

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 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>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use 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>	7 7 5-6 3-4 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'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>Cartoonist Message: criticism of the leaders for risking nuclear war, OR praising the leaders for preventing nuclear war</p> <p>Main Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev have worked together to prevent nuclear war OR Kennedy and Khrushchev risked nuclear war</p> <p>Sub Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev are working together nuclear war is a terrible thing nuclear war almost got out of control neither President wanted a nuclear war</p> <p><i>NB: CK needs to support the message given NB: Do not credit the 'hotline' as CK NB: All relevant description of the October 1962 crisis can be credited</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. 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 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</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 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>NB: Explanations are likely to identify what Castro and/or the USSR did and show why that worried the US</p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>Q: What disagreements were there between the leaders at the Potsdam Conference 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, 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"> • <i>how Germany should be treated, harshly or leniently</i> • <i>how much reparations to take from the defeated Germany</i> • <i>details about the boundaries between the different zones of occupation in Berlin and Germany</i> • <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> • <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> • <i>Stalin wanted a foothold in the Mediterranean and Japan (1), but Truman rejected this (2)</i> <p>NB: credit what disagreements there were and not why there were disagreements (for example do not credit personality clashes or the circumstances around the US atomic bomb programme)</p> <p>NB: supporting detail <u>can</u> include the reasoning behind the disagreement</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why Berlin was a cause of tension between East and West from 1945 to 1949.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. 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 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Berlin between 1945 and 1949.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that 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>NB: do not credit material focussed on Germany as a whole (e.g. currency changes, Bizonia, etc.) NB: do not accept splitting of Berlin into 4 unless it is connected with its geographical position in the Eastern zone</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(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: The following were equally to blame for increasing Cold War tensions in Europe before 1950:</p> <p>(i) Soviet expansion in eastern Europe; (ii) the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid.</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) 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>Level 4 (Both sides exp) 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>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of Soviet expansion OR the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid, 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>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify events that show Soviet expansion AND/OR 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>Level 1 (general points) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Cold War.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>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>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</p>



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


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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: How was the Tet Offensive a turning point in the Vietnam War? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) 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>Level 2 (1 exp) 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>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Tet offensive and/or how it can be seen as a turning point.</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 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>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: ‘The Cold War was the main reason the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s’. 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 the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam 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 the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam 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 argue that the Cold War OR another factor was the main reason the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	10 10 7-9 5-6	<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>I definitely agree that the Cold War was an important reason. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the USA was involved in a Cold War against the USSR, in an attempt to prove its superiority and contain the spread of communism. Anywhere there was a risk of the spread of communism, the USA saw it as its duty to help the anti-communists. It was worried about a domino theory happening, and believed that after China had become communist in 1949 that there was a real risk of South East Asia falling too. As a result, throughout the 1950s it helped the South Vietnam government led by Diem, as he tried to crush communist rebels.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, it was not just about the Cold War. US Presidents had their reputation to think about, and they knew that if they appeared tough on communism, then that would get them a lot of support and votes from the US public. Kennedy in particular talked tough on communism in his election campaign and increased US involvement massively. There were also lots of short-term triggers in 1964 and 1965, which led to Johnson increasing involvement. For example in the Gulf of Tonkin incident the US believed their ships were fired on by a North Vietnamese patrol boats, which allowed Johnson to pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to increase involvement. In 1965 a US airbase at Pleiku was attacked, which was the final straw for Johnson, and led to him sending in the first ground troops.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, neither of these short-term triggers would have happened if the USA had not been involved in Vietnam already, helping the South against the communists, because of the Cold War. Also, the political gain for the Presidents if they talked tough on communism only gained votes because of the Cold War at the time. As a result, I have to conclude that the Cold War was the most important reason.</i></p> <p>NB: Do not credit support for France NB: Candidates might use information for either side but it must not be credited for both NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</p>

<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 (Ids/desc) 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>Level 1 (general) 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>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 factors candidates could highlight contrasting to Cold War</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VC winning • Military industrial complex • to prop up Diem • As a response to provocation (Gulf of Tonkin) • Red Scare • Presidential reputation • to protect US troops <p>Candidates may include these factors as part of Cold War if they construct their argument in that way. However, they could also very reasonably be argued as other factors, separate from the global Cold War.</p>
---	--	---	---

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (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 exps) 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><u>Other IDs possible:</u></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 <i>'attacks on US', 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'terrorism'</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>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. 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. 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. 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: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. Why did President Roosevelt make this broadcast on the radio in 1933? 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 1933. They interpret the purpose of the broadcast being made to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</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 intended and produce a response explaining why it was broadcast.</p> <p>Level 2 (P/M/CK) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the broader context, but they do not relate it to the purpose of the broadcast OR they explain the purpose or message without setting it in the context of 1933.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the broadcast and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 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>Roosevelt made this broadcast because he wanted to maintain the support of the public who had recently elected him. He needed to explain what he was doing and why during the first hundred days, so they would trust him, even when he was doing unusual things which his critics could use against him. Roosevelt used the radio because by 1933 tens of millions had been sold, and it was the most personal and direct way of communicating with the whole nation. These radio broadcasts were known as his 'fireside chats', and were always made on Sundays so people were more likely to be at home. In the first 'chat' he explained how he planned to handle the banking crisis, and this second one was about putting America back to work and offering emergency relief. That is why he explains how the CCC would give young men jobs in forestry, and FERA would have 500 million dollars to provide 'immediate relief' to help the poor. Some of these measures were controversial, for example in the past it had always been state governments who had provided help for the poor. FDR explains that he is not replacing the states but helping them do their job. FDR wanted above all to raise the confidence of the people in him and the future, and he believed if he could speak to the public simply and directly, he would achieve this.</i></p> <p><i>P- maintain support/gain support/reassure public/ give the public confidence</i></p> <p><i>M- FDR has a plan/plan will work/he will have a positive impact on America. The message will need to be positive.</i></p> <p><i>SM (L2 creditable)- any inference short of message- he is doing things/is introducing the New Deal.</i></p> <p><i>CK- any comments on depression/ CCC/FERA/AAA/HOLC. Do not credit 2nd New Deal. Fireside chat is bottom of level.</i></p> <p><i>NB in L2- 2 marks for message and 3 for purpose, 2 or 3 for CK. In L4, only award 7 marks if CK is clearly pinned to recency of election.</i></p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<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 (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 main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (SM+CK) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, explain a valid sub-message and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (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>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist’s message is critical of Roosevelt and his approach to solving the USA’s problems by using alphabet agencies as he isn’t sure of what he is doing. Uncle Sam is ill in the chair, representing the economic problems that America is facing in the Great Depression, and ‘Dr’ Roosevelt has prescribed lots of potions labelled with alphabet agency names. However, there are so many on the table, that the situation is confusing, and even Roosevelt is not sure if they will work, judging by his comments to the US Congress that they may have to try ‘other remedies’. By 1934 FDR had already introduced a range of agencies, like the CCC, AAA and FERA at huge cost, and some people questioned whether they would work, and pointed out that there was overlap and confusion amongst them, shown by so many bottles. Congress is shown as a simpering nurse, possibly criticising its failure to stand up to the President, and if even the doctor, Roosevelt, is unsure if they will work, the cartoonist is saying that he is a poor leader for the country.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist’s message: <u>accept any valid criticism of FDR as long as supported with reasoning except cost, eg critical of FDR approach to solving depression because he isn’t sure what to do and is trying too many different approaches.</u></p> <p>Main Message: Roosevelt is trying to solve the depression with alphabet agencies/New Deal isn’t working. <u>Main message must link to depression or alphabet agencies</u></p> <p>Sub-message: America is having problems, is troubled, FDR is trying to sort America out/FDR is trying to find a solution.</p> <p><i>In L4, quality of CK determines mark in level.</i></p> <p>CK Alphabet agencies/depression alone is not enough- needs an understanding, no matter how weak, of what they were for./what it was</p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. ‘The New Deal achieved its aims’. How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides +eval) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that the New Deal achieved its aims.</p> <p>Level 3 (both sides- low in level if no sce) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that the New Deal achieved its aims.</p> <p>Level 2 (one sided- low in level if no sce) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that the New Deal achieved its aims.</p> <p>Level 1 (Surface Features/Stock evaluation) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source supports the interpretation that the New Deal achieved some of its aims. Roosevelt set out to achieve the 3Rs: Relief, Recovery and Reform and the WPA was part of this in the Second New Deal. It was an alphabet agency designed to bring together all the other organisations set up to create jobs. The source praises its school lunch programme because it not only created jobs for 12,000 cooks and kitchen attendants, but it also provided a hot meal each day for over half a million children. It sees this as an investment in the future as before, many of these children were underfed. Many other organisations like the Federal Writers project, Federal Arts project and other public works schemes created jobs for skilled people to help the economy recover from depression and improve the country’s infrastructure and arts.</i></p> <p><i>However, this is only one side of the story. Roosevelt believed that investing tax-payers money in creating jobs would kick-start the economy. Yet in 1936-7 when he cut funding, the economy stalled, which suggests that his New Deal agencies were not succeeding in mending the nation’s economic problems, only masking them. His critics said recovery was an illusion. It is true that unemployment was only properly solved by the rearmament for war after 1939, which had nothing to do with the New Deal. Equally, this source may be reliable in terms of the facts it gives, but it is from a speech by a WPA official. That person will do their best to promote what the scheme has done, not highlight its weaknesses to a public audience, so it is not reliable for deciding if the New Deal achieved its aims.</i></p> <p><i>The overall success of the New Deal and whether it achieved its aims is debatable. However, what is clear is that many supported FDR, electing him three times over, so clearly they believed he was achieving at least some of his aims.</i></p> <p>Evaluation likely to be via provenance or purpose. <i>In L4, quality of CK determines mark in level.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	<p>Q: What problems did farmers face in the 1920s?</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 'competition'</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>overproduction (1) which led to prices falling so farmers did not make enough money to survive (2)</i> • <i>competition from Canadian wheat (1)</i> • <i>boll weevil attacked cotton crops (1)</i> • <i>new machinery like combine harvesters (1) led to overproduction (2)</i> • <i>expansion of cultivated land in the 1910s led to overproduction (2)</i> • <i>prices collapsed</i> • <i>debts from expansion</i> <p><i>NB overproduction only to be credited to maximum of 2 marks.</i></p>

8(b)	Q: Why was the cinema and movie industry successful in the 1920s? Explain your answer.	6	This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.
	Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the cinema and movie industry was successful in the 1920s. 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.	5-6	<i>One reason was because there was an economic boom and many people had disposable income to spend on enjoying themselves. Living costs were falling as food prices fell because of the problems in farming, yet average wages were rising. As a result, the entertainment industry did very well, especially cinema, because it was new and a fashionable way to spend time. Cinemas appeared all over the country, and by 1929 100 million cinema tickets were being sold every week.</i>
	Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the cinema and movie industry was successful in the 1920s. They produce a single-causal response.	3-4	<i>Another reason it did so well was because the industry developed and adapted to circumstances. Cinema and movie companies didn't just offer luxury cinemas for the rich in city centres costing a dollar a time, they also provided much cheaper venues where poor folk could afford to go. In Chicago, even those who got Mother's Assistance went often to see the latest movie, and entries were only ten or twenty cents. The invention of talkies in 1927 and colour film also energised movies, and made this form of entertainment even more popular.</i>
	Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the cinema and movie industry in the 1920s	1-2	
	Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.	0	

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p>Q: ‘America was NOT a land of fairness and equality in the 1920s’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of America in the 1920s to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of America in the 1920s to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of America in the 1920s to explain whether they think it was OR was not a land of fairness and equality, 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>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>It’s true; America was not a land of fairness and equality in the 1920s. Black people were discriminated against and treated as second class citizens in the Southern states. They were subject to Jim Crow laws and segregation, and found it hard to find better paid jobs, even if they were educated. This was unfair. They were not treated equally to whites, shown by having to complete difficult literacy tests in order to vote in some states. Even in the north they were the victims of racism, and the KKK targeted them if they stepped out of line. The case of Sacco and Vanzetti shows that immigrants were not always treated fairly either. These 2 men of Italian descent were convicted of a crime they probably didn’t commit, just because of their race and because of their political views, (they were anarchists). This was unfair. There was a lot of prejudice and discrimination towards recent immigrants in case they took ‘older’ Americans’ jobs.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, America was making progress towards greater equality and fairness. Although women were still discriminated against in terms of jobs and pay, they had been able to vote in most states since 1920 and they were given more social freedoms, for example smoking and drinking in public. Not everyone approved of it, especially rural folk, but the change meant greater equality than before. Black people in the Northern states also stood a better chance of getting a good education and jobs in the 1920s, including going to university: Howard University in the north was an exclusively black institution. Having said that, they still struggled to be seen as equals, life expectancy for blacks remained lower than for whites, and overall they lived in great poverty, in the north or south. Organisations such as Marcus Garvey’s UNIA became very popular in the 1920s, showing black people wanted fairness and to be economically independent, but they were often the targets of bitter racial abuse and attacks.</i></p> <p><i>America had made progress towards fairness and equality by the 1920s shown in these cases but there was a very long way to go. Both aims were held back by the attitudes of large numbers of citizens, and it was only when the majority of these could be changed that greater fairness and equality would exist.</i></p> <p>NB: This is a societal/social question. Economics are only relevant to show social inequality.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify ways in which America was AND/OR was not a land of fairness and equality in the 1920s. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of America in the 1920s and ways in which it was or was not fair and equal.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>NB: If one group only, bottom of level.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (a)	<p>Q: Describe the 1932 presidential election campaign of President Hoover.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hoover blamed the Great Depression on international economic conditions</i> • <i>Hoover's public speaking failed to inspire people (1) and at some meetings he was pelted with rotten fruit and vegetables (2)</i> • <i>Hoover gave 9 major speeches (1) and wrote his own speeches in contrast to FDR (2).</i> • <i>Hoover promised to continue with high trade tariffs</i> • <i>Hoover was often reluctant to appear in public, and had not planned to campaign but deal with the economic crisis instead.</i> • <i>stuck to republican policies</i> • <i>promised 'prosperity was around the corner'</i> <p>NB Do not credit Bonus marchers- this was not the campaign.</p>

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p>Q: Explain the consequences of the Wall Street Crash.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the consequences of the Wall Street Crash. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain the consequences of the Wall Street Cash. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Wall Street Crash and its consequences.</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 consequence was huge numbers of banks failing. Although banks were already collapsing before the Crash, it got worse after because many banks had lent money to speculators which could not be paid back, or had speculated themselves on the stock market. These banks went bust. After the crash, more people lost their faith in the economy and banks in particular, and so withdrew their savings: tipping even more banks over the edge. This just spiralled. Before the crash around 500 banks went bust each year, in 1931 it was over 2,000.</i></p> <p><i>Another consequence was massive unemployment. The Crash led to a major loss in general confidence, and as people felt nervous about the economy, they cut spending. This led to fewer sales, so businesses then cut production, cut wages and laid off workers. These workers or unemployed workers spent less, so sales got even worse, spiralling down and down, until production had fallen by 40% by 1932, and wages by 60%. America was in the grip of a major economic depression.</i></p> <p><i>Make sure the candidate is talking about causes and not consequences</i></p> <p><u>Expect to see:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • banking crisis • people lost life savings • loss of confidence in banks • reduction in sales • MASS migration from rural areas • high unemployment • increased suicide rates • Hoovervilles • Loss of confidence in govt- HH voted out

Part 2: USA, 1919-1945


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)		10	
	<p>Q: ‘The following were <u>equally</u> responsible for the Wall Street Crash:</p> <p>(i) speculation on the stock market;</p> <p>(ii) long-term weaknesses in the US economy.’</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer, referring only to (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these causes of the Wall Street Crash to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these causes of the Wall Street Crash to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of these causes of the WSC to explain whether they think</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways this is true, speculation was the short-term trigger to the Crash. Speculation got out of control in 1928 and sent the price of shares much higher than it should have been. Speculators look for shares that are rising in value, buy them and sell them on quickly, hoping to make quick money. The stock market was doing so well in the 20s that speculators flooded the market, inflating the value of shares. However, many of these people were very panicky: they had borrowed money from banks to invest and worse than that, were also buying on the margin, only putting down a deposit of 10% on the shares they bought. When share prices dipped, as they do, these people rushed to sell as they could not afford to make a loss and end up in debt. This resulted in spiralling share values as speculators tried to offload shares before they made a loss. As this worsened, the market collapsed.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, you could argue that if there hadn’t been weaknesses in the economy, speculators would not have been spooked and tried to panic sell shares. These problems were clear in the farming industry which was depressed throughout the 1920s and by 1929 even construction and consumer goods sales were slowing. One of the root causes was an uneven distribution of wealth which meant that almost half of the population lived in poverty and could not afford the consumer goods of the boom. Exporting goods was not an answer either, as Europe was still poor from the war, and responded to American tariffs with their own import duties, which hurt American exporters even more. It was these poor statistics for industrial growth which first spooked the market in June 1929.</i></p> <p><i>Both of these factors are clearly connected, as the long-term problems led to reduced growth which spooked the market leading to speculators panicking. However, long term problems and warnings about growth were not decisive; it was shareholders responses which were crucial. If there had been fewer speculators, there would have been less panic and the market may have bounced back. As it was, speculators rushed to sell and it was this that caused</i></p>


<p>speculation OR long-term problems in the economy were more to blame, 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>Level 2 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify or describe whether speculation AND/OR long-term problems were more to blame for the Wall Street Crash. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Wall Street Crash, speculation or long-term problems in the economy.</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>the Wall Street Crash.</i></p> <p><u>Long-term weaknesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>lack of regulation of the stock market</i> • <i>overproduction in certain industries (eg farming)</i> • <i>deregulation of the banks- easy credit</i> • <i>saturation of the market caused by the production line</i> • <i>retaliatory tariffs</i> • <i>Poor distribution of wealth</i> <p><i>All of these need to be linked to WSC. They may well talk about these issues leading to over- valued shares.</i></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

