

## **GCSE**

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

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

### **Mark Scheme for June 2017**

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 2017

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning of Annotation
	Blank page
	Point has been noted, but no credit has been given (big)
	Not Relevant
	Level 5
	Level 4
	Level 3
	Level 2
	Level 1
	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	
	Evaluation
	Development
	Unclear

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (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 (CV+CK)</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 (MM+CK)</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 (SM+CK)</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 (SM/MM/CV)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (SF)</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>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist's message is mainly one of criticism of the two Presidents who allowed the Cuban Missile Crisis to get so bad that a nuclear war could have happened, although there is also a hint of optimism and approval that they are now working together to prevent it in the future. In this Crisis both leaders could have caused a nuclear war, Kennedy by reacting with aggression to the USSR placing missiles on Cuba, and Khrushchev by forcing his way through the US naval blockade. How close they got is shown by the fact that the huge hand is almost out of the box, and this implies a criticism that the leaders did not act sooner to negotiate and prevent the risk of war. They seem relieved and exhausted by the effort of 'shutting war down' in the cartoon which highlights the last minute and quite desperate attempts to negotiate by letter and even using the President's brother.</i></p> <p><i>Yet the cartoon also shows some approval and optimism that the future will be less dangerous. Both leaders are shown working together and agreeing that together they must prevent war in the future by finding 'a lock' for the chest. As it was produced only a month after the crisis ended the cartoonist is aware that both sides made concessions and agreements to prevent war breaking out, and he clearly believes this air of cooperation will continue.</i></p> <p><b>Cartoonist Message:</b> criticism of the leaders for risking nuclear war, <b>OR praising the leaders for preventing nuclear war</b> <b>Main Message:</b> Kennedy and Khrushchev have worked together to prevent nuclear war <i>in the CMC</i> <b>OR Kennedy and Khrushchev risked nuclear war</b> <b>Sub Message:</b> Kennedy and Khrushchev are working together/nuclear war is a terrible thing/nuclear war almost got out of control/<b>neither President wanted a nuclear war</b></p> <p><b>NB: CK needs to support the message given</b> <b>NB: Do not credit the 'hotline' as CK</b> <b>NB: All relevant description of the October 1962 crisis can be credited</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2+ exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. 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 (1 exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (ID/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</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 the USA took action was that they were concerned at the changes Castro was making in Cuba. When he seized power from Batista he nationalised US-owned agricultural businesses and gave away their land to his peasant supporters. This created powerful opposition to Castro in the USA and the government responded by banning sugar imports from Cuba, which was vital to Cuba's economic survival. The whole situation escalated when Castro nationalised US-owned oil refineries without compensation, so the US responded with a full scale trade ban. The USA wanted to disrupt Cuba's trade to weaken its economy and in turn, weaken Castro's hold on power, which they saw as dangerous to its own economic and political interests.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason they took action was that they were concerned about the developing relationship between Khrushchev and Castro. When he first came to power it was not clear that Castro was a communist, however by the summer of 1960 he had allied Cuba with the Soviet Union and signed a trade deal. This worried the USA very much, as they felt threatened by a Soviet satellite 'in their backyard'. The Cold War was hotting up, and any advance of communism could damage the USA, so Kennedy broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba in January 1961. He also gave the go-ahead for the Bay of Pigs invasion with Cuban exiles in an attempt to remove Castro from power.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Explanations are likely to identify what Castro and/or the USSR did and show why that worried the US</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p><b>Q: What disagreements were there between the leaders at the Potsdam Conference in 1945?</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>'future of Europe'</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>how Germany should be treated, harshly or leniently</i></li> <li>• <i>how much reparations to take from the defeated Germany</i></li> <li>• <i>details about the boundaries between the different zones of occupation in Berlin and Germany</i></li> <li>• <i>Soviet influence in eastern Europe (1). Stalin showed no signs of wanting to remove his Red Army from eastern Europe and Truman suspected his intentions (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>future of Poland (1): Stalin had arrested the Polish government in exile, the so-called London Poles (the non-communists) to prevent them taking power (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Stalin wanted a foothold in the Mediterranean and Japan (1), but Truman rejected this (2)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NB: credit what disagreements there where and not why there were disagreements (for example do not credit personality clashes or the circumstances around the US atomic bomb programme)</b></p> <p><b>NB: supporting detail <u>can</u> include the reasoning behind the disagreement</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why Berlin was a cause of tension between East and West from 1945 to 1949.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2 exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. 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 (1 exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (ID/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Berlin between 1945 and 1949.</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 Berlin was deep in the heart of Soviet controlled East Germany and Stalin resented that a large part of it was being run by the Western Allies. Berlin had been split into sectors at the end of the war in the same way that Germany had been split into zones, as it was the capital city. Stalin disagreed with the West's ideology of democracy and free-market capitalism, and did not want people in his zone to be attracted by the fruits of capitalist system. It would also make his own exploitation of East Germany more evident, as the West was not stripping its zones of resources as reparations for war.</i></p> <p><i>Berlin was also a cause of tension because of the Berlin blockade. In retaliation to the West unifying its zones and reforming the currency in 1948, Stalin prevented the Allies accessing West Berlin by land and sea. He closed off all roads, canals and railways forcing the Allies to come up with a plan to resource their 2 million people. They did, the Berlin Airlift, but the blockade massively raised the tension between the two sides and meant that one aggressive move could have resulted in military conflict.</i></p> <p><b>NB: do not credit material focussed on Germany as a whole (e.g. currency changes, Bizonia, etc.)</b></p> <p><b>NB: do not accept splitting of Berlin into 4 unless it is connected with its geographical position in the Eastern zone</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: The following were equally to blame for increasing Cold War tensions in Europe before 1950:</b></p> <p><b>(i) Soviet expansion in eastern Europe;</b></p> <p><b>(ii) the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid.</b></p> <p><b>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War before 1950 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 (Both sides exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1950 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>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</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 USSR increased Cold War tensions by expanding Soviet control into eastern Europe. Stalin had been allowed a 'sphere of influence' in Europe according to the Yalta conference, and he was determined to surround the USSR with 'friendly' countries. He interpreted this as countries that were under his influence, and from 1945 to 1948 he made sure that these countries were run by communists. At times communists seem to have won elections honestly, at other times they gained power with the helping hand of the Red Army and underhand methods. Whichever way, the West was shocked and alarmed that eastern Europe should fall so completely under Stalin's influence, which is what motivated their actions in introducing containment. Stalin's desire for control and security frightened the USA and increased tension massively.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USA did not have to respond in the way it did, and you could argue that the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid provoked Stalin. In 1947 President Truman announced that the USA would help any country at risk of a communist takeover. This was the Truman doctrine and was the start of the US policy of containment. The government did not keep this policy a secret and it not surprisingly raised tensions with the USSR who saw it as a direct attack on their ideology and threat to their security. Stalin could see that it worked too, as it led to the communists losing the civil war in Greece because the Americans funded the monarchists. Equally, when the USA offered money for rebuilding Europe through the Marshall Plan Stalin was suspicious, as he felt that the USA was trying to buy loyalty and discredit him to his allies because he had nothing to offer. The US attitude was provocative and bound to antagonise the Soviets, increasing tension.</i></p> <p><i>It is very difficult to argue one of these is more important than the other as both were motivated by the same reasonable goal of achieving security for a nation and way of life, but both knowingly made the other side feel threatened. Both sides were also acting out of mutual suspicion: as neither of</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 (One side exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of Soviet expansion <b>OR</b> the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid, <b>explaining one side of the argument</b>. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (IDs/desc)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify events that show Soviet expansion <b>AND/OR</b> describe the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid. 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 (general points)</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>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>them trusted the other, they suspected and were suspicious of each other's actions, making both factors equally to blame.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</b></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the anti-Vietnam War protest movement in the USA after 1965.</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>campaigned in many cities</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>included many civil rights campaigners (1) opposed to the money spent and so many blacks being drafted (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>supported by famous singers and celebrities (1) including Muhammad Ali (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>included student groups (1) opposed to the draft (2) (maximum of two marks for groups included)</i></li> <li>• <i>reached its height in 1968-70</i></li> <li>• <i>protests often involved burning the US flag</i></li> <li>• <i>protests often involved violent clashes with the police (1) for example at Kent State University 4 students were shot dead (2)</i></li> </ul>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: How was the Tet Offensive a turning point in the Vietnam War? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2+ exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of how the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War. 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, offering more than one explanation.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (1 exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one way in which the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (IDs/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Tet offensive and/or how it can be seen as a turning point.</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>One way it was a turning point was that after the Tet Offensive the government decided to negotiate for peace and withdraw its troops from Vietnam. Until that point, it had told the people of America that it was winning the war in Vietnam, and would continue to fight until the Vietcong were crushed. However, the Tet Offensive showed that the VC was still strong enough to attack in more than 100 places at the same time, and this convinced the government that the war was unwinnable. As a result, Johnson decided to negotiate and make plans to withdraw troops.</i></p> <p><i>Another result was that the media seems to have turned against the war. Before Tet, when most newspapers and the TV reported the war they concentrated on US successes and what they were being told by the military. However, Tet seems to have changed that because it showed that the war was not going as well as official sources said. This made journalists less willing to believe what they were told by the military, and made them more critical, concentrating on more negative aspects of the war. This then influenced the public mood, and even government, after Tet.</i></p>



<p><b>3 (c)</b> </p>	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (Ids/desc)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the reasons the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (general)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the war in Vietnam and the USA's involvement.</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><b>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</b></p>
---	--	---	--

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (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 (CV+CK)</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 (MM+CK)</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 (SM+CK)</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 (SM/MM/CV)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (SF)</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>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist's message is criticising the leaders' approach to Berlin as it is a very dangerous situation yet neither President seems prepared to back down. Both are shown as determined to get what they want, arguing with their fists clenched. The danger is clear from the thoughts they are having about bombing the other with nuclear weapons, shown by the mushroom clouds in their thoughts. The caption makes it seem as if they are putting each other to the test to see who will give in, which is exactly what was happening at the time. Berlin was a city still divided between the capitalist and communist powers which was creating huge tension as many East Germans were using it as an escape route to the capitalist West. Khrushchev was under pressure from the East German leader to use force to prevent this movement, and at the same time thought he could bully the young new US President and prove his and communism's superiority. As a result, he insisted that the West withdraw US troops from the city. When Kennedy refused, tension grew, shown clearly in the cartoon, and there was a risk that the crisis could escalate and result in military aggression. The cartoonist believes that they are acting irresponsibly, and that they should be more aware of the risks they are running by confronting each other in this way.</i></p> <p><b>Cartoonist Message:</b> criticism of leaders +MM (must relate to Berlin) <b>Main Message:</b> risk of war over Berlin as neither leader was prepared to back down; tensions are rising in Berlin; tensions may lead to war in Berlin (place important). <b>Sub Message:</b> leaders are arguing; Berlin is causing problems for them, mocking the leaders (no place), Berlin is at the centre of the Cold War, leaders are fighting over Berlin</p> <p><b>CK:</b> The USSR had concerns over the number of people leaving East Germany via Berlin; at the Vienna Summit Khrushchev issued an ultimatum about the future of Berlin; the two leaders started to fallout at the Vienna Summit in June 1961; in the dispute over Berlin, Kennedy announced he was going to increase US preparedness for war.'</p> <p><i>NB Do not credit CK about building of wall as that was August 1961; the cartoon is about the build-up of tension. Do not credit blockade/airlift as too long ago.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2 exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. 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 (one exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (ID/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the reason it was crushed.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</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>The main reason the USSR crushed it was because they were <b>concerned that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact</b>. This was a military alliance just created in 1955 which would help protect the Soviet Union should they be attacked by the West. The Soviet Union could not allow a hole in their protective frontier of buffer states so stepped in when it became clear that the new Hungarian leader Nagy wanted to remove his country.</i></p> <p><i>Another important reason is that <b>Khrushchev wanted to send a message to Eastern Europe that there were limits to the changes the Soviets were prepared to accept</b>. Since Khrushchev himself had attacked Stalin's memory earlier in the year, there had already been demonstrations against the Soviet-backed government in Poland. Next in Hungary popular uprisings led to the fall of two communist leaders. When Nagy came to power he wanted much greater political freedoms, including free elections. It would be very dangerous for the Soviets to allow this, for fear they would lose control over the government, and it would also encourage other East European countries to demonstrate for similar freedoms.</i></p> <p><b><u>Other IDs possible:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagy liberal reforms</li> <li>• Nagy abolished the one party state</li> <li>• Nagy announced freedom of speech in Hungary</li> <li>• Nagy announced freedom of religion.</li> <li>• Cardinal Mindszenty, leader of the Catholic Church was released.</li> <li>• The Western powers were involved in the Suez Crisis.</li> <li>• They knew the Americans weren't going to stop them</li> <li>• It was getting out of control as there were many Hungarian protestors on the streets</li> <li>• The power and dominance of the Red Army</li> </ul> <p><b>NB</b> This question is about <b>WHY</b> the Soviets crushed the uprising, not <b>HOW</b> they did. The answer must be connected to the reasons behind the response.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the methods used by Al Qaeda and its supporters.</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 'attacks on US', 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'terrorism'</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>use of suicide bombers</i></li> <li>• <i>attacks on US military (1) for example October 2000 attack on USS Cole (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>attacks on US embassies (1) in Kenya and Tanzania (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>attack on World Trade Centre (Twin Towers) in New York (1) and the Pentagon (1) after hijacking four aircraft (2). Max 2 marks.</i></li> <li>• <i>attacks on Western tourists</i></li> <li>• <i>Madrid train bombing in 2004</i></li> <li>• <i>Hi-jacking</i></li> <li>• <i>Kidnapping (1) with Boko Haram (2) (or Al Shabab)</i></li> <li>• <i>Truck bomb attack on World Trade Centre in 1993 by Ramzi Yousef</i></li> <li>• <i>Attack on USS Cole in Yemen</i></li> <li>• <i>London bombings- 7/7</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of social media/internet</i></li> <li>• <i>Create 'Cells'</i></li> <li>• <i>Radicalisation (1) through the use of the media/teachings/fundamentalist Islam (1)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NB: 'Bombing', 'shooting', 'terrorism' and 'propaganda' are just general points and need to be qualified</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why have some people resorted to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2 exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why some people resort to terrorism. 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 (one exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain <b>one reason</b> why some people resort to terrorism.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (ID/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why some people resort to terrorism and terrorism in general.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>NB: This question is about why terrorists 'resorted' to terrorism. Not just why people supported the cause.</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>Many of the people who resort to terrorism do so because they feel they do not have a voice. They feel powerless and have concluded that no one will listen to them unless they use force. For example, the Provisional IRA believed that even though they lived in a democratic country, the government was biased against them. As Catholics Republicans were also in a permanent minority in the North compared to Protestant Unionists they also felt the electoral system did not represent them. As a result the British government would not listen to their demands for an independent, united Ireland, and the Northern Irish government would not listen either because it was full of Unionist politicians. They saw violence as the way to get what they wanted as it would get the attention of the governments and pressurise them.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons the PLO resorted to violence was because of the strength of their enemies. They were fighting against Israel for control of a homeland in the Middle East, but the USA was supplying Israel with weaponry, so the PLO had little chance of success in a conventional war, even though it was supported by Arab states. As a result some Palestinians turned to terrorist attacks as a way of weakening their enemy, disrupting their lives and business because they were too strong to defeat in any other way. Bitterness and resentment against the Israelis was also bred in the poverty of the refugee camps the Palestinians lived in while they were trying to regain land Israel had claimed. This anger was channelled by the PLO who gave idle and restless refugees status and recognition if they joined their ranks.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <p><i>a) PLO are aggrieved because they have lost land b) The IRA felt they were powerless c) Al Qaeda feel they are opposed by an over mighty enemy.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Al Qaeda terrorists did not 'resort' to terrorism in the same way as PLO and IRA so can accept that they thought this would buy them a route to Jannah/Heaven as they had been radicalised.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c)		10	<p><b>This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.</b></p>
	<p><b>Q: How successfully have governments responded to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to analyse how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. 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 (Both sides exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. 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 (One side exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how governments have <b>OR</b> have not successfully responded to terrorism, <b>explaining one side of the argument.</b> They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Often governments have not dealt successfully with terrorism. In 1971, the British government introduced Internment in Northern Ireland to disrupt IRA activities. This meant they could arrest and hold anyone suspected of terrorism without charge. Not only did it fail to catch the IRA's key leaders, it also increased support for the IRA in Ireland and the USA, because it was only used against nationalists and was often accompanied by torture. This was a massive own goal. Equally, when Israel got tough with the PLO they often created bad publicity for their own cause. In 1982 they launched a full scale invasion of Lebanon to destroy the PLO's bases there, which they achieved. However, there were around 19,000 civilian casualties, including a massacre in 2 refugee camps, which massively damaged support for Israel around the world, even with their ally the USA.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand at times they have successfully limited terrorist's freedom of action. For example in 1985 the British signed an agreement with the Republic of Ireland to increase co-operation between the two countries' security forces. This made it much more difficult for the IRA to move people, arms and equipment between the North and Republic of Ireland. The USA has also had success against Al Qaeda, destroying their training camps and heavy weapons in Afghanistan, finding and targeting Bin Laden and setting up Special Forces bases all over the world to target the organisation. Even in the Middle East, the Israeli government's 'Get tough' approach may be considered to be part of the reason Arafat was willing to compromise some of the PLO's aims in the Oslo Accords.</i></p> <p><i>Terrorism is very difficult for governments to handle effectively as the terrorists are often versatile and skilled propagandists, and governments are criticised for negotiating with them. That said, they have had some success. However the main reason for this is usually more to do with changes in the terrorist organisations themselves, eg the emergence of Sinn Fein as the political wing of the IRA, rather than because they have successfully prevented terrorists actions. As a result, I conclude that overall they have not always responded well enough.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The British Government tried to starve the IRA of publicity</li> <li>• Internment</li> <li>• Good Friday Agreement and other significant attempts to sort out Irish issue- Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1994 meetings with John Major</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Level 2 (IDs/desc)</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. They produce a basic response. 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 governments' responses to terrorism. 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>NB: If only one terrorist group is mentioned- bottom level only- All levels</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Covert operations such as informers</i></li> <li>• <i>Working with the government of Eire</i></li> <li>• <i>Secret talks with IRA</i></li> <li>• <i>Israel launched a full scale assault on PLO bases in the Lebanon in 1982.</i></li> <li>• <i>Commando raids on Tunis in 1998.</i></li> <li>• <i>Oslo Talks</i></li> <li>• <i>'War on Terror' in Afghanistan</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of intelligence – spy satellites and bugging against possible Al Qaeda sympathisers.</i></li> <li>• <i>Guantanamo Bay detention camp</i></li> </ul>
--	---	--------------------------------	--

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the methods used by the Americans and British against the Iraqi insurgency of 2003 to 2006.</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 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'counter-insurgency'.</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>laser guided air strikes to target key insurgents</i></li> <li>• <i>ground war to retake lost land (1) for example, Fallujah (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>cordon and search operations</i></li> <li>• <i>use of informants to identify weapons stashes</i></li> <li>• <i>speeded up transfer of power from coalition forces to an Iraqi government</i></li> <li>• <i>raids on suspected insurgents</i></li> <li>• <i>Use of high tech weapons to target insurgency groups</i></li> <li>• <i>Engagement with the Mahdi Army at Najaf</i></li> <li>• <i>Internment at Abu Ghraib</i></li> <li>• <i>Operation Sinbad - Basra 2006</i></li> <li>• <i>Operation Iron Hammer 2003 – using US air force</i></li> <li>• <i>Operation Phantom Fury- Fallujah, 2004</i></li> </ul> <p><i>NB: Do not accept Operation Phantom. This was in 2007</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain the international impact of the Iraq war.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 (2 exps)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They produce a response explaining <b>multiple impacts</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 (one exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They explain <b>one consequence</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (IDs/desc)</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the international impact of the Iraq war.</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 international impact was the damaged reputations of both America and Britain. Many suspected the motives of the Bush Administration in getting involved in the war, and when it became clear that most of the big rebuilding contracts went to US or non-Iraqi firms it made it even easier to criticise Western involvement in Iraq as being self-serving. The coalition also seemed unable to control the insurgency, which made it look weak and made people question US military might, damaging its reputation further.</i></p> <p><i>A connected and equally important consequence was that the war increased support for militant Islam around the world. To many in the Arab world the war seemed to be a Crusade against Muslims and the large loss of civilian life was evidence of the West's careless attitude. Terrorist cells and attacks in the US and UK often claim to be revenge for Western involvement in Iraq, and Intelligence reports believe the Iraq war has had a key role in increasing the threat of terrorism in the West.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created a humanitarian crisis with refugees</li> <li>• Soured relations between the USA and some European nations</li> <li>• Altered US approach to foreign policy</li> <li>• Helped Obama win US presidency</li> <li>• Led to the rise of Isis</li> <li>• Rise in Oil Price</li> <li>• Ruined international reputation of Blair/Bush</li> </ul>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p><b>Q: “The main reason for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 was because Saddam Hussein refused to co-operate with UN weapons inspectors.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq 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 (Both sides exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq 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 (One side exp)</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to agree <b>OR</b> disagree with the statement, <b>explaining one side of the argument.</b> They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation</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 believe this was the pretext for the invasion, but not the root cause. After the First Gulf War in 1991 the Iraqis were forced to accept UN inspections to ensure they had destroyed all chemical weapons and other weapons sites. However, Saddam Hussein resented this because he did not want to appear to be pushed about by the USA and the West, or appear weak to his enemy Iran when the inspectors confirmed no WMDs, so in the late 1990s and 2001 he refused access to these inspectors. The USA and the UK pushed the UN Security Council for a resolution on the issue, so they could take action, because they were concerned about the growing threat Saddam represented. He treated his own people brutally, and there was a strong chance that he had WMDs, intelligence sources said. After all, if he didn't have them, why was he refusing to allow the inspectors in? When they got this resolution they convinced themselves they had the right to take action against Saddam, and coalition forces invaded.</i></p> <p><i>However, if this is all Saddam had done, it is unlikely there would have been an invasion. Just as important was the leadership of the USA at the time, and what had happened in September 2001. George W Bush was the son of the President who had led the USA during the first Gulf War, when Saddam led Iraq to invade Kuwait, and many felt he wanted to complete his father's 'unfinished business' in the region by removing Saddam from power. He was impatient that Hussein was still in power, despite all US efforts to undermine his support in the years that followed the first war. He was also surrounded by neo-cons who believed in regime change in Iraq to secure US access to Middle Eastern oil and support their ally Israel. Without this leadership which already had Iraq in its sites, it is much less likely Iraq would have been invaded. After 9/11 this became even more likely, as there was a suspicion or excuse that Iraq was involved with Al Qaeda's actions, and as the war on terror had had such early success in Afghanistan, the USA was confident of success in Iraq. It was this which encouraged it to push for the UN resolution.</i></p> <p><i>Saddam's lack of co-operation with the UN gave the US the excuse they wanted to ask the UN for a resolution to take action against Iraq. But in reality, Saddam's lack of co-operation was only the final straw, and the opportunity for the invasion. The war had much deeper roots, and most of them lay in the USA and with its leaders.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to agree <b>AND/OR</b> disagree that the main reason for the invasion of Iraq was because of Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors. They produce a basic response, only identifying or describing factors.</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 reasons for the invasion of Iraq or Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors.</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>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>There was a strong anti-Saddam lobby in the USA</i></li> <li>• <i>Saddam had suspected links with Al Qaeda</i></li> <li>• <i>Saddam's human rights violations</i></li> <li>• <i>Iraq's oil wealth</i></li> <li>• <i>To bring democracy to the Middle East</i></li> <li>• <i>Establish a long term military presence in the Middle East for the USA</i></li> <li>• <i>Pressurise Saudi Arabia over its links with terrorism</i></li> </ul>

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		6	1.
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. Why did Hitler make this speech at a Nuremberg rally? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the <b>purpose</b> of the speech to produce a response explaining its context and its intended impact on the intended audience.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the <b>message</b> of the speech and produce a response explaining why Hitler made it.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the context, but they do not relate them to the purpose of the source <b>OR</b> they explain the purpose or message without setting it in the context of the 1930s.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates paraphrase the speech and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit</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>Hitler made this speech to get people to accept his ideas for the future of Germany and the place of the youth of Germany in these plans. The Nuremberg Rally was the place to do this because it was the annual rally of the Nazi Party and a massive propaganda event with hundreds of thousands of members of the party attending. The rallies were filmed so more people could see them. They were meant to show how the Nazi party and the German people were united. This meant it was the ideal place for Hitler to get his messages across. In this speech Hitler is explaining the importance of young people for the future of Nazi Germany. He wants them to be healthy, fit, fast and tough to an extent that they are 'a new type of human being'. This is justifying the emphasis on physical education and athletics in the school curriculum and the Hitler Youth. This was because Hitler saw young people as the future soldiers and mothers that would keep Nazi Germany strong. He is indoctrinating the German people to accept that they, and their children, belong to the Nazi state and that their education will never end. He is also making sure that parents bring their children up in the right way, devoted to the Nazi party, and that the children listening understand their duty towards the country and the party.</i></p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> This can be accessed 3 ways:  <i>Mental impact</i> - encouraging support for racial or education policies.  <i>Physical response</i> - for parents to encourage their children to join the Hitler Youth, accept/support the new education system.  <i>Nuremberg</i> - to explain purpose of engendering support.</p> <p><b>Message:</b> Hitler is trying to create a super race, changing the education policy, Hitler wants to create soldiers, show education policies are good.</p> <p>General points about Nuremberg rallies are Level 2</p>

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		7	2.
	<p><b>Q: Study Source B. How useful is this source as evidence about the 'Strength Through Joy' programme? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound understanding and evaluation of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a fully developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a developed response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period to paraphrase the source and to make basic claims about its usefulness.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</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>In one way this source is not very useful evidence about the Strength Through Joy programme because it shows only one part of it. It was set up by the Nazis to show the German people the advantages of National Socialism and a Nazi government. It was also designed to eliminate class divisions in Germany and unite the German people by letting them all enjoy middle class leisure activities like going on holiday, especially cruises, going to concerts and going hiking. It was also designed to stimulate the German economy by helping the tourist industry. The source tells us little about any of this.</i></p> <p><i>However, it does show another important part of the programme - the people's car. This was meant to be an inexpensive car that all workers could afford. They would pay for it through instalments by buying stamps which were collected in a savings book until they had enough for the car. The poster shows the promises that were made to the German people. In an idyllic scene the German family has a car of their own and can go on picnics in the wonderful German countryside. In this way the poster is very useful in showing the kind of world that the Nazis were promising people through the Strength Through Joy programme. The swastika on the poster makes sure that people remember it all comes from the Nazis.</i></p> <p><i>The problem is that this poster gives a misleading picture of reality. Although millions of people went on KdF holidays, not one person received the car because the factories were turned over to producing armaments for the war. This does not mean that it is not useful evidence, because it does show how Strength Through Joy was designed to win over the German people by giving them dreams and promises.</i></p>

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)	<p><b>Q: Study Source C. 'Women contributed to Nazi Germany by going out to work'. 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 sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that women contributed to Nazi Germany by going out to work.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that women contributed to Nazi Germany by going out to work.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that women contributed to Nazi Germany by going out to work.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>3.</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>4. <i>I do not entirely agree with this interpretation. The source appears to support it because it shows young German women working on a farm. However, it needs to be used with care. The date is 1942 - during the war. By this date most German men were in the armed forces and there was a shortage of workers so women were used. Even girls in the League of German Maidens, like those in the photograph, were sent to work in factories and on farms. While they did important work and were contributing to Nazi Germany, this was a time of emergency and does not represent women's contribution for the earlier part of the period. Also it is a piece of propaganda published to raise everyone's spirits in time of war and to encourage other women to work. It shows a group of women who are patriotic and happily working hard for the country. However, back in 1933 Hitler wanted them to be mothers and to raise the birth rate so that there were lots of future German soldiers. They were encouraged to get married, stay at home and have large families. They were given loans to get married and rewarded for having children. By 1936 the birth rate had gone up. However, by 1937 Germany was rearming and men were joining the army. Suddenly, the Nazis wanted women to contribute by having jobs. They were needed in armaments factories and on farms. A compulsory 'duty year' was introduced for all women when they were old enough to work. The number of women working did go up considerably but they were still expected to have children and were even encouraged to become pregnant by racially pure SS men.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Overall, the interpretation is partly right. From 1937 onwards and throughout the war, women made an enormously important contribution by working. However, they also contributed in another way, which was to raise the birth rate by having lots of children.</i></p>

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the events of the Kapp Putsch of 1920.</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 'a putsch is an attempt to take over the government' or 'putsch is a rebellion'</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 German government ordered the disbandment of two brigades of Freikorps (1): they refused (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>one brigade marched into Berlin (1)</i></li> <li>• <i>the army refused to fire on it (1) and the Freikorps took control of government buildings (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>the government fled (1)</i></li> <li>• <i>Kapp announced a new government (1)</i></li> <li>• <i>Ebert called on workers in Berlin to go on strike (1)</i></li> <li>• <i>Kapp fled and the putsch collapsed (1)</i></li> </ul>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	<p><b>Q: Why did France occupy the Ruhr in 1923? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why France occupied the Ruhr in 1923. 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 France occupied the Ruhr in 1923. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of events in the French occupation of the Ruhr.</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>France occupied the Ruhr in 1923 because Germany was not keeping to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles which France wanted enforced. Germany was behind with the reparation payments laid down in the Treaty of Versailles. Germany had enormous economic problems and was finding it hard to keep up with the payments. The French thought that Germany had got off lightly in the Treaty and so were determined that Germany should keep to its terms. Under the terms of the Treaty they had a right to carry out this occupation if Germany was not paying the reparations. They thought that Germany could pay and was just trying to avoid the punishment. When in 1922 Germany asked for the second time for more time the French had had enough. French troops went over the border into the Ruhr to put pressure on Germany to pay.</i></p> <p><i>It was the Ruhr that they occupied because this was the richest industrial area of Germany. This was the place to target if France wanted to hurt Germany. There was iron and steel produced here as well as lots of coal and manufactured goods. The French planned to take much of this in place of the reparations. They probably preferred the goods because the German mark was almost worthless due to inflation.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p><b>Q: 'The economic problems of 1919-23 undermined the Weimar Republic for the rest of its existence.' 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 Weimar Republic, its problems and its achievements. 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 Weimar Republic and its problems and achievements to explain how far they agree that economic problems undermined it. 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 Weimar Republic and its problems or achievements to explain whether they think it was undermined for the rest of its existence by the early economic problems, <b>explaining one side of the argument.</b> They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p><b>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>Between 1919-23 Germany suffered great economic problems. Germany came out of the war and the Treaty of Versailles much weakened economically. It lost important industrial areas like the Saarland and Upper Silesia. It also had to pay £6,600 million in reparations. Things got worse with the hyperinflation. People saw their savings wiped out and smaller businesses suffered badly. Soon unemployment was rising quickly. The Weimar Republic was in a desperate state and this explains why there were attempts to overthrow it such as the Munich Putsch. Many Germans blamed all this on the Weimar Republic which looked very weak.</i></p> <p><i>However, it could be argued that these economic problems did not undermine the Weimar Republic for the rest of its existence. In 1923 Stresemann became Chancellor and improved the situation enormously. He solved inflation by bringing in a new currency, the Rentenmark. He also stopped printing money and cut government spending. He also negotiated the Dawes Plan which led to the USA lending Germany money to get itself out of trouble and make the reparation payments which were reduced in size. These actions brought back confidence in the German economy, unemployment went down and people invested in German industry again. After 1924 Germany was much stronger economically and if it had not been for the Great Depression the Weimar Republic could have survived and thrived - in 1930 Germany was one of the world's leading exporters of goods. So it cannot be said that the economic problems undermined the Weimar Republic. It had recovered.</i></p> <p><i>However despite the recovery of the Weimar Republic and restored confidence in the government, I agree with the interpretation because even without the Great Depression the Weimar Republic was still weak at the end of the 1920s. This was as a result of their debt to the Allies and the hyperinflation crisis before 1923. Because of these problems the German economy still depended on US loans and when these were taken away, in 1930, the recovery collapsed. This weakness can also be seen by the fact that in the late 1920s there was still a lot of unemployment in Germany, farming had not recovered and there were extremes of wealth and poverty. The economy was not stable and as soon as the US loans were withdrawn the Republic began to collapse.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify ways in which the Weimar Republic was/was not undermined by early economic problems. They produce a basic response. 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 Weimar Republic and its strengths and weaknesses. 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>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p><b>Q: Why was the Munich Putsch important to the Nazi Party in the period 1924 to 1929? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Munich Putsch was important to the Nazi Party 1924-1929. Their response explains more than one reason and 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 Munich Putsch was important to the Nazi Party 1924 to 1929. Their response explains one reason.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the consequences of the Munich Putsch.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The Munich Putsch was important to the Nazis in several ways. First the trial of Hitler and the other leaders for treason in 1924 was a triumph for the Nazis. It gave Hitler a national audience for the first time and he used it to explain his ideas and beliefs. He spoke very effectively and got across his message that it was the Weimar leaders that were guilty of treason rather than him and that they had let Germany down. His views were reported across Germany and it was clear that he was now the leader of the extreme right-wing throughout Germany. This was a position he did not have before the Putsch. His sentence was only five years which was very lenient for treason. This reinforced his reputation as a talented and skilled leader.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason why it was important was that it taught Hitler that violence was not the right way to gain power. He had tried this and it had failed. He decided that he had to change tactics and gain power legally. This led to a reorganisation of the Nazi party and a focus on propaganda and winning votes. They made much use of public meetings, speeches and election posters. The Nazis saw all this as crucial and even trained their members in public speaking and sent them out across the country. They also put a lot of effort into winning the support of the middle classes and farmers by focusing on issues that mattered to them. This all paid off by 1928 when membership of the party doubled. This had all been brought about by the failure of the Putsch.</i></p>

## Part 2: Germany 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)		10	
	<p><b>Q: Which was more important to the Nazis, the Reichstag Fire or the Enabling Act? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act to explain which was more important to the Nazis. 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 Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act to explain which was more important to the Nazis. 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 period to explain whether the Reichstag Fire <b>OR</b> the Enabling Act was more important to the Nazis, <b>explaining one side of the argument</b>. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation</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 Reichstag Fire was very important for Hitler because it enabled him to discredit the Communists who were Hitler's most dangerous opponents at the time. It allowed him to blame the Communists for starting the fire and show that they were plotting against the government. Hitler was desperate to deal with the Communists and the fire gave him the opportunity. In fact the Nazis may even have started the fire themselves to give them the opportunity. Communist leaders were imprisoned and Hitler was able to get President Hindenberg to pass an emergency decree which allowed Hitler to rule by decree and restricted freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. It was the start of the Nazi dictatorship because the Communist Party had been banned and the Nazis could now put their opponents into concentration camps without trial.</i></p> <p><i>The Enabling Act was also very important to the Nazis because they could not get an overall majority in the Reichstag. This meant Hitler could not carry on with the Nazi revolution until he got the constitution changed to give him absolute power because there were enough MPs from other parties to oppose him. The Enabling Act gave the Nazis the power to make laws without the approval of the Reichstag or the President and made Hitler a dictator. It meant that the Reichstag was now irrelevant and that Hitler could do what he liked. Without it he would have had constant battles in the Reichstag to get laws through. The Nazi revolution could now take place and this would not have been possible without the Enabling Act. Trade Unions were banned and their leaders were sent to concentration camps. All the money and members of these unions were simply given to a new Nazi organisation. The workers were now controlled by the Nazis. All other political parties were banned and all state institutions like the Civil Service were brought under Nazi control.</i></p> <p><i>The Enabling Act was more important because after the Reichstag Fire and the emergency decree, the Nazi plans could still be stopped by Hindenberg. He could cancel the emergency decree and Hitler could still not be sure of getting his reforms through the Reichstag. The Enabling Act changed all that and basically allowed the Nazis to do what they wanted.</i></p>

	<p>are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify or describe reasons why the Reichstag Fire <b>and/or</b> the Enabling Act was more important to the Nazis. 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 Reichstag Fire and/or the Enabling Act.</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>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	
--	---	--------------------------------	--

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

<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 2017

