

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A013/01**: Aspects of international relations and The USA, 1919–1941

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

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)	<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>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>	5-6 3-4 1-2	<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><i>NB: Care should be taken not to credit material after 1946, (such as Bizonia or the Truman Doctrine)</i></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><i>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)</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 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>US trade embargoes on sugar, oil and guns (2)</i> • <i>produced anti-Castro propaganda</i> <p>NB: No more than two marks for the Bay of Pigs (or any other relevant factor)</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p>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 3 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> <p><i>NB: The two ‘sides’ are the USA (success and/or failure) and the USSR</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>(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>censorship 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>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 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><i>NB: The focus is on the reasoning why the Polish government acted, not why the USSR wanted action. Explanations must link back to Poland.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<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-</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Gorbachev's actions were very important. When he introduced glasnost and perestroika in the USSR, it allowed more open debate on government policy, including criticisms of it, and changes to the economy. As people in Eastern Europe saw this, they demanded similar reforms in their own countries. When they heard that Gorbachev was also planning on withdrawing Soviet troops from Eastern Europe, they realised that their leaders could not count on Soviet force, so they could be free of the worst aspects of communism. From May 1989 onwards, people rebelled against communist rule in Eastern Europe, and without the backup of the Red Army, communism collapsed. Without Gorbachev's actions, demand for change wouldn't have been so obvious, and Eastern bloc countries could also have relied on Red Army troops to deal with protesters.</i></p> <p><i>But economic problems were also important. This is why Gorbachev introduced many of his reforms. For years the Soviet economy had been very weak, spending too much money on weapons, and it was in need of major reform to improve the quality of industries and raise the standard of living for the Soviet people. Previous leaders had just buried their heads in the sand. Gorbachev wanted to change things. As a result, he introduced perestroika, which introduced market forces and private business, which inspired people in Eastern Europe to want these changes too, as their economies were also a shambles. Crucially, to save money, he also cut spending on defence, including deciding to remove the Red Army from Eastern Europe, removing the prop for unpopular communist governments. With this gone, their days were numbered.</i></p> <p><i>As I've explained, Gorbachev's actions were largely the result of economic problems, so you could argue that as they came first they were more important than him. But I don't agree. The economic problems had existed for a long time. It took a man who wanted to do something about them, and crucially, the way he did something about them that made all the difference.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
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 <i>'attacked Britain and its government'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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>

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

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. 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	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<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>

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: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source 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 main message and produce a sound 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 cartoon, explain a valid sub-message 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 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist's message is critical of America's immigration policy as it is endangering the nation. The cartoon shows a shifty looking 'European anarchist' about to plant a bomb behind the Statue of Liberty, which stands for America's ideals of liberty and equality. Presumably the European is an immigrant, welcomed by America's invitation of 'Come unto me all who are oppressed', but in actual fact the anarchist is going to destroy America's ideals and endanger the nation. At this time in 1919 America was in the grip of a Red Scare, caused by large amounts of immigration, the Communist Russian Revolution of 1917 and a wave of extremist bombings in US cities in June 1919. Many immigrants in the US held radical views, and included anarchists who wanted to overthrow government, and they were blamed for strikes, bombings and assassination attempts. The cartoonist is critical of inviting them into the country and causing the recent troubles.</i></p> <p>CV-Criticism of US policy/ government towards Immigration</p> <p>MM- criticism of immigration but not getting to govt or criticising immigration but not getting to policy</p> <p>SM- US welcomes everyone/ Anarchists are coming/Anarchists are dangerous</p> <p>CK-1919 general strike in Seattle which /Red Scare/1917 Russian Revolution/ demand for isolationism post-war/criticism of 19th century open-door immigration policy/anti-immigrant feeling during war/ social issues in immigrant ghettos/1919 bombs on Palmer homes and others/Palmer raids during which 556 immigrants deported</p> <p>NB do not credit as CK fear of communism</p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<p>Q: Study Source B. Why was this photograph published in 1925? 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 America in 1924. They interpret the purpose of the publication of the photograph to produce a response explaining its intended impact in the context of the time.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of America in 1924. They interpret the message of the cartoon and produce a response explaining why this message was published in the context of the time.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of America in 1924, but they do not relate this to the message or purpose of the cartoon OR they explain the message or purpose of the cartoon without setting it in the context of the time.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The purpose of publishing this photograph was to gain public support for the work that federal prohibition agents were doing and also deter people from disobeying the law. By 1925 it was already clear that prohibition was not working well, as so many ignored the law: in that year there were more speakeasies in American cities than there had been saloons in 1919. Many urban Americans simply did not want to obey this law. What made it worse was that not all agents carried out their work well: poor pay left them susceptible to bribery from the gangsters that controlled the business. Their job was made harder by low numbers and having far too large an area to police. Although they were discovering millions of litres of alcohol, they were unable to stem the flow, and the availability of booze merely encouraged more people to drink, undermining the effectiveness of law enforcers further. Izzy and Moe were adept at getting publicity for their successes to gain prestige and encourage greater respect for the law, and that is why they often phoned journalists to report on their stories and publicise their success, as in this case. This publicity was simply part of the effort to convince an unwilling America to obey a very unpopular law. In turn it would also motivate other prohibition agents to resist the bribes from organised crime, and in general make the law more likely to succeed.</i></p> <p><i>P- gain public support for prohibition/ warn or deter public from breaking the law/reassure public that law is being enforced</i></p> <p><i>M- prohibition is working, prohibition agents are enforcing the law</i></p> <p><i>SM- people are hiding alcohol/ making alcohol/pas are looking for alcohol/ scare people</i></p> <p><i>CK- many speakeasies were set up, moonshine was being made, organised crime was increasing, Al Capone in Chicago supporting rumrunners, Two Guns Hart enforcing law, etc</i></p> <p>NB CK must not go beyond 1925 so Elliott Ness and St Valentine's Day Massacre not acceptable.</p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. ‘Most women’s lives changed little in the USA in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to answer the question.</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 in the 1920s most women’s lives and attitudes changed very little in the USA.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that in the 1920s most women’s lives and attitudes changed very little in the USA.</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 that in the 1920s most women’s lives and attitudes changed very little in the USA.</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 agrees as it says that there wasn’t much change. It says that on the whole middle class women didn’t respond to the adverts and buy the labour saving devices being promoted, buying ‘few of these mechanical aids’. For farmers’ wives lives carried on as before, with the hardship of bringing up a family, doing housework and working on the farm. This was true: most farmers in the 1920s were caught up in a depression spiral which meant their profits fell and they struggled to make a living. This would have meant their wives shared these difficulties and did not have the luxury of free time, flapper fashions or vacuum cleaners. There is a lot of evidence many middle class women’s lives weren’t transformed by the 1920s boom either, and rather than embracing change, many clung to old fashioned values. As a woman writing in America in 1932 she would have observed changes around her, and would have little vested interest to exaggerate, and if she had wanted to, her audience would have quickly lost interest as she wrote so soon after the events.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, there was a lot of change in certain areas of life and for some, which she ignores. In the 1920s women had more social freedom in large towns and cities, and could go out with a man without a chaperone for the first time, drink, kiss and wear make-up in public. More jobs were also becoming available, like working in typing pools and as a telephone operator, which gave more women financial independence, and the fact that advertisers targeted women shows that they had money to spend.</i></p> <p><i>However, overall I agree with the interpretation, as films and adverts can mislead you into thinking that was how women were living rather than how they wanted to live, and a reported 24% increase in number of women at work isn’t that high, when there were so many jobs available in the boom.</i></p> <p>NB L2 and L3. Only top of level if the source is used.</p> <p>In L4, evaluation enables candidate to access the level, quality of CK increases the mark within L4. Evaluation must go beyond basic stock response. Evaluation is likely to be based on purpose/provenance.</p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	<p>Q: Describe the events of the Wall Street Crash.</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>massive drop in share prices</i> • <i>over 10 days in October 1929 (2)</i> • <i>speculators rushed to sell shares</i> • <i>13 million shares sold on Black Tuesday 29th October 1929 (2)</i> • <i>On 24 October the banks intervened to buy shares to hold up the price.</i> • <i>Black Tuesday was the worst day for price falls</i> • <i>Newspaper headlines panicked markets</i> • <i>Prices recovered temporarily</i> <p><i>NB 19th-29th October- stock market crash</i></p> <p><i>We are looking for a narrative of events, not causes or consequences</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	<p>Explain why America's farmers struggled in the Great Depression.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why America's farmers struggled in the Great Depression. 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 America's farmers struggled in the Great Depression. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the problems of farmers and the Depression.</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 they struggled was because many of them were already doing badly in the 1920s. This was because of overproduction. After the First World War the extremely productive American farmers found there just wasn't as much demand which led to a cycle of falling prices and profits, so by 1930 many were already bankrupt or on the verge of it. Demand fell further in the depression, because of unemployment and increased poverty, so farmers were forced over the brink. Huge numbers were unable to pay their mortgages, and banks seized their homes. Farmers organised themselves to resist by barricading highways and farms, but most had no choice but to pack their bags and head west. This was made worse by over-farming and drought. If you keep on planting on the same soil without giving it a rest or using fertiliser, then the soil loses its goodness. Some farmers did this as they became desperate for income when faced with falling prices. When combined with drought in the early 1930s, millions of acres literally blew away in the central and southern states, turned into a dust bowl. Farmers couldn't farm it even if they had wanted to.</i></p> <p>NB credit dustbowls</p> <p>Expect to see: demand falling further in depression, boll weevil, over farming, drought, overproduction, tariffs as a protectionist measure by foreign governments, share croppers.</p> <p>Accept all operable factors, unless they are explicitly pinned to early 20s.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p>Q: ‘The most important reason for Roosevelt’s election victory in 1932 was President Hoover’s policies during the Great Depression.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for Roosevelt’s election victory 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. 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 reasons for Roosevelt’s election victory 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. 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 FDR’s election victory, to explain whether they think Hoover’s policies during the Great Depression was OR was not the main reason, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>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>Hoover’s policies during the Great Depression were definitely an important reason. Hoover and the Republicans believed in laissez faire and so thought it was better if the depression ended naturally, without politicians getting too involved. However as businesses and banks collapsed, millions became unemployed and there was a general feeling that the government should be doing more to help. Hoover got the reputation of being a ‘do nothing’ President. This was a bit unfair, as he had tried to do some things to help kick start the economy, like tax cuts in 1930 and 1931, and setting up the Reconstruction Finance Company to prop up failing banks. However, by not doing more, and by not offering any central government help to those suffering, he lost a lot of support. During the depression, the American people lost confidence in their President and his policies and voted for a politician who said he would do something about the problems: Roosevelt.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, if Roosevelt hadn’t been so appealing and made so much effort, then the Republicans might have got back into power. Roosevelt was a charismatic speaker who promised a hopeful ‘New Deal’ for the American people. He wasn’t precise about what he would do, but this was a good tactic, because he couldn’t be criticised for the details of his policy. What people did know was that he was a Democrat and so believed in active government, and he had a proven track record of helping the unemployed as Governor of New York. People also warmed to him as he had struggled against polio, and so they felt that he would understand their suffering, and he made a big effort on his election campaign to travel all over the country to see the ‘forgotten man’: he travelled over 14000 miles by train.</i></p> <p><i>All in all, it’s clear from his landslide victory that Roosevelt got the public’s support. But it’s harder to say if this was because of his strengths, or Hoover’s policies, as they were connected. Roosevelt’s appeal was made greater by the weak policies and mistakes of Hoover in managing the depression, and FDR’s particular qualities and style seemed so well suited to managing a time of crisis. Having said that, historians have argued that people would have voted for anyone in 1932 as long as it wasn’t Hoover, so in that sense, it was Hoover’s policies and handling of the depression which was the crucial factor.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (a)	<p>Q: Describe the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority.</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>built dams to control the flow of the Tennessee river and prevent flooding (2)</i> • <i>irrigated dried out farmland</i> • <i>built dams to create hydroelectric power (2)</i> • <i>provided electricity to one of the poorest regions in the US</i> • <i>created thousands of jobs</i> • <i>insisted that states cooperated to solve the problems of the river</i> <p><i>NB do not credit 'a New Deal agency- this is not its work</i></p> <p><i>NB Allow 'created Norris as a settlement'</i></p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p>Q: Why did Republicans oppose the New Deal? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Republicans opposed the New Deal. 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 Republicans opposed the New Deal. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge the Republicans or opposition to the New Deal.</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 they opposed it was because they believed in laissez faire. This was the idea that the government should not get involved in the economy and business as they believed businessmen knew best, and markets should be left to perform without interference. The New Deal was the opposite of this, as the government became a major employer, creating jobs artificially to stimulate the economy. They also tried to regulate businesses through agencies like the AAA introducing quotas and the NRA encouraging better working conditions and unions. The Republicans hated this and called it over-regulation by a dictator, and compared Roosevelt and his plans to the economic plans of communist rulers.</i></p> <p><i>They also disliked the fact that taxes were raised to pay for these plans and fund job creation. They believed that high taxes discouraged people from working hard, and gave money to people for doing nothing. They particularly criticised jobs they considered to be boondoggles, created to prime the pump of the economy. Instead, they wanted people to be left with more money of their own to spend how they chose, which would naturally restore the economy.</i></p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)	<p>Q: How far do you agree that the first New Deal did little to help the poor? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the first New Deal, to explain whether they think FDR did enough to help the poor. 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 first New Deal, to explain whether they think FDR did enough to help the poor. 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 first New Deal, to explain whether they think FDR did OR did not do enough to help the poor, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways this is true, the first New Deal did not do a lot to help the poor directly. Many were still unable to find jobs, as they were the least skilled workers, and unemployment remained high at above 14% until 1941. More farm labourers were put out of work by AAA attempts to modernise farms with machinery and new quotas which meant less unskilled labour was needed. In many ways this is not surprising, as the main focus of the first New Deal was not poverty, but solving the banking and economic crisis, and this would only help the poor in the longer term. For example the CCC and PWA were launched at this time to create jobs and reduce unemployment, but these did not create enough for everyone, and the \$1 a day earned in the CCC hardly lifted families out of poverty. Many of PWA jobs were also short-term, some even day-work. The EBA stabilised banks and so meant some businesses could be helped by loans, but the poor did not have savings, so this only helped them indirectly.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, you could argue that by providing people with jobs Roosevelt was helping the poor. He aimed to prime the pump of the economy, lifting people out of poverty by offering them short term jobs, until the economy recovered enough to create its own jobs. With unemployment at 25% by 1933, tackling unemployment first was a sensible first step. Also, one agency, FERA, did directly help the poor. It spent \$500 million provided by the federal government and offered emergency help to those hardest hit by depression. This provided much needed temporary accommodation, blankets and soup kitchens to keep the poor alive.</i></p> <p><i>Roosevelt was criticised a lot for not doing enough for the poor in the first New Deal, and by the standards of the Second New Deal he wasn't as focused on them as he would be later. However, many of the things he did</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 whether the first New Deal did AND/OR did not do enough to help the poor. 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 First New Deal.</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>do would have indirectly helped the poor, and at a time of catastrophic financial and economic crisis he had to solve that first.</i></p> <p>Not left-wing opposition or reference to Second New Deal unless part of clinching argument at end</p>

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

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

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	SPaG	Total
1/4 (a)	1	2	4		7
1/4 (b)	4	4	0		8
2/3/5/6 (a)	4	0	0		4
2/3/5/6 (b)	3	3	0		6
2/3/5/6 (c) 	4	6	0	6	16
7 (a)	1	2	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

