

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A017/01**: Aspects of international relations and The USA, Land of freedom? 1945–1975

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (SM+CK) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>7</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>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 message of the cartoonist is that the Nazis pose a significant threat to Central Europe now that they have taken over Czechoslovakia. The vultures cast a dark and evil shadow over the land suggesting that the cartoonist believes there is bloodshed and danger ahead for this part of Europe. The swastika shape of the vultures shows who is behind the threat: the Nazis. Since the cartoon was published on March 22 1939, it is a reaction to the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia earlier in the month. Hitler had already demanded and taken the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia in October 1938, and now went further and invaded the whole country. The cartoonist is clearly implying that this is a very dangerous development that puts at risk the whole of Central Europe. Up until then Hitler's gains of territory could be justified as self-determination - he gained land where there were many Germans living. However, the invasion of Czechoslovakia could not be justified this way and showed that Hitler was simply after expanding the German state and thus threatening the rest of Central Europe.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist's message: CV: Nazi invasion of Central Europe is a significant threat.</p> <p><i>NB- need focus on Nazi/Germany/Hitler, on Central Europe/Czech and the candidate needs to push the sense of threat, its imminence, dangerousness or significance.</i></p> <p>Main Message: MM: Nazis are targeting/threatening/menacing/taking over Central Europe.</p> <p><i>Needs focus on Nazis/Germany and Central Europe.</i></p> <p>Sub message: SM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • war is coming/tension • Nazis are a threat (no place) • critical of Nazis • Central Europe is unstable/ • critical of appeasement and Britain and France <p>NB Note the CK needs to support message level, and is only valid if Feb 1938 onwards</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Hitler was able to achieve Anschluss with Austria in 1938. They explain to produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Hitler's actions and the Anschluss with Austria.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason he was able to achieve <u>Anschluss with Austria</u> was because there was <u>already</u> a strong Nazi party in Austria, and much support for the idea. <u>Many people were attracted to union with Germany</u> as they saw themselves as German and were attracted to the possibility of economic recovery at a time when Austria was much weaker than Germany. Hitler also used the <u>Austrian Nazi Party</u> membership to his advantage, encouraging them to <u>cause trouble</u> for their government by holding demonstrations demanding union with Germany. This put a lot of pressure on the Austrian Chancellor Schuschnigg, eventually resulting in him calling a plebiscite. Once he had done this, the door was open for Hitler to send in troops to make sure the vote was 'trouble-free', and there was little surprise when the public 'willingly' voted for the union.</i></p> <p><i><u>The attitude of the Allies</u> was also a crucial factor. When Schuschnigg turned to them for help to resist Hitler before the plebiscite, they did not want to get involved. Many British people and politicians felt that Germany and Austria naturally belonged together, and that the Treaty of Versailles had been wrong to forbid a union. If Schuschnigg had had more support from stronger powers, he may have been able to stand up to Hitler and may not have made the mistake of calling for the plebiscite.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDS:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hitler moved his troops to the border - Hitler arrested 80,000 opponents within Austria - because of appeasement - used a plebiscite - League a failure - pressured to include Nazis in government (Seyss-Inquart) - support from Austrians - pressurised Schuschnigg - Mussolini now an ally - economic reasons- unemployment in Austria <p>NB this question is how, not why the Anschluss happened, in other words, what factors facilitated it, as opposed to what Hitler's motives were. Be careful with this.</p>



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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: What were Woodrow Wilson's 'Fourteen Points'?</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 'Wilson's aims at Versailles', 'Wilson's set of ideas'.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>General point to be used instead of a genuine point on the right, not in addition to.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Wilson's ideas for maintaining world peace</i> • <i>Wilson's ideas for ending the war fairly</i> • <i>a set of principles he wanted all countries to agree to at Versailles</i> • <i>included freedom of the seas (1) and setting up a League of Nations (2)</i> • <i>included no more secret treaties (1), reduction of armaments in all countries (2)</i> • <i>a speech made to the US Congress</i> <p><i>Allow 4 marks for 4 different terms.</i></p> <p><i>Accept disarmament.</i></p> <p><i>Make sure the candidate's description is accurate and not confused with the Treaty of Versailles.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why did the Germans react angrily to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Germans reacted angrily to the Treaty of Versailles. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Germans reacted angrily to the Treaty of Versailles. They produce a single causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the German reaction to the Treaty of Versailles.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason is that they were <u>appalled by the 'war guilt' clause</u>. This said that they were responsible for causing the war and should therefore pay reparations. For many Germans, this was totally unacceptable: they at the very least felt blame should be shared, and many believed that their enemy Russia was more responsible for war as they had mobilised first. The idea of paying reparations was also hated. Although the sum to be paid had not yet been agreed, the German economy was majorly damage by war, its people were starving and they feared reparations would cripple them.</i></p> <p><i>Another source of anger was the <u>loss of 10% of its land</u> to benefit its enemies. This was a major blow to its pride and economy. Both the Saar and Upper Silesia were important industrial areas; in total Germany lost 16% of its coalfields and almost half of its iron and steel industry. Many people reasoned that reparations would be unpayable after these losses, and that the German economy would take years to recover from the blow. The Treaty seemed outrageous.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible:</u></p> <p><i>reduction in size of armed forces</i></p> <p><i>destruction of Reich- loss of colonies</i></p> <p><i>unfairness of not being allowed self-determination</i></p> <p><i>did not follow Wilson's 14 Points</i></p> <p><i>diktat</i></p> <p><i>they had already conceded a new democratic government</i></p> <p><i>reparations were too high</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 		16	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How far were ‘the Big Three’ satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied with the agreements made at Versailles. They produce a developed response explaining both sides of the argument and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how far ‘the Big Three’ were satisfied OR unsatisfied with the agreements made at Versailles, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways, the European allies were satisfied, as they got a lot of what they wanted. For example the military restrictions gave both the French and British security, which were aims of Clemenceau and Lloyd-George. By reducing the German army to 100,000 men, the French border would be much easier to defend, and their enemy much less likely to attack. The British got the naval restrictions they wanted; reducing the German navy to only six battleships and no submarines meant the British had massive naval superiority. Likewise, the French were pleased that the Germans lost use of industrial lands such as the Saar as this weakened their economy and meant a revenge attack was less possible The French were also pleased that the principle of reparations had been agreed: they badly needed this money for rebuilding, as the war had done most damage to their land, not Germany's.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, Wilson had less to be pleased about. He had gone to the conference intending not to punish Germany harshly, and wanted to ensure peace in the future through a League of Nations. Although he got his organisation, he believed the Treaty was too harsh, and would make Germany vengeful in the future. For example losing territory like the Polish corridor cut Germany in two and went against the idea of self-determination. Having said that, he had some small victories: he and Lloyd-George acted as a brake on Clemenceau's more extreme ideas, for example of dividing Germany into separate states. Equally, the European allies were not totally satisfied, for example Clemenceau had to agree to the Rhineland's demilitarisation, even though he truly wanted this border region to be an independent buffer zone between France and Germany.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, although it may seem that they were all more satisfied than not, because all got some of what they wanted, ultimately I feel they were more unsatisfied, as all had to compromise. Most importantly all left with big concerns about future security, Wilson and Lloyd George feeling the Treaty's harshness could provoke war from Germany, Clemenceau worried that France was still not safe as the Treaty was not harsh enough. As a result the feeling was largely one of dissatisfaction.</i></p> <p><i>The two sides in this question are Satisfied and Unsatisfied.</i> <i>If only one member is mentioned, bottom level only- all levels.</i> <i>L1- aims and general statements about harshness ‘WW thought too harsh’ etc</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance				
<p>2 (c)</p> 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (ID or desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify how far 'the Big Three' were satisfied AND/OR unsatisfied and produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (gen/ltd response) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the agreements made at Versailles and the leaders' reactions to them.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1144 248 2069 587"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1144 248 1608 288"><i>Pleased/Satisfied</i></th> <th data-bbox="1608 248 2069 288"><i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1144 288 1608 587"> <p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p> </td> <td data-bbox="1608 288 2069 587"> <p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NB Be aware that Clemenceau was actually not happy with the Rhineland demilitarisation as he had wanted Germany split into its separate states. Neither was he happy with the level of disarmament as he had wanted Germany totally disarmed. However, it can be credited that Clemenceau was happy with the greater protection that the demilitarised Rhineland and German disarmament gave him.</p>	<i>Pleased/Satisfied</i>	<i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i>	<p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p>	<p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p>
<i>Pleased/Satisfied</i>	<i>Displeased/Unsatisfied</i>						
<p><i>-WW- got L o N and self-determination: 14 points</i></p> <p><i>-Clem- got Saar for 15 yrs, got Alsace-Lorraine, highish reps, German economy hampered by loss of resources and territory, WG clause. gained colonies</i></p> <p><i>-LG reps and war Guilt pleased public at home, weakened navy, colonies</i></p>	<p><i>-WW thought War Guilt/economic terms too harsh</i></p> <p><i>- Clem wanted loss of all army and higher reps, wanted Germany carved up into separate states</i></p> <p><i>-LG unsatisfied as harshness impacted future trade and rise of communism, worry about Danzig security</i></p>						



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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the work of the League of Nations for workers and slaves.</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>“tried to improve their lives”, “tried to control things”, “reduced the amount of slaves”, “improved working conditions”</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the ILO (1) tried to improve working conditions throughout the world for example banning white lead in paint (2),</i> • <i>ILO (1) tried to introduce a 48 hour working week, (2) 8 hour day (2)</i> • <i>the ILO brought together employers, governments and workers representatives (1), once a year (2).</i> • <i>the ILO collected statistics and information on working conditions in member states (1) and persuaded member states to use its rulings, but could not force them (2).</i> • <i>the Slavery Commission (1) worked to abolish slavery around the world bringing about the freeing of 200,000 slaves in Sierra Leone (2).</i> • <i>the Slavery Commission organised raids against slave owners and traders in Burma</i> • <i>Reduced use of forced labour on Tanganyika railway and reduced numbers from 50%-4%.</i> <p><i>4 marks possible for one group only.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one reason why the Japanese invaded Manchuria.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Manchurian invasion and the reasons for it.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason why the Japanese invaded Manchuria in 1931 was because of the <u>world economic depression</u>. The Depression hit Japan hard, as the <u>USA</u> was one of its <u>leading trading partners</u>, and it put <u>tariffs on Japanese imports</u>. The collapse of the American market put the Japanese economy in crisis, and Army leaders felt that the answer to their problems was to build an own overseas empire to trade with. This was why they took advantage of the Mukden incident to invade.</i></p> <p><i>The <u>Mukden incident</u> was the trigger for the invasion. The Japanese had built and owned an important railway running through Manchuria. This helped them sell Japanese goods to Manchuria and China, and brought in valuable raw materials which their own country lacked. In September 1931 the Japanese claimed that Chinese soldiers had sabotaged the railway: this was the Mukden incident. In retaliation, the Japanese took control of Manchuria, throwing out all Chinese forces and setting up their own government ‘to restore order’. Many believe this incident was a set-up, as Japan had ambitions to build an empire.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>desire to build an empire</i> - <i>army acted independently</i> - <i>secure raw materials</i> - <i>secure a market for Japanese products</i> - <i>opportunism- weakness of League</i> - <i>Manchuria in chaos</i> - <i>KMT threatening to take back railway</i> - <i>Underlining above indicates other possible ids</i>

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 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: ‘The causes of the League’s weakness in the 1930s were already clear in the 1920s’. How far do you with this statement. Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the causes of the League’s weaknesses in both decades to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the causes of the League’s weaknesses in both decades to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the League’s weaknesses in both decades to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some senses this is true. One cause of weakness was the lack of the USA as a member. If it had been a member in the 1930s, Mussolini may have been more reluctant to invade Abyssinia in 1935, because the League would have had more credibility and authority to act with the USA in the Council. The League’s sanctions would also have been more effective with the US on-board. Italy’s invasion could have been stopped if oil sanctions had been applied. However as the US was the world’s largest supplier and was not in the League, it was not applied, for fear the US would ignore it. This weakness had also been clear in the 1920s. When Italy bombed the Greek island of Corfu in response to the Tellini incident, it was Greece that ended up paying compensation to Italy, because Mussolini threw his weight around with Britain and France. If the USA had been a member, again, Mussolini may have been more reluctant to use force in the first place, and would have found the other Council members harder to influence with the USA behind them.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, the League had successes in the 1920s, unlike later when little went right: this suggests that something had changed in the 1930s. That something was the economic situation. The Great Depression which started in America made the leaders of the League much more concerned with their own self-interest. Britain and France could have applied economic sanctions to Japan in 1932, following the invasion of Manchuria, but they were more concerned with their own trade continuing, and preoccupied with sorting out their own and not world problems. This was not the case in the 1920s, when they showed more decisive decision-making over Corfu and the Bulgarian crisis, condemning first Italian and then Greek action. Countries also listened to the League in the 20s, Sweden and Finland in the Aaland islands, and Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. In the 1930s in Manchuria and Abyssinia, Japan and Italy just ignored it.</i></p> <p><i>The League had many weaknesses in its lifetime but these were not all clear in the 1920s. This is shown by the fact that at the start its leading members were able to act reasonably decisively and be successful. It was the added challenges of the 1930s economy which was the real source of its decline.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance												
<p>3 (c) </p>	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (ID or desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the causes of the League’s weaknesses. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (gen/ltd) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the League’s weaknesses and its issues in the 1920s and 1930s.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Ideally answers will focus on the Leagues’ weaknesses and use an example of how one was a problem in the 20s and 30s and then explain another factor that was a problem in the 30s to explain that actually there are new problems which have appeared:</i></p> <p>Also as L2 any narrative or explanation of a failure in the 20s and 30s without relating it to the question (ie an incident explained).</p> <p>Also as L3 answers which do not focus on the causes but focus on a slight misreading of the question: ‘Was the League a failure from the 20s’. Cap at L3/5.</p> <p>Expect to see specific examples of incidents/events explained at L3.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1137 571 2065 852"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1137 571 1603 603">Yes</th> <th data-bbox="1603 571 2065 603">No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 603 1603 651">Failure to apply any/enough sanctions</td> <td data-bbox="1603 603 2065 651">Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 651 1603 699">Failure to use military force/no army</td> <td data-bbox="1603 651 2065 699">Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 699 1603 746">US not a member</td> <td data-bbox="1603 699 2065 746">Aby</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 746 1603 794">British and French self-interest</td> <td data-bbox="1603 746 2065 794"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1137 794 1603 852">Dealing with larger powers</td> <td data-bbox="1603 794 2065 852"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	Failure to apply any/enough sanctions	Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch	Failure to use military force/no army	Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-	US not a member	Aby	British and French self-interest		Dealing with larger powers	
Yes	No														
Failure to apply any/enough sanctions	Great Depression- failure in Aby and Manch														
Failure to use military force/no army	Rise of/strengthening of fascist dictators with explanations in 30s.-														
US not a member	Aby														
British and French self-interest															
Dealing with larger powers															

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (SM+CK) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>7</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>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>Cartoonist Message: criticism of leaders +MM (must relate to Berlin) Main Message: 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). Sub Message: 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>CK: 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>Q: Explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 expts) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the reason it was crushed.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The main reason the USSR crushed it was because they were concerned that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact. 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 Khrushchev wanted to send a message to Eastern Europe that there were limits to the changes the Soviets were prepared to accept. 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>Other IDs possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagy liberal reforms • Nagy abolished the one party state • Nagy announced freedom of speech in Hungary • Nagy announced freedom of religion. • Cardinal Mindszenty, leader of the Catholic Church was released. • The Western powers were involved in the Suez Crisis. • They knew the Americans weren't going to stop them • It was getting out of control as there were many Hungarian protestors on the streets • The power and dominance of the Red Army <p>NB This question is about WHY the Soviets crushed the uprising, not HOW 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>Q: Describe the methods used by Al Qaeda and its supporters.</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"> • <i>use of suicide bombers</i> • <i>attacks on US military (1) for example October 2000 attack on USS Cole (2)</i> • <i>attacks on US embassies (1) in Kenya and Tanzania (2)</i> • <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> • <i>attacks on Western tourists</i> • <i>Madrid train bombing in 2004</i> • <i>Hi-jacking</i> • <i>Kidnapping (1) with Boko Haram (2) (or Al Shabab)</i> • <i>Truck bomb attack on World Trade Centre in 1993 by Ramzi Yousef</i> • <i>Attack on USS Cole in Yemen</i> • <i>London bombings- 7/7</i> • <i>Use of social media/internet</i> • <i>Create 'Cells'</i> • <i>Radicalisation (1) through the use of the media/teachings/fundamentalist Islam (1)</i> <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>Q: Why have some people resorted to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why some people resort to terrorism. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one reason why some people resort to terrorism.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why some people resort to terrorism and terrorism in general.</p> <p>Level 0 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>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>
	<p>Q: How successfully have governments responded to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how governments have OR have not successfully responded to terrorism, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<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"> • The British Government tried to starve the IRA of publicity • Internment • Good Friday Agreement and other significant attempts to sort out Irish issue- Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1994 meetings with John Major



	<p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) 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>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of governments' responses to terrorism. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>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"> • <i>Covert operations such as informers</i> • <i>Working with the government of Eire</i> • <i>Secret talks with IRA</i> • <i>Israel launched a full scale assault on PLO bases in the Lebanon in 1982.</i> • <i>Commando raids on Tunis in 1998.</i> • <i>Oslo Talks</i> • <i>'War on Terror' in Afghanistan</i> • <i>Use of intelligence – spy satellites and bugging against possible Al Qaeda sympathisers.</i> • <i>Guantanamo Bay detention camp</i>
--	--	--------------------------------	--

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by the Americans and British against the Iraqi insurgency of 2003 to 2006.</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"> • <i>laser guided air strikes to target key insurgents</i> • <i>ground war to retake lost land (1) for example, Fallujah (2)</i> • <i>cordon and search operations</i> • <i>use of informants to identify weapons stashes</i> • <i>speeded up transfer of power from coalition forces to an Iraqi government</i> • <i>raids on suspected insurgents</i> • <i>Use of high tech weapons to target insurgency groups</i> • <i>Engagement with the Mahdi Army at Najaf</i> • <i>Internment at Abu Ghraib</i> • <i>Operation Sinbad - Basra 2006</i> • <i>Operation Iron Hammer 2003 – using US air force</i> • <i>Operation Phantom Fury- Fallujah, 2004</i> <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>Q: Explain the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They produce a response explaining multiple impacts that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They explain one consequence.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One 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"> • Created a humanitarian crisis with refugees • Soured relations between the USA and some European nations • Altered US approach to foreign policy • Helped Obama win US presidency • Led to the rise of Isis • Rise in Oil Price • Ruined international reputation of Blair/Bush

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>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.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to agree OR disagree with the statement, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation</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>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to agree AND/OR 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>Level 1 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>Level 0 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"> • <i>There was a strong anti-Saddam lobby in the USA</i> • <i>Saddam had suspected links with Al Qaeda</i> • <i>Saddam's human rights violations</i> • <i>Iraq's oil wealth</i> • <i>To bring democracy to the Middle East</i> • <i>Establish a long term military presence in the Middle East for the USA</i> • <i>Pressurise Saudi Arabia over its links with terrorism</i>

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	<p>Q: Study Source A. 'The grape strike by Hispanic Americans in the 1960s meant that their struggle for civil rights was successful.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (2 sided + eval) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that the grape strike by Hispanic Americans in the 1960s meant that their struggle for civil rights was successful.</p> <p>Level 3 (balanced argument - 2 sided) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that the grape strike by Hispanic Americans in the 1960s meant that their struggle for civil rights was successful.</p> <p>Level 2 (one sided- only 2 marks if no use of sce) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that the grape strike by Hispanic Americans in the 1960s meant that their struggle for civil rights was successful.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response or no response worthy of credit. 	<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>I do not agree with this interpretation and the source only partly supports it. As the source says the grape strike itself was a success. It was a strike starting in 1965 by mostly Hispanic American farm workers in California against the grape growers. It was organised by the United Farm Workers. These workers were poorly paid and had dreadful working conditions. This was mainly due to the refusal of the grape growers to recognise unions. The workers used lots of methods such as consumer boycotts, marches and persuading other workers not to load shipments of grapes. They had support from other unions and civil rights groups. The consumer boycott spread across the USA. The source shows that in 1970 the growers gave in and gave the workers contracts signed with the union. They gave the workers better pay and conditions. It was an outstanding success.</i></p> <p><i>However, the source also talks about 'the many obstacles' they faced in the USA. Despite the source coming from a website supporting rights for Hispanic Americans, this does not exaggerate the problems facing them. The grape strike was only one part of their struggle for civil rights. During and after the Second World War the US Government encouraged Mexicans to come and work in the USA but they soon faced discrimination. Their children went to inferior racially segregated schools, they were often discriminated against when they went for jobs and they were often not used for jury service. There were some advances - the 1965 Voting Act gave them equal opportunity to register and vote. However, many are illegal immigrants without rights and many have no proper homes and work in the poorly paid seasonal jobs. Overall, they still have not got equal civil rights and because of this Chicano movement started up to try and put this right.</i></p> <p><u>CK likely:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the 1964 Immigration and Nationality Act migrants were able to come from Mexico legally, and those who were already there because of the Bracero programme were able to bring family members (because of its family reunification clause). • These people were still some of the most discriminated against in terms of employment rights, and suffered high unemployment, low wages and ill treatment, poor housing, educational segregation and discrimination by the police. • They were far less likely to register to vote. • The grape strike (1965-70) was a notable event which achieved some success. There were also other campaigns, for example by Reies Tijerina in the mid 1960s: he launched a legal campaign to get areas of New Mexico returned to Chicanos. But this campaign was defeated. • The grape strike drew attention to the plight of southern workers amongst people from

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><i>northern states.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Rodolfo (Corky) Gonzales founded a Crusade for Justice in Denver in 1966 which campaigned for better treatment for Chicanos. He worked with MLK on the Poor People's Campaign, and also led Chicano representatives on the 1968 Poor People's March on Washington.</i> • <i>In March 1968 Chavez was also an inspiration to the high school walk outs in LA.</i> • <i>In 1968 Chavez went on a hunger strike to protest for better treatment.</i> <p>NB: The comment "Hispanic Americans still had poor working conditions" or "they faced discrimination" is insufficient CK to be credited.</p>

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		6	•
	<p>Q: Study Source B. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context. (CV+CK)</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the main message and produce a sound response in context. (MM+CK)</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, explain a valid sub-message and produce a response in context. (SM+CK)</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way. (SM/ MM/ CV)</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response. (SF)</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit</p>	6 6 4-5 3 2 1 0	<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 being critical of the Women's Liberation movement that was strong in the USA at this time because it shows what happens when women fail to fulfil their proper role as housewives. There was still an expectation at this time that women would marry, start a family and look after her husband and family. If they did work they had access to a narrow range of types of jobs e.g. only 6% of doctors were women. They even had no right to their husbands' earnings or property when their husbands could control their wages and property. The National Organisation for Women campaigned for equal rights for women in all areas including the legalisation of abortion. There were also more radical feminist groups. They had some successes such as no-fault divorce being introduced as well as the outlawing of illegal rape.</i></p> <p><i>There was a lot of opposition to them as this cartoon shows. At the time of this cartoon, there were nation-wide protests and marches for women's rights. These may have led to the cartoon because there was a backlash against the women. Many people, even women, were conservative about family roles. This can be seen in the cartoon. Many men thought women's rights was a trivial issue and dismissed them. The cartoon shows what happens when women get involved in campaigning. The man's wife is an activist but it is implied she has let him and the family down by neglecting her duties. This has led to the husband trying to cook meals and look after the children. He is shown to be in a terrible state. The cartoonist clearly thinks the woman's place is in the home and that the feminists were wrong and this by the fact that the interviewer can guess the man's wife is a feminist because of the state of the family.</i></p> <p>CV- critical of women's lib/women's movement as women are neglecting proper role as housewives</p> <p>MM- women's movement is active; women are no longer fulfilling traditional roles/critical of women's movement/women's lib (with no sense of why)</p> <p>SM-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • women are becoming more like men • households are falling apart • There is inequality / equality • Women are successful • Women's movement is successful (creditable at SM as actually a 'flat version of CV) but not actually MM.

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p>Other CK possible:</p> <p><i>In the 1960's, organisations like the National Organisation of Women (NOW) were campaigning for equality of the sexes, either through protests and marches in the streets, or through taking cases to court.</i></p> <p><i>They and groups similar were demanding abortion rights, an end to discrimination and no-fault divorce.</i></p> <p><i>Politicization and radicalization meant women attended meetings and rallies, reducing the time at home.</i></p> <p><i>The Women's Liberation Movement was a radical group of feminists in the late 60s and early 70s.</i></p> <p><i>Its attention seeking tactics like picketing the Miss World competition in 1968 and crowning a sheep Miss World were criticised by some who felt they devalued women's role.</i></p> <p><i>Betty Friedan wrote a book called <i>Feminine Mystique</i> (1963) which talked about the frustration women felt with the life expected of them as home-keeper and domestic servant</i></p> <p><i>The Roe v Wade case started in 1970 and tried to establish abortion laws in the US.</i></p> <p><i>By 1970 6.5 million women were on the pill (in 1965 the Supreme Court allowed married women to have the pill, but 26 states refused this).</i></p> <p><i>Schult v Wheeton Glass Co court appeal: women and men but substantially equal for equal pay act to stand.</i></p> <p><i>Betty Friedan's Women's Strike for Equality in 1970 (a large strike to demand equal rights).</i></p> <p>NB. Do not credit generic CK about women being the victims of discrimination so needing to fight for more rights.</p>

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
	<p>Q: Study Source C. Why was this poster published in 1973? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (P+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the situation in 1973. They interpret the purpose of the poster to produce a response explaining its context and its intended impact on the intended audience.</p> <p>Level 3 (M+CK) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the poster and produce a response explaining why it was published.</p> <p>Level 2 (CK or M/P) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the broader context, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the poster OR they explain the message or purpose without setting it in the context of 1973.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the poster and use surface information. They produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>This poster was published in 1973 because this was when the Wounded Knee incident took place. 200 Native Americans and members of the American Indian Movement occupied the town of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. They were protesting about the failure of the US government to fulfil treaties with the Indian people and about a corrupt government official, Dick Wilson, who was responsible for terrible conditions on the reservation. The poster is trying to persuade people to support the protestors who controlled the town for 71 days. They were surrounded and attacked by US marshals and the FBI and there was shooting from both sides. People from all over the country flocked to Wounded Knee to show their support. The American Indian Movement was trying to win more support by claiming that there could be a second massacre. This is a reference to the massacre of Indians there in the nineteenth century. This is a way of winning sympathy for the Indians and of persuading people that the authorities might kill the demonstrators. The other purpose of the poster is to win public support to stop the US army intervening. This could have led to a massacre. Many of the protestors believed that only publicity and public support would stop the US army from going in.</i> • P- call to action/intended impact- to generate support for protestors and Indian win public support to stop US army intervening. • M- Indians are fighting for their rights/the Indians are doing a good thing / they are at risk. • CK- see above in text – this is likely to be about the events themselves or about the reasons for the siege (ie discrimination and mistreatment with a specific example). Or, candidates may also mention Marlon Brando in March 1973 sending Little Feather to receive his Oscar, if it supports their message. • <i>If the candidate uses CK about the Battle of Wounded Knee in 1890 this must be made relevant to their message/purpose about the siege in 1973.</i> • CK must go beyond ‘a siege’ to be creditable.

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	<p>Q: Describe the measures taken against suspected communists in the USA in the period 1945 to 1955.</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 'persecution,' 'witchhunts,' or 'interrogations'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit. • 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Answers could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>government employees checked by the FBI/ Federal Loyalty Board and sacked if found to be communist (2) / made to swear an oath of loyalty (2).</i> • <i>blacklisting (1)</i> • <i>members of communist organisations had to register with the government (1) were finger-printed (1) and were refused employment (2) or the right to a US passport (2). (This was the McCarran Act).</i> • <i>investigations by HUAC into unions, education, the film industry and government (2)</i> • <i>Movie studio bosses like Walt Disney refused to employ anyone suspected of communist sympathies (2)</i> • <i>over 100 university lecturers were fired (1)</i> • <i>Hollywood Ten jailed for contempt (1) for failing to answer questions about whether they had been a member of the communist party.</i> •

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	<p>Q: Why were Americans fearful of communism in the late 1940s and early 1950s? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Americans were fearful of communism in the late 1940s and early 1950s. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Americans were fearful of communism in the late 1940s and early 1950s. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID or desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of American fear of communism in the late 1940s and early 1950s.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2. • • <i>One reason for this was the Cold War with communist Russia. There was fear that the Soviet Union was planning to take over Europe and even the world. This was supported by communist takeovers in countries in eastern Europe like Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia. Stalin's attempt to blockade Berlin, and force the West out, made things worse. The fears of Americans grew even more when North Korea, supported by China and the Soviet Union, invaded South Korea. It seemed to Americans as if as every part of the world was under attack from communism.</i> • <i>American fears were made worse by Senator McCarthy. He began claiming that the government, and even the armed forces had been infiltrated by communists. He never had any proof and in fact never uncovered one single communist agent, but most Americans including the President were reluctant to criticise him because they might appear to be anti-American. He came out with smears and lies and got a lot of his information from Hoover, the head of the FBI. For two years he led a committee which investigated government departments and interviewed and accused people. In the climate of the Cold War this was bound to make Americans fear that communism had even got into their own government and army.</i> • <u>Other IDs possible:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developments in the Cold War- communist takeover in East Europe; Truman doctrine/Marshall aid; Hostile rhetoric v USSR; Berlin blockade 1948-9; China fell to communism 1949; USSR atomic bomb 1949; North Korea invasion of South 1950; fear of nuclear war. • internal factors in US- actions of HUAC; FBI Loyalty Boards stoked fear; accusations and actions of McCarthy: Hiss case; Rosenberg case. • • NB. Factors which are more long-term eg ideological differences are acceptable at L1 but not L2/3 as Qu is focusing on late 1940s and early 1950s.

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p>Q: 'McCarthy's attack on the Army led to his downfall.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the activities of McCarthy and of opposition to him 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. Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the activities of McCarthy and of opposition to him 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. Level 3 (One-side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of McCarthy to explain whether they think his downfall was caused by his attack on the Army OR because of other factors, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. 	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2. • • <i>McCarthy's downfall was due to several factors and not just his attack on the Army. However, this was a great mistake by him. It began when he failed in his attempt to get the draft withdrawn from a friend of his. He was angry about this and began to investigate possible communist influence in the Army. His committee began this work in 1953 and it soon became clear that McCarthy had made a big mistake with the Army making several accusations against him. The Army fought back. The Army-McCarthy hearings were watched by millions on television and McCarthy came over as a bully and dishonest. This also caused the media to turn on him and he was losing support fast.</i> • <i>There were other reasons for his downfall. Some people had been suspicious of him for some time and not just about his attack on the Army. One was Ed Murrow who hosted a TV series that was very critical of McCarthy. It criticised his methods and accused him of being dishonest and of using fear to frighten people. It asked people to stand up to him and there was an enormous public backlash against him. Hundreds of thousands of people signed a petition asking for his election to be recalled. There had always been some Senators opposed to him and they were joined by others who accused him of a long list of charges. He was found guilty of some and was censured. This finally finished him.</i> • <i>McCarthy was very unwise to attack the Army. It was trusted and valued by most Americans and it was powerful enough to fight back. However, McCarthy's methods and behaviour were already beginning to turn people against him. There was opposition growing from a number of directions including the Republican party who were finding him an embarrassment. It was his methods generally that were disliked and his attack on the Army was just one example of those.</i> • <u>Other Factors possible:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Criticism of him- Ed Murrow, Owen Lattimore, • - Opposition in the press- New York Times and Wash Post, Herb Lock cartoonist • - Literary criticism- The Crucible

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level 2 (id and description) Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify reasons for the downfall of McCarthy. They produce a basic response. <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (gen – ltd knowledge) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the downfall of McCarthy.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - <i>political opposition in the Senate and House</i> • - <i>his tactics and failure to produce evidence.</i> •

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	<p>Q: Describe the economic and social position of African Americans in 1945.</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. E.g. 'poverty', 'unemployment'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit. • • 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Answers could include: • • <i>educational inequality- segregated and inferior schools (2)</i> • <i>discrimination in employment - often ended up with the worst and lowest paid jobs (2)</i> • <i>poor housing</i> • <i>segregation on public transport (2)</i> • <i>segregation in other places e.g. bars, parks, housing and diners (2)</i> • <i>segregation and discrimination worse in the South (2)</i> • <i>intimidation prevented voting</i> • <i>determined to stand up for their rights (1) after their wartime service (2).</i> • <p>1 mark only for multiple examples of segregation and discrimination.</p> <p>Students may talk about war experience. This is only valid if they link this to the position of AAs as a result, ie earned respect because of.....(1)</p>

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: The Land of Freedom?

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p>• Q: Explain the importance of Rosa Parks in the development of civil rights.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain reasons why Rosa Parks was important to civil rights. They produce a response with more than one reason explained that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain the importance of Rosa Parks to civil rights. They produce a response with one reason explained.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID or desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the importance of Rosa Parks.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>•</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>•</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>•</p> <p><i>One reason Rosa Parks was important was that she was successful. She was responsible for the mass boycott of buses in Montgomery in 1955 which brought about the end of segregated buses in Montgomery. She was travelling on a bus home. When it became full the driver demanded she give up her seat to a standing white passenger as was normal there. She refused and the police arrested her. This led to 50,000 black people boycotting all the buses in the city. They walked to work or shared cars. Their protest lasted 381 days and finally they won. The courts ruled that segregation on the buses was illegal and the buses were integrated.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason why she was important was that she started something that could not be stopped and brought the attention of the world to the struggle for civil rights. The boycott, the marches and the meetings in Montgomery set the pattern for the civil rights fight for the next ten years. The movement that started in Montgomery was not going to stop. Rosa Parks was important because she had shown that mass action could be effective and that discrimination could be fought by black Americans. Further mass protest followed. This was partly because Martin Luther King emerged during the boycott as an important leader and he learned much about peaceful protest as a method from the boycott.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>showed the power of non-violent direct action</i> • <i>inspired others to commit acts of defiance</i> • <i>led to Supreme Court ruling</i> • <i>success in MBB</i> • <i>led to rise in support for NAACP</i> • <i>brought MLK to public prominence</i>

Part 2: The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)	<p>Q: Which was more important in advancing civil rights in the USA:</p> <p>(i) the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling of 1954, or</p> <p>(ii) the events at Little Rock High School in 1957?</p> <p>Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc)</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the relative importance of the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling and the events at Little Rock High School. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp)</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the importance of the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling and the events at Little Rock High School. 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2. • <i>The Brown v Topeka Education Board ruling was important because it dealt with the issue of segregation in schools. The situation up to then was that states could provide separate but equal educational facilities. The problem with this was that the separate facilities were not equal with black children being given inferior education. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled that this was wrong. It said that all separate facilities were, by their nature of being separate, inferior. This was a landmark decision and changed the situation that existed for over 50 years. In a second decision the Court ordered states to desegregate schools. After this decision that segregated schools were against the Constitution there was no going back and the days of segregated schools were over.</i> • <i>The events at Little Rock High School were also important because it led to the President sending troops to defend integrated schools. Nine black students tried to attend the all white Central High School. When they did a white mob and the National Guard sent by the state Governor Faubus stopped them from entering. President Eisenhower sent the Army in to protect the students and allow them to enter the school. Faubus closed Little Rock's other high schools to try and stop integration but the Supreme court ordered integration of the schools to go ahead. The fact that the President was willing to send troops to enforce integrated schools sent a clear message to the rest of the country.</i> • <i>I think that the Brown ruling was more important. Although schools were not immediately integrated, and it needed incidents like the events in Little Rock to enforce integration, it was the Brown ruling that started everything off. The students in Little Rock would not have tried to enter the school if the Brown ruling had not taken place three years before. So it could be said the Brown ruling caused the events at Little Rock.</i>


	<p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the importance of either the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling or the events at Little Rock High School, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>5-6</p>		
	<p>• Level 2 (ID or desc) Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify reasons for the importance of the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling and/or the events at Little Rock High School. 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>3-4</p>		
	<p>Level 1 (gen- ltd knowledge) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Brown v Topeka Board of Education ruling or the events at Little Rock High School.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p>	<p>1-2</p>		
	<p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>0</p>		

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

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

Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

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

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

