they failed to stand up to him he became confident enough to carry out the rest of his foreign policy including taking over Czechoslovakia and the events that led to war. So I think the Rhineland was more important because it led to the rest of Hitler's aggressive policies that led to war.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
<b>3 (c)</b> 	<p>understanding of the consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland <b>or</b> the Munich Agreement in order to explain how far they agree. 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b>  Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify consequences of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and the Munich Agreement, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>  Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and/or the Munich Agreement.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (7 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context. Establishes <b>criticism, must be critical of Kennedy, Kennedy is the target.</b> Examples of cartoonist's main message: criticising Kennedy's handling of the invasion, and decision to invade, a personal attack.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoon's main message</b> 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><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub–message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. <b>They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response. Simply describe the cigar blowing up in his face.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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>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>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (6–8 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe what happened during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-9.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Stalin cut off road and rail links between West Berlin and the rest of Germany (2 marks – 1 point and support)</i></li> <li>• <i>people in Berlin left without any supplies</i></li> <li>• <i>the western powers decided on an airlift of crucial supplies</i></li> <li>• <i>hundreds of thousands of trips were made</i></li> <li>• <i>In 1949 Stalin called off the blockade</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Allow bullet points.</b></p> <p><b>Credit from start of blockade only.</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)	<p><b>Q: Why were there disagreements at the Potsdam Conference in 1945? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there were disagreements at Potsdam and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 repeat 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

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><b>Q: 'The Marshall Plan was an attempt by the USA to control Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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>	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 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><b>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</b></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe how the USA fought the war in Vietnam.</b></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"> <li>• <i>large scale bombing over North Vietnam (Operation Rolling Thunder) and other countries such as Cambodia</i></li> <li>• <i>use of napalm</i></li> <li>• <i>traditional military tactics based on heavy armaments</i></li> <li>• <i>moving villages to new sites behind barbed wire</i></li> <li>• <i>defoliation using Agent Orange</i></li> <li>• <i>Vietnamisation</i></li> <li>• <i>incidents such as My Lai</i></li> <li>• <i>bombing</i></li> <li>• <i>huge numbers of troops</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Allow bullet points.</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement in Vietnam.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (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><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> 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 very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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>	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 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</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b>            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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b>            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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b>            No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>Offensive as if it was a defeat for the US, when it was not. It the 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><b>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: What is the cartoonist's message. Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (7 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoon's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context. Main message: IRA killing civilians, increasing bombings.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub–message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	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>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why terrorism has often failed in achieving its aims. You must refer to at least one terrorist organisation that you have studied.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (6–8 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why terrorism has often failed.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 any more 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 C - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact on Berliners.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>barbed wire barricades put up without warning overnight in 1961, a more substantial wall built later (3 marks)</i></li> <li>• <i>it divided the city in half</i></li> <li>• <i>built by East Germany under instructions from the Soviet Union</i></li> <li>• <i>it stopped East Berliners emigrating to the West for a better life</i></li> <li>• <i>it divided families</i></li> <li>• <i>many were unable to go to work</i></li> <li>• <i>East Berliners who tried to cross were shot</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Allow bullet points.</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why did the Polish government find it difficult to deal with Solidarity? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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
8 (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><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the 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>	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 leadership, did not change the fundamental similarities which were more important.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id.</b></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>he was a dictator, President and in charge of the army, he tried to copy Stalin's methods</i></li> <li>• <i>use of censorship, indoctrination in schools</i></li> <li>• <i>he used purges and terror against opponents or anyone he saw as a rival or threat</i></li> <li>• <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></li> <li>• <i>he dealt with Shiite revolts brutally</i></li> <li>• <i>attacked the Marsh Arabs and their marshes</i></li> <li>• <i>used a personality cult</i></li> <li>• <i>modernised the economy e.g. electrification, social improvements such as more schools and hospitals</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Allow bullet points.</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why there was opposition around the world to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 C - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c) 		16	 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><b>Q: Do you agree that the international consequences of the Iraq War were more important than the consequences inside Iraq? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> 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> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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>	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> <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</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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>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><b>NB: Examiners use L2 annotation for an id. Credit both positive and negative consequences.</b></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. Why did Kenyatta make this speech in 1952? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 (6-7 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the situation in Kenya in 1952. They interpret the purpose of the speech to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (4-5 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the speech and produce a response explaining why the speech was made.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge of the context, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the speech or they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates use surface details of the speech and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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>Kenyatta was making this speech at the time of the Mau Mau campaign of violence. The Mau Mau murdered Europeans and also carried out some dreadful atrocities. Kenyatta was the head of the Kenya African Union which was accused by the British of being part of the Mau Mau movement. The government arrested several members of the KAU during the state of emergency. Kenyatta is making this speech to make clear to the audience but also to the British that he was not a member of the Mau Mau and that the KAU had no connections to the Mau Mau. He is doing this so that he and his movement will not suffer from the campaign the British were conducting against the Mau Mau. He is also trying to persuade the Kenyans not to support the Mau Mau. He knows that if they do, it will simply make the British more determined to clamp down and not to give Kenya independence which is what he wants. His speech did not really work because later in the year he was arrested for being a member of the Mau Mau.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source B. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (6 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (5 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is criticising British efforts to deal with the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya. As soon as the British started to fight back against the Mau Mau they fled to the forest. This made it much harder for the British to find them. They also found it difficult to tell who was a member of the Mau Mau and who was just an ordinary villager. This is what the cartoon is showing. The cartoonist is very critical of the methods the British were using against the Mau Mau. The words 'counter brutality' on the dog show that the cartoonist thinks the British are hypocrites. They are meant to be working against brutality, but are using brutal methods themselves. The words on the sign 'around and around to nowhere' suggests that the British are failing. They are getting the British nowhere, they were just going around in circles.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (c)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source C. 'In the period 1950 to 1960 British methods against the Mau Mau were not effective'. How far do you agree with this interpretation. Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 (6-7 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that the British methods against the Mau Mau were not effective.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (4-5 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that the British methods against the Mau Mau were not effective..</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that the British methods against the Mau Mau were not effective.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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>In some ways the methods used by the British can be considered effective, even though they were brutal. Thousands of Kenyans were sent to concentration camps where the conditions were awful and prisoners suffered from forced labour. The British then set up screening camps where prisoners were interrogated and tortured to get them to confess to being a member of the Mau Mau. Hundreds of thousands of people were moved into protective villages. These drastic measures were effective in that they cut off supplies of recruits, information and support for the Mau Mau so that by 1956 Britain felt that it had the situation under control.</p> <p>However, the source supports the argument that British methods were ineffective due to their brutality. It is written by the Police Commissioner who was British. For him to admit that British methods were alienating Africans, and therefore undermining British efforts to deal with the Mau Mau, provides strong supporting evidence for the statement. This evidence is supported by the fact that, at the same time, the KAU was growing in support. Further evidence is that in 1952 around 15,000 men fled into the forests where they joined the ranks of the Mau Mau, turning it from a minor threat into an underground army. By 1959, terrorist activity was beginning again so much so that the Colonial secretary ended the state of emergency and released the remaining prisoners.</p>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the extent of the British Empire in 1919.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Africa - Kenya, Botswana, Rhodesia, Tanzania, Nigeria, Uganda</i></li> <li>• <i>Middle East - Egypt, Iraq, Palestine, Persia</i></li> <li>• <i>India</i></li> <li>• <i>Australia, New Zealand</i></li> <li>• <i>Canada</i></li> </ul>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why did nationalism grow in parts of the British Empire between 1919 and 1939? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why nationalism grew after WW1. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why nationalism grew after WW1. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why nationalism grew after WW1.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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 the growth of nationalism in the British Empire was the work of individuals like Gandhi. He was an inspirational figure and used his policy of non-violence to encourage the Indian population to acts of civil disobedience such as protesting against the land tax. He also led the Salt March in 1930 against the Salt Tax. His example of simple living and his modesty won him thousands of supporters. From 1921 he was head of the Indian National Congress which he led in a campaign for independence.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was the First World War. Many parts of the British Empire had fought in the war and this raised the issue of what relationships between Britain and parts of the Empire would be after the war. The war gave them a chance of seeing the white man defeated and in Africa the fear of the white man began to decline. This led to the growth of nationalism. There was also an increased demand for raw materials from Africa after the war and this led some to accuse the colonial powers like Britain of exploiting their land resources.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11(c)		10	
	<p><b>Q:</b> 'After 1945 factors in Britain were more important in bringing about the end of the British Empire than factors in other parts of the world.' How far do you agree with this statement. Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the ending 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><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the ending of the British Empire 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the ending of the British Empire 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 several factors in Britain that led to the end of the British Empire. Britain came out of the war totally exhausted and poor. It was no longer in a position to subsidise the Empire or pay large sums to protect it. Gradually people in Britain began to ask whether Britain could afford the Empire. The victory of the Labour Party in 1945 was another factor as it was less enthusiastic about keeping the Empire than the Conservatives. However, it was not long before Macmillan made his 'Wind of Change' speech about Africa in which he indicated it was time for Britain to leave. All this shows that attitudes in Britain were gradually changing.</i></p> <p><i>Factors outside Britain were also important. President Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter had justified the Second World War as a fight for democracy. Empires were not democratic and the Americans were not keen on the British keeping theirs. This mattered because America was now the most powerful country in the world while Britain fell to the second division of world powers. America wanted to trade freely throughout the world and was upset by the way Britain protected its Empire and its trade. Another key development was Suez. Here Britain was caught acting like an old imperialist power. It worsened relations with the US and with many members of the Commonwealth. In many ways it was the turning point and showed that Britain could no longer be an imperial power. To add to this was the growing nationalism and resentment of British rule in countries like Kenya.</i></p> <p><i>I think that factors in other parts of the world like Suez and growing nationalism were more important. These developments influenced what people in Britain thought about Empire. There is also the fact that the development of nationalist movements in Africa and elsewhere meant there was no turning back from moves towards independence. For many people in Britain Suez was the final factor.</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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the ending of the British Empire and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the ending of the British Empire.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q:</b> Describe how Britain ruled India in the years after the First World War.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>more local government by Indian ministers for the provinces</i></li> <li>• <i>gradual move to more self governing institutions</i></li> <li>• <i>the viceroy kept control of central government</i></li> <li>• <i>the use of force against demonstrators at Amritsar</i></li> <li>• <i>more demonstrators killed when protesting about the verdict of the Hunter Commission</i></li> <li>• <i>jailed leaders of the civil disobedience movement in early 1920s</i></li> </ul>

## Part 2: End of Empire, c.1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12(b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain the importance of the Amritsar Massacre of 1919.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the importance of the Amritsar Massacre. They produce a response explaining more than one reason why it was important. They demonstrate thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the importance of the Amritsar Massacre. They produce a response explaining one reason.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the importance of the Amritsar Massacre.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> 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>One reason that the Amritsar Massacre was important was that the killing of 370 Indians by British troops made British rule even more unpopular. It encouraged more Indians to consider the idea of independence for India. Many began to be convinced that if the British were going to rule by force in this way then British rule was unjustifiable. It also led to Gandhi setting up the Non-cooperation Movement in 1920.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason why it was important was the impact that it had on the British. Dyer's actions at Amritsar were condemned by the Hunter Commission which led to his dismissal. It also led to the British reconsidering how they should rule India. They began to use the Army in a different way. Soldiers were re-trained so that they could deal with crowds by using a minimum amount of force. Nobody in Britain wanted a repeat of what happened at Amritsar.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (c)		10	
	<p><b>Q: Was Gandhi more important than Jinnah in India in the period 1919 to 1947? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (10 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think Gandhi or Jinnah was more important. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (7–9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think Gandhi or Jinnah was more important. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of Gandhi and/or Jinnah 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>In many ways Gandhi was far more important. He led the struggle for independence for decades and was an inspirational leader. He led the Salt March and nonviolent and peaceful resistance to British rule gaining mass support. He was the leader of the Congress and managed to keep all the groups fighting for independence united. During the war he set up the Quit India movement and although he spent some time in prison by the end of the war the British knew that they had to agree to Indian independence. This was largely due to Gandhi efforts.</i></p> <p><i>Jinnah did not really get properly involved in the moves towards independence until the later 1930s. He was very worried when the Muslims in Congress came out of the 1937 elections with nothing. He then started to throw his energies into reorganising the Muslim League. He began to see that an independent India might be dominated by Hindus. He then began to work for partition. Gandhi wanted to win independence first and then deal with the issue of partition afterwards but Jinnah insisted that partition and independence happen at the same time. He finally won Congress round to his view and then defended his demands in negotiations with Mountbatten.</i></p> <p><i>It would seem that Gandhi was far more important. It could be argued that independence happened in 1947 because of his efforts over three decades. But his idea of an independent India always included the Muslims. He wanted a united India and an India with many religions with safeguards for the minority religions. Jinnah won and this makes him important because although he did not bring about independence he did influence the kind of independence that was won. He brought about partition. This makes him very important. He is sometimes blamed for the violence that took place at partition. This is not fair, there would probably still have been terrible violence if Gandhi's plan for a united India had been followed.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12(c)	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the work of Gandhi and/or Jinnah and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Gandhi or Jinnah</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2015

