

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A011/01**: Aspects of international relations and Germany, 1918–1945

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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

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

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

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

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

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

© OCR 2016

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: ‘By 1949, the USA had achieved more success in the Cold War than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the US successes OR the USSR’s achievements and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways I agree. The USA had success in the Cold War from the beginning. By 1947 they were alarmed at Stalin’s control in Eastern Europe, and in response came up with the Truman Doctrine: America would assist countries if they were at risk from communist takeover. As a result, they helped the King of Greece defeat the communists, which was a success for containment. Likewise, in Berlin the USA were successful. Stalin had tried to take control of West Berlin, run by Britain, France and the USA, by blockading it in 1948. The Allies successfully airlifted supplies for 11 months to save it. Stalin could do nothing, for fear of triggering a war, and eventually gave up humiliated. By contrast the Allies looked like the good guys ‘saving’ Berlin from being strangled by communism, another US success.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USSR also had some success. Stalin wanted a sphere of influence in Europe to act as a buffer zone of friendly countries to prevent future attack: twice in thirty years Germany had attacked Russia. By 1949, there were communist governments across the whole of Eastern Europe, meaning that Stalin had the security he wanted. He may have achieved this by encouraging election rigging, banning opposition parties and murdering opposition politicians, but he had achieved it no less. He had also got what he wanted with Germany. At Yalta and Potsdam he had been determined to punish Germany and get reparations to compensate for the terrible loss of life and hardship the USSR had experienced during the war. He got this, as dividing Germany weakened it, and he took reparations from his zone.</i></p> <p><i>However overall, despite some USSR successes, it was the USA who looked strongest by 1949. Although it may look like the USSR was in the driving seat, provoking reactions from the USA like the Berlin Airlift and Truman Doctrine, it was they who came off worst when the USA reacted, shown by having to end the Berlin Blockade achieving nothing. Other than getting their sphere of influence, they were only just catching up with where the USA already was in terms of their allies and atomic weapons, by 1949.</i></p>

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



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


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

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

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q ‘The USA gained more from the Cuban Missile Crisis than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to argue that the USA OR the USSR gained more and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I definitely agree that the USA gained a lot. When Khrushchev put his missiles on Cuba, America had to react in some way, as this was a threatening and provocative act. Missiles could target most American cities within minutes. The blockade was a sensible option as it was not a direct act of war, and forced Khrushchev into the position of villain or weakling, if he caused a war or retreated. It led to the Russians backing down and the missiles were removed meaning the USA was safe and Kennedy’s reputation was improved because he had stood up to Khrushchev. In that sense, America gained a lot. Kennedy also held his nerve when negotiating the removal of the bases: he waited for Khrushchev to change his negotiating position before agreeing a deal. That meant the US got to remove its missile bases from Turkey in secret, so it looked like only the Russians had backed down, another US win.</i></p> <p><i>That said, Khrushchev also secured his goal, so the USSR did well. In return for removing its missiles, the USA had to give a commitment not to attack Cuba, securing the survival of the regime to this day. One could argue this is why Khrushchev put missiles on the island in the first place, so in removing them, the USSR had lost nothing. It was a propaganda success for Khrushchev too outside the USSR, as the US had made no secret of its dislike of a communist country so close, but they could do nothing about it. The USSR also got the US missiles removed from Turkey, as part of the deal, meaning their people were less at risk from attack by America.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, I’d argue that the USA achieved more. Although both sides had gains, the USA’s gains were more public and without the humiliation of retreating from the naval blockade and removing missiles in public. Their losses were also private. As the Cold War was about propaganda and appearances, this mattered more.</i></p>

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how Gorbachev's actions OR the USSR's economic problems led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Gorbachev's actions were very important. When he introduced glasnost and perestroika in the USSR, it allowed more open debate on government policy, including criticisms of it, and changes to the economy. As people in Eastern Europe saw this, they demanded similar reforms in their own countries. When they heard that Gorbachev was also planning on withdrawing Soviet troops from Eastern Europe, they realised that their leaders could not count on Soviet force, so they could be free of the worst aspects of communism. From May 1989 onwards, people rebelled against communist rule in Eastern Europe, and without the backup of the Red Army, communism collapsed. Without Gorbachev's actions, demand for change wouldn't have been so obvious, and Eastern bloc countries could also have relied on Red Army troops to deal with protesters.</i></p> <p><i>But economic problems were also important. This is why Gorbachev introduced many of his reforms. For years the Soviet economy had been very weak, spending too much money on weapons, and it was in need of major reform to improve the quality of industries and raise the standard of living for the Soviet people. Previous leaders had just buried their heads in the sand. Gorbachev wanted to change things. As a result, he introduced perestroika, which introduced market forces and private business, which inspired people in Eastern Europe to want these changes too, as their economies were also a shambles. Crucially, to save money, he also cut spending on defence, including deciding to remove the Red Army from Eastern Europe, removing the prop for unpopular communist governments. With this gone, their days were numbered.</i></p> <p><i>As I've explained, Gorbachev's actions were largely the result of economic problems, so you could argue that as they came first they were more important than him. But I don't agree. The economic problems had existed for a long time. It took a man who wanted to do something about them, and crucially, the way he did something about them that made all the difference.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by the Provisional IRA.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg 'attacked Britain and its government'.</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>attacks on the Northern Ireland police force (RUC) and British army</i> • <i>planting bombs in Northern Ireland or on the British mainland</i> • <i>attempting to kill members of the British Government including the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher</i> • <i>attacks on loyalist politicians and organisations</i> • <i>secret negotiations using their political wing, Sinn Fein</i> • <i>the dirty protests by IRA prisoners</i>

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: ‘Nationalism is usually more important than religion in motivating terrorist actions’. How far do you agree? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how nationalism OR religion motivates terrorism and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I agree that nationalism may seem more important, but it’s often more complicated than that and difficult to separate the two.</i></p> <p><i>Nationalism has often been more important. Take for example the case of the IRA in Ireland. They and their supporters were almost always Catholics, and their opponents were almost always Protestants. But they weren’t fighting about religion, they were trying to achieve a united republic over the whole of Ireland, without British interference. That’s nationalism. The only way religion really came into it was that some of them may have wanted revenge for past injustices against people of their faith. The same is true of the PLO: they were and are mainly Palestinian Muslims fighting against Jewish Israelis, but religion isn’t the main issue, it’s that they are arguing over the same land which they believe should be a homeland for their nation. In 1947 Zionists declared the state of Israel to exist on Palestinian land. The Palestinians believe that land is theirs. As a result, they attack Israel and Israelis.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, religion does matter and can be the most important factor. Osama Bin Laden believed that the Islamic religion was under threat from enemies everywhere and that it was the duty of every Muslim to take part in jihad. His ideas formed the basis of Al Qaeda’s actions and resulted in them terrorising Western democracies, communist nations, the state of Israel and especially the USA. But at the same time, even Al Qaeda has nationalist influences, as it benefits from the idea that all Arabs no matter where they live are part of a single group united by their faith, and so it gets support from Arabs around the world. This support is crucial, as it funds them and provides activists prepared to commit terrorism.</i></p> <p><i>So the two are definitely linked, and because of that it’s difficult to argue that one is more important than the other: they are both equally important.</i></p> <p><i>NB: To reach L4/9 candidates must refer to at least 2 groups</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 Candidates use some relevant knowledge to describe terrorist incidents AND/OR nationalist and religious ideas in terrorist organisations 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 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of terrorists' motivation and their actions.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i> <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i> <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. Why was this poster published in 1923? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the Ruhr Crisis. They interpret the purpose of the poster to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the poster and produce a response explaining why this poster was published.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the broader context, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the poster OR they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the poster and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>Source A was published by the German government to tell the workers in the Ruhr to continue with their passive resistance. In January 1923 the French invaded the Ruhr because Germany had not paid its reparations. The Ruhr was the most important industrial region of Germany, and the French had the right to take raw materials and other resources if the Germans missed a payment. However, the Germans were outraged, as this felt like an invasion, and told the workers in the Ruhr that they should use 'passive resistance'. In other words, they were told not to cooperate with the French, so they could not get the resources they wanted. The worker in the poster is looking angry and defiant, and the French are clearly threatening him with bayonets on the end of rifles. He says to them ' No, you can't force me', because he knows he has the backing of his own government. The poster is meant to reassure Ruhr workers that they should stand up to the French by refusing to work for them, or help them gather the materials they want. It was published to encourage support for the passive resistance to defeat the French.</i></p> <p><i>Purpose is a physical or mental reaction.</i></p> <p><i>Purpose is to encourage the workers to go on strike or rally support for Germans worker/ policy</i></p> <p><i>Message: The Germans are standing up to the French.</i></p> <p><i>The German government has told the workers to go on strike.</i></p> <p><i>Tell the German people about the French have invaded Germany.</i></p> <p><i>CK must refer to Ruhr crisis</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<p>Q: Study Source B. How useful is this source as evidence about life in Weimar Germany between 1924 and 1929? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound understanding and evaluation of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a fully developed response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a developed response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period to comprehend surface features of the source and to make basic claims about its usefulness.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This painting is useful as it shows a Berlin nightclub scene. Going to clubs was very popular in the 1920s and there were hundreds in Berlin. Many people had more money by the late 1920s and so could afford to live it up, as Germany got back on its feet and its economy recovered from the hyperinflation. Berlin's clubs were famous for being very daring and liberated. The painting is a fairly reliable depiction of the fashions and styles of entertainment at the time: the women are shown wearing the latest extravagant styles exposing a lot more of their body than people would have been happy with in the past. Bands played the new jazz music indicated here by the saxophones, and cabaret artists were daring in their songs and criticism of the government.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the source is limited because it is not typical of the lives of most people in Weimar Germany in this period. Also, it doesn't show reactions to these new trends. Society was very divided, and many people were appalled by what was going on in Berlin. Those in villages and small towns saw Berlin's night life as evidence that the country had lost its moral values and they rejected Weimar culture as decadent. The Wandervogel movement grew up as an alternative culture where people went on country hikes and camping and had more traditional hobbies. Many in the rural north east were also too poor to afford clubs.</i></p> <p><i>So this source isn't totally useful as evidence about life in the Weimar Republic, particularly as a painting can't tell us much about attitudes and reactions. However, that the artist shows some of the dancers as ugly and grotesque may show he doesn't totally approve, which hints that reactions and life were more complicated than the scene suggests.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. ‘By 1929 the Weimar Republic had recovered from its earlier problems’. How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that by the late 1920s the Weimar Republic had recovered from its earlier problems.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that by the late 1920s the Weimar Republic had recovered from its earlier problems.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that by the late 1920s the Weimar Republic had recovered from its earlier problems.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source disagrees in a way because Stresemann says that Germany’s economic problems weren’t over. There were huge war debts and reparations to pay after the I World War, and Germany only got back on her feet after 1924 when the Dawes plan lent 800 million marks to pay reparations. This was precarious, as they could be withdrawn, as he says. That Stresemann as Chancellor should admit this in a speech when you would expect a politician to cover up weaknesses and simply take the credit for the improved economy shows he knew how weak the situation was. Other problems also hadn’t completely gone away, like lack of support for democracy by some, shown in the 1928 election by the communists getting over 50 seats.</i></p> <p><i>However, the source also agrees that things were better than they had been, because it says the ‘economic position was flourishing on the surface’. This is true because by 1929 German industry had revived and was producing more than it had in 1913 and wages were going up, contributing to a rise in living standards. Germany had also improved its relationship with other countries after the Ruhr crisis ended and t entered the League of Nations in 1926. Support for non-democratic parties was also falling compared to in the years straight after the war.</i></p> <p><i>So overall, I agree that there had been some recovery, but it’s going too far to say it had totally recovered. Stresemann’s balanced view is justified, especially as it’s surprising for a politician to be so even handed.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p>Q: What was the Enabling Act of 1933?</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 law that allowed Hitler to pass decrees without the approval of the President or the Reichstag (2)</i> • <i>it made Hitler a ‘legal’ dictator</i> • <i>it was to last 4 years unless renewed before</i> • <i>an amendment to the Constitution</i> • <i>a law passed by the Reichstag when surrounded by the SA and SS</i> • <i>agreed by a 441 to 94 majority</i> • <i>Allowed him to abolish Trade Unions, political parties etc. (Max of 2 on consequences)</i>

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Night of the Long Knives was significant for Hitler.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Night of Long Knives was significant for Hitler. They explain more than one way in which it was significant and demonstrate thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one way in which the Night of Long Knives was significant for Hitler.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Night of Long Knives.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>This event was significant because Hitler removed a potential threat to his power in the Nazi party in a very ruthless way. Over the course of a weekend Hitler wiped out Rohm and other leaders in the SA because he feared that they had become too powerful and might act against him. Up to 400 people were arrested and executed, including some who had no connection with Rohm, just because they were outspoken critics of Hitler. Until this point, Hitler had acted against people in other parties, now he removed people he was suspicious of from his own party.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for the importance of this event was that it won him the support of the army. Its leaders were still unsure about Hitler in 1934 and had been worried about the size of the SA and its behaviour. Rohm had talked about making the SA into a second German army which worried them. In choosing to deal with the SA, Hitler won the support of the army so strengthened his hold on power. One month later the army confirmed their support by agreeing to swear an oath of personal loyalty to Hitler as Fuhrer.</i></p>

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)		10	
	<p>Q: Which was more important in enabling the Nazis to control the German people, terror or propaganda? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the use of propaganda and terror to control the German people. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the use of propaganda and terror to control the German people. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the use of propaganda OR terror to control the German people and explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Terror was definitely important. The Nazis set up concentration camps as soon as they came to power and anyone who disagreed with or criticised them ended up there. They were brutal places, hard labour camps with limited food, harsh discipline and random executions and inspired great fear. The SS ran them, and they and the Gestapo were feared as they could arrest anyone and send them to the camps without trial. When dealing with some groups the SS could be particularly brutal, for example, when arresting Jews there was often terrible violence. The police and court system were also controlled by the Nazis, as they filled all the top jobs, which meant that opponents of the Nazis rarely got a fair trial. The whole system was meant to silence opposition and made people afraid to speak out.</i></p> <p><i>But that ignores the fact that many people wouldn't have wanted to oppose the Nazis as they were bombarded with propaganda in the form of pro-Nazi posters, broadcasts and rallies. Propaganda increased support by brainwashing people into believing their lives were better under the Nazis, and agreeing with Nazi racial ideas. As Minister of Propaganda Josef Goebbels made sure that people were constantly told about Germany's latest successes, whether it was road building, the Olympics or the latest Hitler speech. He strictly controlled the radio, cinema and newspapers, so that people only heard what the Nazis wanted them to. In this way, he was able to hide unpleasant truths, and concentrate on indoctrinating people into a Nazi way of thinking, reducing opposition. Rallies every year at Nuremberg also gave the impression that the Nazis were a party of order, discipline and energy, persuading people that they had saved Germany from the troubles of the Weimar years.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think propaganda was the most powerful. Having said that, it is difficult to separate them, because without the terror, there would have been more opposition, which would have made propaganda less effective. So on balance, they are both equally important.</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 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify or describe the use of propaganda and terror to control the German people 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 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of terror and propaganda in Nazi Germany</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i> <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i> <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe Nazi policies towards the working class.</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. The Nazis helped them.</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>aimed to create full employment</i> • <i>schemes such as Strength through Joy (KDF), which gave cheap theatre and cinema tickets, and cut price cruises (2)</i> • <i>Beauty of Labour tried to improve working conditions and offered cheap canteens (2)</i> • <i>all workers had to join the DAF- the Labour Front</i> • <i>a savings scheme to buy a 'people's car'</i> • <i>abolished trade unions</i> • <i>include policies towards farmers</i> <p><i>NB: Only credit policies after 1933.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why did the Nazis persecute different groups in Germany? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Nazis persecuted different groups in Germany. They produce a response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Nazis persecuted one group in Germany. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of who the Nazis persecuted and why.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason they persecuted some Germans was that they believed that Aryans were superior to Jews. The Nazis thought you could divide up the world by race, and some races were more important and valuable than others. They thought that 'lesser' groups were a danger to Aryan Germans and could pollute their pure blood. This is why they wanted to remove them, and so persecuted groups like gypsies, Jews and even people from Eastern Europe.</i></p> <p><i>There were also other groups they persecuted, like homosexuals and mentally handicapped people, and this was for a similar reason, that they were 'imperfect' in their eyes. Homosexuals were a threat to family life, and people with hereditary illnesses were a burden and would pass their illness on. The Nazis wanted a perfect race, and these people didn't fit in.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Q: ‘Nazi policies towards young people were more successful than their policies towards women’. How far do you agree? Explain your answer</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think Nazi policies towards young people were more successful than their policies towards women. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think explain whether they think Nazi policies towards young people were more successful than their policies towards women. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain whether Nazi policies towards youth OR policies towards women were more successful, but only explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways, their policies were successful with youth. They tried to breed complete loyalty and prepare both boys and girls for their roles in later life. So they set up Hitler Youth for boys and girls of all ages, and the boys were trained to be good at sports, outdoor pursuits and even use a rifle, and the girls had classes in homemaking and other ‘womanly’ activities. School subjects were changed to support these aims too. In some ways this was quite successful, as many willingly joined these youth groups and became devoted Nazis: by 1939 more than half the children in the country were in the Hitler Youth, and lots of historians think it was Hitler’s most successful policy. But after 1939 lots of kids complained about it being made compulsory, and some rebel groups grew up, like the Swing movement and Edelweiss pirates. You could also argue that if it was so successful, they wouldn’t have needed to make it compulsory!</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, their policies towards women had some successes. The Nazis wanted to increase the birth rate so Germany would get stronger, and they achieved this because it went up by a third. They did it by offering marriage loans and giving mothers ‘Gold Cross’ awards for having more children. They successfully encouraged women to give up work by banning married women from having some professional jobs, and bombarded them with propaganda that a women’s place was at home, supporting the family. But they weren’t totally successful here either, as when the war started they needed women to go out to work, so they had to change their mind, and encouraged them back to work. Not all women were happy about giving up professional jobs either, and considering all that they did, a birth rate increase of one third isn’t that amazing.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think they had more mixed results with women than youth, so I would say they had more success with young people. With both groups though things seems to get less successful as time goes on, which may show that at the end of the day, they weren’t totally successful with either.</i></p>


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

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

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

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

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

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

