

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

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 (7 marks) 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 (5–6 marks) 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 3 (3–4 marks) 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 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>I think the cartoonist was making fun of, but also criticising, Kennedy. This cartoon is about the Bay of Pigs in 1961. It was an attempt by the American government to use Cuban exiles to invade Cuba and to overthrow Castro and his communist regime. The attempted invasion was a fiasco and within three days the Cuban armed forces had defeated the invaders who got no further than the beaches. Kennedy had only been President for three months and this was an enormous embarrassment for him and a terrible start to his presidency. The cartoonist is showing all this. The CIA had been planning to kill Castro with an exploding cigar and the cartoonist is using this as a symbol of the failure of the Bay of Pigs. It is exploding in Kennedy's face, not Castro's, to show it was a disaster for Kennedy. The fact that the cartoonist only shows Kennedy says that he holds Kennedy personally responsible for the fiasco and not the CIA or others. The message is that Kennedy should not have even attempted the invasion and it has blown up in his face making him look stupid.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully. 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 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<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 Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully was the existence of nuclear weapons which was what the crisis was all about. These weapons were enormously destructive as had been seen at Hiroshima at the end of the Second World War. By the time of the crisis they were even more powerful. The Soviet Union was putting missiles into Cuba which would be able to destroy most major US cities. At the same time the USA had missiles based in Turkey which could reach many Russian cities. Because of their destructive power neither side wanted to use them. They were there for deterrence. This is why the crisis ended peacefully - because neither side were willing to use the missiles because of the dreadful results. Each side could destroy the other as a nuclear war could result in mutually assured destruction.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was Kennedy's decision to blockade. This was a turning point in the crisis. Some of Kennedy's generals were advising him to launch a nuclear attack on Cuba. Kennedy knew this would be disastrous. By ordering the blockade, stopping Russian ships delivering the missiles he stopped them coming into Cuba but also gave Khrushchev a chance to get out of the crisis without losing face. The Russian ships turned back and this then gave Kennedy and Khrushchev a chance to find a solution. It was the crucial point in the crisis.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe what happened during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-9.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stalin cut off road and rail links between West Berlin and the rest of Germany</i> • <i>people in Berlin left without any supplies</i> • <i>the western powers decided on an airlift of crucial supplies</i> • <i>hundreds of thousands of trips were made</i> • <i>In 1949 Stalin called off the blockade</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why were there disagreements at the Potsdam Conference in 1945? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why there were disagreements at Potsdam. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there were disagreements at Potsdam and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why there were disagreements at Potsdam. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One of the main reasons is that Roosevelt had died and was replaced by President Truman. He was much more anti-communist than Roosevelt and he decided to get tough with the Russians. He felt he could do this because America had just tested an atomic bomb. He was also annoyed by the fact that the Soviet Union had already started to install puppet governments in countries in eastern Europe. All this persuaded Truman to take a hard line with the Soviets.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason there were disagreements was Germany. The two sides had completely opposite views about what should be done here. Stalin wanted to stop Germany from recovering so that it was never a threat again. He wanted to strip Germany of anything valuable and take it back to Russia to help Russia's economic recovery. Truman wanted Germany to be able to recover so that it was a defence against communist Russia. He did not want to repeats the mistakes of Versailles and leave Germany with grievances for the future. He also wanted to hold democratic elections in Germany but Stalin was opposed to this.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 34 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: 'The Marshall Plan was an attempt by the USA to control Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the motives behind the Marshall Plan 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the motives behind the Marshall Plan in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the motives of the Marshall plan in order to explain 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>	10	<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>It can be argued that the Marshall Plan was designed to help the people of Europe. After the Second World War Europe was in a terrible state especially the economies of the European countries. There was rationing and many people were starving. When Marshall introduced the plan he said it was to end poverty and hunger and it was offered to all parts of Europe, even to communist countries. It was not America's fault if Russia turned the offer down and made other communist countries reject it. The fact that it was offered to them shows that America was genuinely interested in helping the people of Europe. The US had not suffered like European countries in the war and it was in a position to help.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Russians thought it was all a trick to make European countries slaves to the US and to capitalism. If they accepted the aid they would become dependent on the US giving the US enormous power over them. The plan meant that European countries had to run their economies in a way that was good for America and it ensured that all these countries would be capitalist like America. They would have to buy American goods providing an enormous market for American industries. The Soviets believed that the offer of the plan to communist countries was just a trick to make it look good. The Americans knew the communists would not take them up on the offer.</i></p> <p><i>The truth is probably somewhere in the middle. America did genuinely want to help Europe - it cost America billions. However, it realised that this would also benefit Americans. Helping Europe to recover would also have the effect of helping to sell American goods and of creating a capitalist anti-communist bloc. So both sides of the argument are true. It was designed to help Europe but it was also designed to be anti-communist and to give America great influence over Europe.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify motives behind the Marshall Plan and 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the motives behind the Marshall Plan. Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe how the USA fought the war in Vietnam.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>large scale bombing over North Vietnam (Operation Rolling Thunder) and other countries such as Cambodia</i> • <i>use of napalm</i> • <i>traditional military tactics based on heavy armaments</i> • <i>moving villages to new sites behind barbed wire</i> • <i>defoliation using Agent Orange</i> • <i>Vietnamisation</i> • <i>incidents such as My Lai</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement in Vietnam.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why Kennedy and Johnson increased America's involvement. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Kennedy and Johnson increased the USA's involvement and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why Kennedy and Johnson increased America's involvement. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>When Kennedy became President he realised that if America was going to achieve anything in Vietnam, it needed to be much more involved. Otherwise communism would spread right across the region. It was also clear that the UN would not agree to be involved. Kennedy also had something to prove. He had failed in the Bay of Pigs and some Americans thought he should have acted more strongly in the Cuban Missile Crisis. He started by sending more equipment and advisers but it soon became clear that this was not enough against the Viet Cong. The only thing that would work, it was thought, was direct American involvement in the fighting. And so the number of American troops was significantly increased.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons why Johnson increased America's involvement in Vietnam was the Gulf of Tonkin incident. This was when Vietnamese ships attacked a US warship in 1964. No serious damage was done but it gave Johnson, who was a bigger supporter of the war than Kennedy, the opportunity to persuade Congress to give him more power over the war so he could react quickly. This allowed him to take much more military action in Vietnam. He had decided that a full-scale war was needed if America was to be effective. This led to an enormous campaign of bombing North Vietnam and more troops being sent.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 34 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: Do you agree that the reporting of the Vietnam War by the media was the most important reason why the USA eventually withdrew its troops? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the different reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam in order to explain 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>	10	<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 think that the media reporting was the crucial factor. To explain why, I first need to look at other reasons for US withdrawal. One was that the Americans were not winning the war on the ground. The Viet Cong were using much more effective tactics despite the Americans having more powerful and sophisticated weaponry. The North Vietnamese used guerrilla tactics which meant that there were no big set piece battles where the US weapons would have been powerful. Instead the Viet Cong used surprise hit and run tactics and would then disappear back into the jungle where they mixed with the ordinary peasants. The Americans could not tell between ordinary villagers and the Viet Cong and when they destroyed villages they lost the support of the Vietnamese people. It is also true that the Vietnamese were fighting for their own country and people and were far more determined than the American soldiers many of whom just wanted to go home. In 1968 the North Vietnamese launched the Tet Offensive attacking dozens of American targets and cities. This proved to be disastrous for the Americans.</i></p> <p><i>Public opinion in America was also important. The American people were horrified by incidents such as My Lai where innocent civilians were massacred and they just got fed up with the long war and the increasing numbers of American dead. People could see that they were not winning. There were large demonstrations all over America and this made Johnson decide not to run for president again. The American people did not share his support for the war. When Nixon became president it was clear he would have to end the conflict because support for the war was disappearing.</i></p> <p><i>However, none of these reasons would have been enough by themselves. What mattered was the media reporting of it all. The media reported the Tet Offensive as if it was a defeat for the US, when it was not. It was the media who brought the horrors of the war like My Lai and the number of young Americans dying into people's living rooms. If the media had not done this, then the American people would not have turned against the war so quickly.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify reasons for US withdrawal from 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the reasons for US withdrawal from Vietnam.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (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 (7 marks) 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 (5–6 marks) 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 (3–4 marks) 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 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<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 cartoonist is criticising the IRA. He is saying that they are brutal murderers who have no compassion. The cartoon was published in 1971 and this was when the IRA campaign of violence was reaching a climax. The Northern Ireland government introduced internment and this made the IRA resort to more extreme tactics. By 1971 it was all out war. The IRA launched a major bombing campaign. They targeted the army and Protestant shops, businesses and pubs where British soldiers went. This is why the IRA man is warning babies not to use pubs used by British troops. This is making a mockery of IRA warnings not to go to these pubs. The cartoonist is suggesting that the IRA don't really care how many innocent people they kill. All the gravestones represent the people they have killed and the gun he is holding also refers to this. The cartoonist is saying the IRA don't care who they kill in their campaign against the British.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why terrorism has often failed in achieving its aims. You must refer to at least one terrorist organisation that you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (6–8 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why terrorism has often failed. 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 (3–5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why terrorism has often failed. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why terrorism has often failed.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	8	<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>Terrorism often does not work. The PLO discovered that the use of violence can often be counterproductive. In the late 1960s and early 1970s the PLO, using its base in Jordan, used terrorist methods such as hijacking planes. This did not help the organisation keep the support of King Hussein of Jordan. In 1970 the terrorists forced three planes to land at Dawson's Field in Jordan. They demanded that terrorist prisoners be released. When the Israelis refused they blew the planes up. This angered King Hussein who was trying to negotiate for a settlement of the refugee question. This ruined his efforts and he used his army to drive the PLO out of Jordan. By 1973 Yasser Arafat realised that terrorism was not working and he denounced the terrorists and began concentrating on peaceful methods.</i></p> <p><i>The IRA in Ireland found something similar. The violence used by the IRA through the 1970s, 80s and 90s certainly brought the issue of the treatment of Catholics in Northern Ireland to everyone's attention. However, it also brought decades of bombings, murders, British troops in Northern Ireland and internment. The Omagh bombing of 1998 lost them a lot of support especially when the people of Northern Ireland voted for the Good Friday Agreement. People like Gerry Adams realised that terrorism could not achieve any more and he began to support peaceful negotiations. Through these talks the Catholics have achieved a share in running Northern Ireland, something that terrorism by itself could never achieve.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p>Q: Describe the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact on Berliners.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>barbed wire barricades put up without warning overnight in 1961, a more substantial wall built later</i> • <i>it divided the city in half</i> • <i>built by East Germany under instructions from the Soviet Union</i> • <i>it stopped East Berliners emigrating to the West for a better life</i> • <i>it divided families</i> • <i>many were unable to go to work</i> • <i>East Berliners who tried to cross were shot</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why did the Polish government find it difficult to deal with Solidarity? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity. 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 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Polish government found it difficult to deal with Solidarity. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The government found it hard to deal with Solidarity for several reasons. First, it was very well organised. It had a committee, spokespeople and a newspaper which was printed on the shipyard printing press. They also had a charismatic leader, Lech Walesa. They were also organised enough to have a clear set of demands. All of this made them very different from earlier movements in Hungary and Czechoslovakia that were not nearly so well organised. This level of organisation meant it could win and use support all over the country which made it hard for the government to silence and defeat.</i></p> <p><i>It also won support in vast numbers far more than earlier protestors in eastern-bloc countries. This made it difficult to deal with. The reason for its support was that its demands were national ones that people from all over the country could support. The movement also won support because it was very careful not to use violence and in the early years never set itself up as an alternative to the Communist Party. So people could join it but still be loyal to the Party. Walesa was also enormously popular. He was a devout catholic which helped and he was regarded as an ordinary worker who could be trusted.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 34 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: 'The Hungarian Uprising in 1956 and the Prague Spring in 1968 were very similar.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring in order to explain 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>	10	<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 think there are many ways in which they are similar. They were both caused by resentment towards Soviet rule, and the communist regimes in the two countries. In both the people wanted more political freedom and a better standard of living. Both wanted an end to censorship and more freedom of speech. The Soviet Union was very worried about both events because it saw them as threats to its control over Eastern Europe. In both events the hated Communist leader was replaced. In Hungary Nagy was appointed to carry on reforms and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was appointed to do the same. Both countries had a short period when the new government introduced the reforms that people wanted. Both risings ended in failure because of the Soviet Union. In both cases the Soviet army moved in to crush the risings. In Hungary Nagy was executed and in Czechoslovakia Dubcek was dismissed.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were also differences. In Hungary the rising was led by the people. Students started demonstrating and were joined by workers and soldiers. But in Czechoslovakia it was the leadership of Dubcek that started it, with the people following. Another difference was that Dubcek insisted he was loyal to the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union while Nagy was opposed to them. He said Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and he appealed to the UN for help. In Hungary the rebels fought the Soviet soldiers but this did not happen in the Prague Spring.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think the similarities are fundamental while the differences are details. Both events were against Soviet rule and for more freedom and in both the Soviet army put them down. This makes them fundamentally the same because differences such as having different types of leadership, did not change the fundamental similarities which were more important.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the Hungarian Uprising 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>he was a dictator, President and in charge of the army, he tried to copy Stalin's methods</i> • <i>use of censorship, indoctrination in schools</i> • <i>he used purges and terror against opponents or anyone he saw as a rival or threat</i> • <i>he tried to unite the country and ran a ruthless campaign against the Kurds using mustard gas and cyanide. Many were killed, displaced or fled</i> • <i>he dealt with Shiite revolts brutally</i> • <i>attacked the Marsh Arabs and their marshes</i> • <i>used a personality cult</i> • <i>modernised the economy e.g. electrification, social improvements such as more schools and hospitals</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why there was opposition around the world to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why there was opposition to the invasion of Iraq. May be in the form of a long narrative, a point, or points are identified but not explained.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that many people did not believe that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. This was one of the major reasons that Bush and Blair used to justify the invasion. They claimed that these weapons posed an immediate threat to the West. UN weapons inspectors went into Iraq to find them but could not find any. They were ignored by the US and Britain who claimed they were there. None were found during or after the war. This showed that the war had been fought on a lie and this upset a lot of people given the numbers of lives that were lost. They suspected that the real reason for the invasion was to get American control of Iraq's oil.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that many people did not accept Bush's claim that the Iraqi government had been working with Al Qaeda which was responsible for the attacks on New York on 9/11. The US Secretary of State told the UN Security Council that Iraq was protecting a terrorist cell. The Americans claimed that because of this terrorist connection Iraq had to be disarmed. Most people simply did not believe that Saddam was harbouring terrorists. They did not accept that there was any connection between Iraq and 9/11 and so there was no justification for the invasion. They did not accept that the invasion was part of the war on terrorism. In fact some argued that invading Iraq would make matters worse and would increase radical Islamists around the world.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 34 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: Do you agree that the international consequences of the Iraq War were more important than the consequences inside Iraq? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War in order to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	10	<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 results of the war inside Iraq were disastrous for many Iraqis. Although the terrible regime of Saddam Hussein had ended, the war caused chaos and instability. After the war there was an insurgency using guerrilla tactics against the Americans which caused more violence. The war itself had led to about 2 million people being displaced within Iraq and about 2 million fled to other countries. The instability caused by the invasion and the fighting led to massive unemployment and about one third of the population lived in poverty. For many people their normal lives disappeared with schools, hospitals, drinking water and electricity all becoming rare. There was also a breakdown in law and order with no police force for a long time. Rivalries between Sunni and Shiite led to much fighting and the Kurds were more or less ruling their own region. It was clear that the invading forces had given no thought about what they would do after the invasion was completed and they had also made a dreadful mistake of disbanding all the Iraqi forces of law and order. Even the elections of 2005 did not help much because by 2006 Iraq was in a civil war.</i></p> <p><i>The international consequences of the war were that the US and Britain were viewed as occupiers of Muslim land by many Arab states and became very unpopular. In particular it led to hatred among 'home grown' Islamists in Britain and America who have committed terrorist acts. It also led to more terrorist acts around the world. The destruction of Iraq as a major power in the area has also increased Iran's power in the area leading to a dangerous imbalance of power in the region. This is particularly worrying to Israel because of Iran's threats against it.</i></p> <p><i>I think that the international consequences were more important because they affected the whole world and have had an impact on people in the USA, in Britain and right across the Middle East. They have also made the West be more cautious about intervening in the Middle East. However, they are</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the international and domestic consequences of the Iraq War 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the consequences of the Iraq War</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><i>connected with the consequences in Iraq. These were dreadful for the Iraqi people but also meant Iraq became a breeding ground for terrorism which affected the whole world. So the two cannot be separated.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. Why was this painting published in Nazi Germany? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the aims and beliefs of the Nazi regime. They interpret the purpose of the painting to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the painting and produce a response explaining why this painting was published.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) 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 painting or they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the painting and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<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>Source A was published to tell everybody in Nazi Germany how important the family was. For the Nazis the family was crucial to the building of a great German state. The family provided stability and it provided children for the future development of the state. The children could be brought up in the family to be good Nazis and Germans. The woman in the family would bring the children up in this way and would look after the father. The painting shows in the background the German countryside that the family will be supporting and defending. All the people in the painting are Aryan with blond hair. They are typically German and represent racial purity. They are the master race and the Nazis wanted Aryan's to marry each other to keep the race pure. This was to fight the threat from the Jews. The family in the painting is also large so that there are boys for the German army and girls to have more children in the future. The purpose of the painting was clear. It was to give the German people a model to follow - marry a fellow Aryan, have lots of children and bring them up as good Nazis. This was the way to protect Nazi Germany and ensure its future.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source B. How is this source useful as evidence about Nazi Germany? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period and of Kristallnacht and broader Nazi Jewish policies to evaluate the source for utility. Sophisticated inferences are made to explain the usefulness of the source to produce a fully developed response.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period and of Kristallnacht to evaluate the usefulness of the source. A developed response is produced.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period and of Kristallnacht to comprehend surface features of the source, and to make basic claims about usefulness.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates describe the source and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This source is very useful because it tells us about Kristallnacht in 1938. This was when there were widespread attacks on Jewish homes and shops and synagogues were burnt to the ground. The Nazis claimed at the time that this was spontaneous action by the German people against the Jews because a Jewish student shot a German diplomat dead in Paris. However, this source tells us that this was not the case. It tells us that Heydrich, head of the Gestapo, was helping to organise the events of that night. When he says that demonstrations are expected, he knows this because the Nazis are organising them. He goes on to explain how the demonstrations are to be conducted, making sure Germans did not suffer, but only Jews. The Gestapo were meant to be secret police but we can see from this source that they are not going to stop the demonstrations and violence, in fact they are helping to create them. This source fits in well with the interpretation that Kristallnacht was suggested by Goebbels to Hitler to win favour with him. They wanted to remove Jews from the economic life of Germany which is why their businesses were hit. The source is also useful because it shows how Nazi policy against the Jews was developing. In 1935 the Nuremberg laws had deprived Jews of citizenship and banned sexual relations with Germans. Kristallnacht can be seen as the next step in the Nazis policies that eventually led to the Holocaust. The source shows that the Nazis were really behind Kristallnacht although they wanted people to think that the German people were behind it.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. 'There was little opposition inside Germany to the Nazi regime.' How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (6-7 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that there was little opposition to the Nazi regime.</p> <p>Level 3 (4-5 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that there was little opposition to the Nazi regime.</p> <p>Level 2 (2-3 marks) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that there was little opposition to the Nazi regime.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7	<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 suggests that there was some opposition and that it was important enough for the Nazi Party to report it to the Gestapo. The fact that a Nazi report admits that incidents involving young people not sympathetic to the Nazis were becoming more common suggests that it can be trusted. The Nazis would have no reason to lie as it is an internal report warning the Gestapo that they need to act. The young people mentioned in the source were probably part of Swing Youth because of the musical instruments They listened to jazz music which the Nazis hated because it was associated with Black Americans. Other youth groups that opposed the Nazis were the Edelweiss Pirates who attacked the Hitler Youth and the White Rose group based at Munich University and handed out leaflets telling people not to support the war effort. More young people opposed the Nazis during the war years because the Hitler Youth became less fun and members of it were sent off to the front and because of the dreadful conditions caused by the bombing which is mentioned in the source.</i></p> <p><i>However, before the war there was little opposition. The German population was generally kept happy with jobs and they were also bombarded with Nazi propaganda in school, at work and on the radio. The Nazis got rid of most opposition very early on in the 1930s when they rounded up communists and Social Democrats. Not everyone in Germany supported the Nazis and there was a lot of private grumbling but people knew that if they actively opposed the Nazis the punishment would be dreadful so they just kept their heads down. Some church leaders criticised the Nazis and there were working-class groups producing leaflets but there was little opposition. The Gestapo and the SS made sure of that.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I agree with the interpretation, but as the source shows there was more opposition during the war years particularly from youth groups. However, none of these were a real threat to the Nazis.</i></p>

Part 2: Germany, 1918-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the Spartacist rising of January 1919.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht</i> • <i>a communist attempt at revolution</i> • <i>they captured the headquarters of the government's newspaper in Berlin</i> • <i>badly organised</i> • <i>crushed by the Freikorps</i> • <i>the leaders were murdered</i> • <i>Ebert had put himself into the hands of the right-wing Freikorps</i>

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)	<p>Q: Why did the Kapp Putsch take place in 1920? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Kapp Putsch took place in 1920. 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 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why the Kapp Putsch took place in 1920. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why the Kapp Putsch took place.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The Kapp Putsch took place in 1920 because the Allies were getting worried by the growing size of unofficial armies in Germany like the Freikorps. They told the German government to disband them and to keep to the limit of 100,000 men required by the Treaty of Versailles. When it tried to do this Kapp led the Freikorps into Berlin and declared a new government. They knew that if they were disbanded all their power would disappear.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that the Freikorps were opposed to the Weimar Republic and to Ebert's government. They regarded these as weak. They wanted Germany to be strong again. They hated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and wanted a more right-wing government in power that would reverse the terms. They were also very nationalist and opposed democracy. They wanted to eliminate the threat from communism in Germany and thought the only way to do this was through a strong government and a strong army.</i></p>
	6		

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)		10	
	<p>Q: 'The Weimar Republic never recovered from the events of its early years.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Weimar Republic 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 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the Weimar Republic in order 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 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Weimar Republic in order to explain 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>	10	<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 Weimar Republic got off to a bad start because it was associated with the Treaty of Versailles and Germany's humiliation. It had to sign away German land and agree to pay Reparations. Weimar struggled to overcome this association with Germany's humiliation and there were several attempts to overthrow it. It had to survive crises like the Munich Putsch and hyperinflation. The real low point came when the French invaded the Ruhr to recover reparations that Germany was not paying. The constitution of Weimar did not help. It used proportional representation which meant that it never had one party winning a majority of seats. There were always coalition governments which did not help strong government. There were many people, especially from the right, who wanted to get rid of the Weimar Republic at the first opportunity.</i></p> <p><i>However, some people would argue that it did recover from its problems and that it had a real chance of success. This was mainly due to the work of Stresemann. In 1924 the USA lent Germany 800 million marks through the Dawes Plan. This helped the economy to recover and by 1928 German industry was producing more than before the war. It was exporting large amounts of manufactured goods and many people were becoming richer. The governments were also more stable and there were no more attempted revolutions. Stresemann even began to take Germany back into international acceptability and in 1926 it joined the League of Nations. This all shows that it could recover from its early years.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I agree with the statement. It only appeared that the Weimar Republic had recovered. It still depended on the American loans as was seen when American recalled the loans because of the Depression. There was still a lot of unemployment and farming had never recovered. The recovery of the Republic was misleading. When the Depression hit Germany, the Republic fell quickly to Hitler.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the Weimar Republic 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Weimar Republic.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Section B – Germany c.1919-1945

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe how the Nazis used the Depression in their political campaigns.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>use of election posters</i> • <i>promised to deal with the Communists</i> • <i>promises of 'Arbeit, Freiheit und Brot'</i> • <i>they promised full employment through public works</i> • <i>they claimed that a strong leader was needed for Germany to recover</i> • <i>they promised farmers higher prices and small shopkeepers protection against competition</i> • <i>they promised to make Germany great again</i>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p>Q: Explain why Hitler was appointed as Chancellor in January 1933.</p> <p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Hitler was appointed as Chancellor. 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 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Hitler was appointed as Chancellor. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of why Hitler was appointed as Chancellor.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	
		6	<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>One reason for this was plotting and intrigue between the politicians. Von Papen wanted to become Chancellor again but he had very little support. He decided he needed the support of Hitler. They made a deal with Hitler becoming Chancellor but with von Papen holding the real power. When Von Schleicher resigned in January, von Papen persuaded Hindenberg to appoint Hitler. He thought he could keep Hitler and the Nazis under control and persuaded Hindenberg of this.</i></p> <p><i>There were also wider reasons why Hitler became Chancellor. The Depression and the rise in unemployment gave Hitler his chance. Over half the population were unemployed and unemployment pay was cut. This led to many people turning to the extremist parties like the Nazis and the Communists. The Nazis were doing well in elections and in 1932 they became the largest party in the Reichstag. As their leader this put Hitler in a position where he might become Chancellor but Hindenberg was against it. It needed the political infighting described above before Hitler could be appointed.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Q: How far was the Munich Putsch a disaster for the Nazis? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (10 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think the Munich Putsch was a disaster for the Nazis. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts, and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–9 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain whether they think the Munich Putsch was a disaster for the Nazis. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the Munich Putsch in order to explain one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	10	<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 Munich Putsch was an absolute disaster. When the Nazis marched into Munich, Kahr, the head of the Bavarian government, failed to support them as he had promised. The army were waiting for them and it only took a bit of shooting for the Nazis to be defeated. They had won no popular support and they had failed to take over the government in Bavaria - the attempted coup had failed. Hitler did not come out of it well as he lost his nerve and fled. He and some of the other leaders were put on trial in 1924 and were sentenced to five years in prison. It looked like the Nazi Party was finished for good because it was banned and so could not campaign. However, it was not as bad as it looked.</i></p> <p><i>Hitler used the trial brilliantly. He told the court that he had acted for Germany and against the weak Weimar Government. This was reported throughout Germany and he soon became a nationalist hero. He spoke so well that he was given a short prison sentence for such a crime and he only served nine months of it. This meant that he was able to continue to lead the party as early as 1925. The Putsch was not a disaster for another reason. Through its failure Hitler had learned that he needed to use political and legal methods if the Nazis were to be successful. He began reorganizing the Party. He held lots of public meetings and used the anti-Jewish message a lot more. He also wrote Mein Kampf which became a best seller. The Nazis gradually grew in popularity and were ready to exploit people's misery when the Depression hit Germany.</i></p> <p><i>In the short term the Putsch was a disaster but in the longer term it was not. Even by the time of the trial Hitler was winning support and the changes he made to his methods laid the basis for the Nazis later success. He might not have made these changes without the failure of the Putsch.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify aspects of the Munich Putsch 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 (1–2 marks) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Munich Putsch.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid

<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.

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 2015

