

## **GCSE**

### **History B (Modern World)**

Unit **A015/01**: Aspects of international relations and causes and events of the First World War, 1890–1918

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:

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoon's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid <b>sub-message</b> of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. <b>They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates <b>describe the cartoon</b> and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 supporting Lloyd George's attitude that the reparations Germany has to pay are too high, and he is right to try to persuade Briand of this.</i></p> <p><i>In the cartoon, the horse has been saddled with a huge burden of debt, the 'Unlimited Reparations', which is so heavy it cannot move. This refers to the fact that In 1921 the Allies finally agreed that Germany should pay reparations for the Great War of 132 billion gold marks. Lloyd George felt that this was too high, as Germany would be unable to get back on her feet again, and her economy would be stalled. This is shown by the debt on the cart stopping the horse (Germany) from moving. He tries to persuade Briand in the caption, saying Germany may get going, with less debt, but the French were reluctant to listen, as they wanted maximum revenge and compensation after the destruction and suffering the French had been through.</i></p> <p><i>The cartoonist's view is that Lloyd George is right, as he shows that Germany can clearly go nowhere as it is overloaded, and Briand should be able to see this.</i></p> <p><i>CV=supportive of Lloyd George's attitude to reduce reparations / critical of France's attitude to setting high reparations</i></p> <p><i>Main message=Germany can't function / recover because reparations are too high / Germany is crippled because of the reparations / Britain wants to reduce the amount of reparations/ the French are being too harsh</i></p> <p><i>Sub message = Treaty is too harsh / reparations are too high</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference. They produce a <b>multi-causal response</b> that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference. They explain to produce a <b>single-causal response</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Clemenceau and his aims at Versailles.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason he did not get everything he wanted was because the USA limited what he could achieve. France had suffered much at the hands of the Germans, with devastated land and millions of casualties, and as a result Clemenceau wanted revenge and high reparations. However, Woodrow Wilson and the Americans were worried that if Germany were punished too much, she would want revenge in the future. Wilson didn't fully appreciate the impact of war on France as America herself had not been attacked directly, and joining the war in 1917 meant that their manpower losses were the lowest of the allies at 100,000. Wilson was more concerned about getting long term peace than revenge, so America didn't have to be involved in another European war. As a result, he prevented Clemenceau getting the more severe terms he wanted.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason Clemenceau didn't get what he wanted was that Britain didn't support all of his aims. For example, when it came to disarming Germany, Britain was only really concerned about the German navy. Clemenceau on the other hand wanted Germany's land forces crippled, and with 100,000 men and the country not broken into independent states, he was still worried Germany would be too powerful. Lloyd George resisted breaking Germany up, as he felt it would weaken her too much and he did not want this to affect Britain's trade or strengthen the French too much either.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Identifying what Clemenceau wanted but didn't get is L1 only. For explanation candidates must get to why he did not get these things. Award the final mark for explanation in a level only if candidates refer to both the term Clemenceau wanted and the term of the final Treaty</i></p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the role of the Assembly in the League of Nations.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example '<i>acts as the League's Parliament</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"> <li>• <i>vote on admitting new members</i></li> <li>• <i>appoint temporary members of the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>vote on the budget</i></li> <li>• <i>vote on ideas put forward by the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>discuss and recommend action to the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>elect judges to the Permanent Court (along with the Council)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NB: The question is about the role of the Assembly, not the composition</i></p>


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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the League had some failures in the 1920s.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the League had some failures in the 1920s. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the League had some failures in the 1920s. They produce a single causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the League's failures in the 1920s.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason is because Britain and France were too self-interested. In 1920 a Polish army invaded Vilna, the capital of the new state of Lithuania, and seized it for Poland. The League should have acted to force Poland to back down. However, the French did not want to do anything against the Poles, as they saw them as a future ally in the East in case Germany rose up, and Britain did not want to get involved in sending troops so soon after the Great War had finished. With two of the League's leading members only condemning but not acting against Poland, Lithuania was left to live with the results of aggression.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that the USA was not a member, so larger European members threw their weight around. Italy bombed and invaded Corfu after the murder of General Tellini, and was able to put pressure on the League so that it got compensation for the murder of Tellini whereas Greece got none for the damage to Corfu. If the USA had been a member, Italy may have acted less aggressively, as it would have been worried about the disapproval of the USA as a large and powerful member.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Credit narrative about failures in L1 only</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 		16	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: How far can the failure of the League in the 1930s be blamed on the Manchurian Crisis? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of the League in the 1930s to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of the League in the 1930s to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how the Manchurian crisis <b>OR</b> other reasons led to the failure of the League in the 1930s 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>The Manchurian Crisis did weaken the League and contribute to its failure. After the Japanese occupation of Manchuria the League acted too slowly to investigate what had happened. It was over a year before Lord Lytton filed his report saying that the Japanese were in the wrong, by which time it was too late to remove them. None of the 3 remaining permanent powers in the League's Council wanted to use force because they were more concerned about their countries' economic problems in the Great Depression and did not want to take action on the other side of the world. As a result of the crisis, the League looked weak as it had failed to stop Japan, which encouraged other powers to think they could get away with acting aggressively, for example Italy in 1935 in Abyssinia, and Germany in breaking the Treaty of Versailles, both of which totally undermined confidence in the League.</i></p> <p><i>However, the real weakness of the League was not the issues it dealt with but its underlying problems. The absence of the USA was a blow from the start. Had it been a member during the Abyssinian crisis in 1935, its authority and credibility might have deterred Mussolini from action. If it had agreed the League's trade sanctions on Italy then they may have been more successful, instead the USA actually increased sales of oil to Italy. Another underlying problem was leadership by Britain and France. If they had not been so weakened by war, the League may have been more effective in the 1930s. Neither gave decisive leadership during the Abyssinian crisis as they were more concerned with their own interests. For example, Britain did not want to apply sanctions on coal sales as they feared the loss of mining jobs at home.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, the crises the League faced, such as in Manchuria, revealed its weaknesses, rather than creating them, and so one crisis alone cannot be blamed for its failure. If the League had been strongly led by countries able and prepared to act, the Manchurian crisis would not have been so damaging, and would not have signalled to the world that the League was a paper tiger, escalating international problems later in the 1930s.</i></p>



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the weakness of the League <b>AND/OR</b> describe the Manchurian 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><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Manchurian crisis or the weakness of the League in the 1930s.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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 Inter-War Years, 1919-1939


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the Nazi-Soviet Pact.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example '<i>an agreement between Germany and the USSR</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"> <li>• <i>a ten-year non-aggression pact (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Germany and the USSR agreed not to attack each other</i></li> <li>• <i>hiding a secret clause to divide Poland between them</i></li> <li>• <i>defined Nazi and Soviet spheres of influence in Eastern Europe</i></li> <li>• <i>also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact as they were the foreign ministers who agreed it (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>an unlikely agreement between sworn enemies</i></li> <li>• <i>agreed in 1939</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NB: Do not credit reasons why the Pact was agreed.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why was Stalin concerned about the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for Stalin's concern about the Munich Agreement. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Stalin was concerned about the Munich Agreement and produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the USSR and the Munich Agreement.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason why Stalin was concerned was that he was not invited to join the discussions about what should happen to the Sudetenland. Czechoslovakia shared a border with the USSR so he would obviously be concerned if part of it became German, in case the rest of it followed. Hitler had written in Mein Kampf about wanting to destroy communism and Stalin would have known this so it would be very threatening to have the Nazis next door.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason he was concerned was he believed it was evidence that Britain and France were deliberately appeasing Germany so it would get stronger and fight the USSR. The Munich Agreement meant that Hitler would have access to the rich industries and mineral deposits of the Sudetenland, which would strengthen his military massively. Stalin knew that Britain and France were afraid of the spread of communism, and saw the Munich Agreement as proof that he could not trust the west and needed to protect himself against the Nazis.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: ‘Hitler’s foreign policy was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the outbreak of war in 1939 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the outbreak of war in 1939 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how Hitler’s foreign policy <b>OR</b> other reasons led to the outbreak of war in 1939 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>Hitler’s foreign policy was certainly one of the main reasons war broke out in 1939. Since 1933 he had been breaking the Treaty of Versailles, first with secret rearmament, then publically rebuilding his military after 1935, and then remilitarising the Rhineland in 1936. Every time he did this, Britain and France had reasons to allow him to continue, until he invaded Czechoslovakia in 1939, when they could no longer give him the benefit of the doubt. Hitler was clearly building an empire and had to be stopped, so when he invaded Poland in 1939 they declared war. If Hitler hadn’t bullied countries to gain land and invaded others, then this would have not happened. His foreign policy was to blame.</i></p> <p><i>But Hitler could have been stopped sooner, so you could also blame the countries who didn’t stop him before, for why war broke out in 1939. Britain and France both appeased Hitler which made him grow in confidence and military might so by 1939 he felt confident to attack Poland, which triggered war. Britain in particular wasn’t convinced before 1938 that Hitler needed to be stopped. Some felt that he was simply correcting the mistakes that Versailles had made and would settle down once he had taken the land lost. Others, like Prime Minister Chamberlain, didn’t want a war so soon after the terrible Great War. Economic issues also held Britain back as before 1938 she was concentrating on her own problems not rearming to fight Hitler. But appeasing Hitler was like a red rag to a bull, it simply encouraged him, which is why he broke the Munich Agreement and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia and then Poland.</i></p> <p><i>Without a doubt, it was Hitler’s foreign policy that caused war. As that was only encouraged and not created by appeasement, it is more important. That said, appeasement influenced the timing of war’s outbreak: by 1939 it was clear that appeasement had failed, so war to stop Hitler was inevitable.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the outbreak of war <b>AND/OR</b> describe Hitler's foreign policy, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy and other reasons for the outbreak of war.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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- The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam in the 1950s under President Eisenhower.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam under President Eisenhower. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US involvement in Vietnam under Eisenhower.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>6-8</b></p> <p><b>3-5</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: What was the Truman Doctrine?</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only. <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"> <li>• <i>a policy of the US government for limiting the spread of communism</i></li> <li>• <i>the idea that communism would not be allowed to spread</i></li> <li>• <i>containment</i></li> <li>• <i>it provided aid, money, equipment and advice to countries at risk of becoming communist (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>announced in 1947</i></li> <li>• <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></li> </ul> <p>NB: 'containment' and 'stopping communism spreading' are the same point and should not both receive credit</p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks 6	Guidance
5 (b)	<p><b>Q: Why did Stalin fear the USA by 1946? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Stalin had reason to fear the USA and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about relations between the USA and USSR to 1946.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the US successes <b>OR</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify successes for either side in the Cold War <b>AND/OR</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> 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><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the USA's reaction to the Cuban Revolution of 1959.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, 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"> <li>• <i>at first they recognised Castro as the new leader of Cuba</i></li> <li>• <i>encouraged US businesses in Cuba not to use USSR imported products</i></li> <li>• <i>Eisenhower authorised the CIA to investigate ways of overthrowing Castro</i></li> <li>• <i>sponsored the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961</i></li> <li>• <i>US trade embargoes on sugar, oil and guns (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>produced anti-Castro propaganda</i></li> </ul> <p>NB: No more than two marks for the Bay of Pigs (or any other relevant factor)</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why did the Soviet Union become involved in Cuba ? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba, or events in Cuba 1959-61.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 B - The Cold War, 1945-1975

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 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q ‘The USA gained more from the Cuban Missile Crisis than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> 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>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 C – A New World? 1948-2005



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why the multinational forces could not leave Iraq in 2003 after the Iraqi army had been defeated.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>6-8</b></p> <p><b>3-5</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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 C - A New World? 1948-2005

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in 1981</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Polish government's actions towards Solidarity in December 1981.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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
8 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how Gorbachev's actions <b>OR</b> 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>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
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how these factors led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Gorbachev's actions, the USSR's economic problems or the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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> <p><i>NB: There must be an attempt to make glasnost / perestroika relevant to Eastern Europe in order for responses to be credited as explanation</i></p>

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9		6	
9 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) used terrorism.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the PLO and its terrorist methods.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 C - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how nationalism <b>OR</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to describe terrorist incidents <b>AND/OR</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> 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><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (a)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. How useful is this source for understanding the First Battle of Ypres? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound understanding</b> and evaluation of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, <b>assess its utility</b> and produce a fully developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>some understanding</b> of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, <b>assess its utility</b> and produce a developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>basic knowledge</b> and understanding about the period to comprehend <b>surface features</b> of the source and to make <b>basic claims</b> about its usefulness.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates <b>describe the source</b> and produce a very <b>limited</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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 source is useful in some ways. It tells us the aims and outcome of the German strategy at the time: to cut off access to Calais, and accurately describes the German defeat which helped result in the stalemate of trench warfare, as neither side could score an overall victory. It gives us the perspective of Joffre, the leader of the French forces at the time, and therefore a man you would think in possession of all the military intelligence he would need to make an accurate judgement. In that sense, it should be reliable. What he says is accurate, this was a decisive defeat for the German army as Haig and the British held this ground and kept control of the Channel ports, with fewer casualties than the Germans.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, as leader of the French forces he would obviously want to emphasise the extent of his enemy's defeat, to show that the Allied forces were doing well, and he does that, describing that this was a 'complete' defeat, and that the Germans experienced massive casualties. But at the same time he does not mention that the BEF also experienced significant losses, of at least 50,000, which if anything were more significant than German losses, because after this the British army had to be flooded with new recruits with less training and skill. This suggests the source may be a little misleading. He also chooses not to highlight the fact that this was a battle fought largely by the BEF and the Belgians, and so in some ways is taking the credit for it, which is definitely misleading. It also means he may not in fact have all the relevant details, and in fact, in this extract few are given. Overall then, the source is useful in some ways, but has definite limitations.</i></p> <p><i>NB: This answer is focused on the quality of the CK attached to the analysis. Basic CK cannot get you past L2, even if both sides of the argument are covered.</i></p> <p><i>L3 mark is based on the quality of CK or evaluation of source applied</i></p>

## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (b)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source B. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the <b>main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>some understanding</b> of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, explain <b>a valid sub-message</b> and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. <b>They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates <b>describe the cartoon</b> and produce a very <b>limited</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</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 is pleased that the tank is helping the Allies win the war. The cartoon shows the German army running away from the land they had gained during the war (their trenches?), and the caption 'Good Grief, the worst really is behind us' is a jokey reference to the reason they are running, which is the force of the Allied soldiers attack, and the use of tanks. The Allies are shown attacking in large numbers, with bayonets raised, and supported by the use of armour plated tanks, which look very threatening. This is a direct reference to the fact that after May 1918 the Ludendorff Offensive had run out of steam and the Allied forces pushed back the German advance. The Allies were well equipped and supported by technology like aircraft, the latest artillery and as shown here, tanks. The jokey tone of the source shows confidence in the Allied war effort, as they had at last got the Germans on the run, after the Germans initial success in the Spring Offensive.</i></p> <p><i>CV=<b>supportive</b> of the use of the tank/allied methods to drive back the Germans OR <b>critical</b> of the humiliating nature of the German withdrawal/retreat OR <b>mocking</b> the German retreat</i></p> <p><i>Main message=The tanks are being successful/effective in driving the Germans back OR The Germans are retreating in a humiliating way</i></p> <p><i>Sub message = The German army are retreating/losing OR The British are winning OR The Germans are going to lose OR The allies used tanks</i></p>

## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (c)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source C. ‘The British army was well led by General Haig.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>sound evaluation</b> of the source, to <b>evaluate effectively</b> the interpretation that the British army was well led by General Haig.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>some knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>some understanding</b> of the source, to <b>evaluate</b> the interpretation that the British army was well led by General Haig.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>basic knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>basic understanding</b> of the source, to <b>comment</b> on the interpretation that the British army was well led by General Haig</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and <b>evaluate</b> the source <b>superficially</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The source supports this interpretation, although Foch is not an impartial witness. General Haig and the army command has been criticised hugely for what happened in the first days of the Battle of the Somme, but as the source makes clear, in 1918 he was very successful in pushing back the German Spring Offensive, bringing victory to the British and allied side. This was partly because of his ‘energetic leadership’ which improved Britain’s communication and transport systems, and other improvements he made to the army. Even at the Somme, he achieved his aims of relieving pressure on Verdun, and killing as many German soldiers as possible, so what Foch says this in the source, is correct in some senses.</i></p> <p><i>However, Foch is slightly biased, because as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces you’d expect him to be keen to defend a General he fought alongside, and the military in general. Lots of people had criticised Haig for his strategy in the war, for example Prime Minister David Lloyd George had a poor relationship with him, so it’s not surprising the overall commander of the Allied force is praising him to redress the balance. It’s also true that Haig oversaw a massive slaughter of British soldiers at the Somme, and you could argue that he ought to have been better informed about the strengths of the German defences and weaknesses of British artillery fire to defeat them, which would have made the Somme less of a slaughter.</i></p> <p><i>So although overall this source supports the interpretation, it’s not an unbiased source, and many would disagree with it about Haig’s conduct of the war as a whole.</i></p> <p><i>NB:L2 and L3. Only top of level if the source is used</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation of the source can get you into L4, but the mark in the level is based on the quality of the Contextual Knowledge used. Evaluation must go beyond stock eval and is likely to be on provenance/purpose</i></p>

## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: What was the Triple Alliance?</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy (1)</i></li> <li>• <i>each country offered support to the others in case of an attack by a rival Great Power</i></li> <li>• <i>formed in early 1880s (20 May 1881, but can accept 1882)</i></li> <li>• <i>it was the Dual Alliance, until Italy joined (+1)</i></li> <li>• <i>lasted for 22 years</i></li> <li>• <i>mainly organised by Bismark.</i></li> <li>• <i>Italy was always the junior partner</i></li> <li>• <i>Italy agreed to remain neutral in any war involving Russia</i></li> <li>• <i>Was dissolved in June 1914</i></li> <li>• <i>Romania was also a (secret) member from Oct 1883</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NB: Don't credit 'in response to the Triple Entente or Entente Cordiale' as they were 1907 and 1904 respectively</i></p>

## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain how colonial issues created tension between the Great Powers before the First World War.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain <b>more than one way</b> in which colonial issues created tension between the Great Powers. 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain <b>one way</b> in which colonial issues created tension between the Great Powers. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of colonial issues before the First World War.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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>Germany and France were rivals for influence in North Africa. There was tension in 1905 and 1911. In 1905 the French planned to take control of Morocco, but the Kaiser made a speech saying that he supported independence for Morocco. The French were furious, and in a conference at Algeciras in 1906 Germany was humiliated by Britain and France ganging up against it. This made the Kaiser very bitter and suspicious of France and Britain's new found friendship. His feelings only grew when soon after this Moroccan crisis France and Britain formed an alliance with Russia.</i></p> <p><i>There was also a desire for an expanded empire on the part of Germany and Italy in other parts of Africa, as both were only small colonial powers. This brought them into conflict with Britain, who was keen to safeguard what she had already gained on the continent. As a result, Italy chose to side against Britain, with Germany in the Central Powers alliance</i></p> <p><i>NB- Question is specifically about colonialism- answers commenting solely on formation of alliances without link to colonial issues not to be credited.</i></p> <p><i>CK:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Scramble for Africa</i></li> <li>- <i>Italy lost Tunis to France in 1881 and joined Triple Alliance</i></li> <li>- <i>Entente Cordiale/Triple Alliance set up in response to German colonialism</i></li> <li>- <i>First and Second Morocco Crises (can be separate points)- can be dealt with separately but only if dealing with different outcomes on tensions</i></li> <li>- <i>Colonial issues leading to naval expansion e.g. Germany and Transvaal etc.</i></li> </ul>

## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (c)		10	
	<p><b>Q: 'The race for naval supremacy was more important than the alliance system in causing the First World War'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons for the outbreak of war to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons for the outbreak of war to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain <b>one side of the argument</b>. 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>The naval arms race was an important cause of war, as it increased tension between Germany and Britain. Both countries built up their navies massively after 1900, and after 1905 they also started building state of the art warships called Dreadnoughts. Britain had had the biggest navy in Europe for some time, and was worried when the Kaiser started building up Germany's. Britain felt threatened as it could not understand why a country without a big empire needed a large navy. Although the naval arms race didn't directly cause a war, it did make relations between these 2 countries tense, and encouraged them to think any war was winnable using naval power. Some historians also think Germany was deliberately acting provocatively to pick a fight with Britain.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, the alliance systems were also important. These were formed to offer protection and support. There were two in place by 1914, the Triple Entente between Britain, France and Russia, and the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. Although they were agreed as countries felt threatened and vulnerable after the Franco-Prussian war, in some ways they made war more likely, as countries were confident that they would get the back up of their allies in disputes. This was certainly true of Austria when she made demands of Serbia in 1914, as Germany had already backed her against Serbia and Russia in 1908. Alliances also increased tension, as there were suspicions and rivalry between the two alliances, and by 1914 these tensions were definitely at breaking point.</i></p> <p><i>Both of these reasons were clearly important, but the alliance system was the more important, as although the naval arms race raised tensions and made countries cling to their allies more, it was the alliance system itself that dragged the continent into a war, rather than any two countries. Despite their membership of opposing alliances, Germany had even hoped that Britain would stay out of a European war in 1914, so their naval race hadn't created overwhelming friction. By contrast the alliance system created mutual fears and ties which bound many countries, and meant that the most foolhardy could drag their allies into their disputes.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they describe these reasons for the outbreak of war. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the outbreak of war or these reasons for it.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></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> <p><i>NB: The question is about whether or not the race for naval supremacy was more important than the Alliance System. The two 'sides' of the argument are therefore that the race for Naval supremacy was the more important and that the Alliance System was the more important, no other factors are applicable.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Needs to be directly related to causing WW1 not just increased rivalry</i></p>



## Part 2: Causes and Events of the First World War 1890-1918

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe what went wrong at Gallipoli.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the Turks were aware that the attack was coming and were prepared</i></li> <li>• <i>mines had been laid in the Dardanelles and artillery guns put in place</i></li> <li>• <i>the Turkish army was much stronger than they had thought and was well dug in</i></li> <li>• <i>the allied army faced heavy machine gun fire when they attacked</i></li> <li>• <i>the commanders had been refused aid by the Royal Flying Corps so lacked valuable reconnaissance</i></li> <li>• <i>the troops dug in rather than withdraw, leading to massive casualties.</i></li> <li>• <i>Poor decision making – decided on land invasion over sea</i></li> <li>• <i>Rampant disease in awful conditions</i></li> <li>• <i>Frostbite in winter</i></li> <li>• <i>Old, antiquated maps of the area</i></li> <li>• <i>The Turkish were well prepared by Von Sanders (+1)</i></li> </ul>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why both sides claimed they won the Battle of Jutland.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why both sides claimed they won the Battle of Jutland. They produce a <b>balanced response, fully explaining both sides</b>, demonstrating thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding. They produce a response fully <b>explaining only one side</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Battle of Jutland.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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>The Germans could claim they had won because they sank more British boats than they lost themselves. At the time, Germany was trying to break through the naval blockade which Britain had put around Germany to prevent supplies getting in. By 1916, this had been quite effective and was strangling Germany's trade and supply routes. By inflicting more damage than they received, they weakened Britain and made a success for Germany more likely in the long term.</i></p> <p><i>However, in actual fact, Britain was probably right that it had won. Although it lost more ships, it had more to begin with, and had fewer problems getting supplies to rebuild, as the German U boat campaign wasn't destroying all shipping from America. The German attack also failed to break through the blockade, so it did not achieve its objective. After this, the navy never left port again, so clearly the damage that was done was too much for them to risk happening again. Hardly a clear victory.</i></p> <p>CK: <b>Britain won:</b> <i>GB navy was unphased and was still very powerful Germans were blockaded and had failed to break it German fleet remained in port for rest of war</i></p> <p><b>German won:</b> <i>GB had 14 ships sunk to Germany's 11 GB was embarrassed</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (c)	<p><b>Q: ‘Military failures were more important than problems at home in explaining why Russia lost the war on the Eastern Front.’ How far do you agree? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons for Russian defeat 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><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons for Russian defeat 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain <b>ONE</b> of these reasons for Russia’s defeat. 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><b>10</b></p> <p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>7-9</b></p> <p><b>5-6</b></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>Military failures were certainly important. Even at the start of the war the Russians experienced crushing defeat: at the Battle of Tannenburg the Russians were badly led, poorly equipped and underfed. The German army by contrast was strong, with well trained, well-supplied soldiers making the best use of technology on and off the battlefield to support the troops. In 1915 the Russians put up a better fight against the Austrians in Galicia, but in one year they lost over two million men dead or wounded. Such casualties were unsustainable and Russia struggled to recruit and train enough men. Even when their military held their own against the better equipped and trained Austrians as in the Brusilov offensive, the officers and generals were let down by the Russian High Command who made poor decisions, and failed to capitalise on success. However a much greater issue was its internal problems which meant Russia struggled to keep up with the demands of the war effort. Keeping the soldiers supplied meant there were food and fuel shortages back home especially after 1916, as the Russian railway system struggled to transport enough stock. These issues also contributed to military weakness as with raw materials and manpower in short supply industrialists were unable to fulfil their war contracts. Politically the war also destabilised a weak leadership. There was disquiet in St Petersburg as the Tsar had made the mistake of leaving government in the hands of the disliked Tsarina and Rasputin, and by leading the armed forces himself, he was blamed for their failures. Protests in the cities boiled over into revolutions, leading to the Tsar’s abdication, and the collapse of the war effort. Clearly military failure contributed to low morale, recruitment problems and resource issues for the Russians, but this was not fundamentally the reason why they lost the war. They lost the war because they were not organised to fight it well enough, economically, politically and socially. These problems lay with the leaders and country back home, not on the battlefield.</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>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they describe these reasons for Russia's defeat. They produce a basic response. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<b>3-4</b>	<p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p> <p>NB: You must be careful to not credit description about issues on Russian homefront that did not have a direct influence on the war effort. The issues addressed 'at home' must be linked directly to failure at war.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of these reasons for Russia's defeat. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p>	<b>1-2</b>	
	<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<b>0</b>	

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid for use with questions 2c and 3c OR 5c and 6c OR 8c and 9c.

<b><i>High performance 5-6 marks</i></b>
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.
<b><i>Intermediate performance 3-4 marks</i></b>
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.
<b><i>Threshold performance 1-2 marks</i></b>
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
<b>Totals</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>81</b>

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

