

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2016

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2016

Assessment Objectives (AOs)

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to:

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 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 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 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 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 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>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is supporting Lloyd George's attitude that the reparations Germany has to pay are too high, and he is right to try to persuade Briand of this.</i></p> <p><i>In the cartoon, the horse has been saddled with a huge burden of debt, the 'Unlimited Reparations', which is so heavy it cannot move. This refers to the fact that In 1921 the Allies finally agreed that Germany should pay reparations for the Great War of 132 billion gold marks. Lloyd George felt that this was too high, as Germany would be unable to get back on her feet again, and her economy would be stalled. This is shown by the debt on the cart stopping the horse (Germany) from moving. He tries to persuade Briand in the caption, saying Germany may get going, with less debt, but the French were reluctant to listen, as they wanted maximum revenge and compensation after the destruction and suffering the French had been through.</i></p> <p><i>The cartoonist's view is that Lloyd George is right, as he shows that Germany can clearly go nowhere as it is overloaded, and Briand should be able to see this.</i></p> <p>CV=supportive of Lloyd George's attitude to reduce reparations / critical of France's attitude to setting high reparations. (If no Britain or France, no CV)</p> <p>Main message=Germany can't function / recover because reparations are too high / Germany is crippled because of the reparations / Britain wants to reduce the amount of reparations/ GB thinks the reparations are too high/ France is being harsh</p> <p>Sub message = Treaty is too harsh / reparations are too high/ Germany is struggling/suffering</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference. 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 of why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference. They explain to produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Clemenceau and his aims at Versailles.</p> <p>Level 0 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>6-8 <i>One reason he did not get everything he wanted was because the USA limited what he could achieve. France had suffered much at the hands of the Germans, with devastated land and millions of casualties, and as a result Clemenceau wanted revenge and high reparations. However, Woodrow Wilson and the Americans were worried that if Germany were punished too much, she would want revenge in the future. Wilson didn't fully appreciate the impact of war on France as America herself had not been attacked directly, and joining the war in 1917 meant that their manpower losses were the lowest of the allies at 100,000. Wilson was more concerned about getting long term peace than revenge, so America didn't have to be involved in another European war. As a result, he prevented Clemenceau getting the more severe terms he wanted.</i></p> <p>3-5 <i>Another reason Clemenceau didn't get what he wanted was that Britain didn't support all of his aims. For example, when it came to disarming Germany, Britain was only really concerned about the German navy. Clemenceau on the other hand wanted Germany's land forces crippled, and with 100,000 men and the country not broken into independent states, he was still worried Germany would be too powerful. Lloyd George resisted breaking Germany up, as he felt it would weaken her too much and he did not want this to affect Britain's trade or strengthen the French too much either.</i></p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p> <p>NB: Identifying what Clemenceau wanted but didn't get, or his aims is L1. For explanation candidates must get to why he did not get these things.</p> <p>NB: Do not accept that Germany wanted a demilitarised Rhineland. For a developed answer the candidate must mention either the term Clemenceau wanted and didn't get, or the term he got but didn't want with explanation.</p>



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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the role of the Assembly in the League of Nations.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example '<i>acts as the League's Parliament</i>'.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>vote on admitting new members</i> • <i>discuss disputes</i> • <i>appoint temporary members of the Council</i> • <i>vote on the budget</i> • <i>vote on ideas put forward by the Council</i> • <i>discuss and recommend action to the Council</i> • <i>elect judges to the Permanent Court (along with the Council)</i> <p><i>NB: The question is about the role of the Assembly, not the composition</i></p>

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

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 		16	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How far can the failure of the League in the 1930s be blamed on the Manchurian Crisis? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of the League in the 1930s to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the failure of the League in the 1930s to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how the Manchurian crisis OR other reasons led to the failure of the League in the 1930s and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The Manchurian Crisis did weaken the League and contribute to its failure. After the Japanese occupation of Manchuria the League acted too slowly to investigate what had happened. It was over a year before Lord Lytton filed his report saying that the Japanese were in the wrong, by which time it was too late to remove them. None of the 3 remaining permanent powers in the League's Council wanted to use force because they were more concerned about their countries' economic problems in the Great Depression and did not want to take action on the other side of the world. As a result of the crisis, the League looked weak as it had failed to stop Japan, which encouraged other powers to think they could get away with acting aggressively, for example Italy in 1935 in Abyssinia, and Germany in breaking the Treaty of Versailles, both of which totally undermined confidence in the League.</i></p> <p><i>However, the real weakness of the League was not the issues it dealt with but its underlying problems. The absence of the USA was a blow from the start. Had it been a member during the Abyssinian crisis in 1935, its authority and credibility might have deterred Mussolini from action. If it had agreed the League's trade sanctions on Italy then they may have been more successful, instead the USA actually increased sales of oil to Italy. Another underlying problem was leadership by Britain and France. If they had not been so weakened by war, the League may have been more effective in the 1930s. Neither gave decisive leadership during the Abyssinian crisis as they were more concerned with their own interests. For example, Britain did not want to apply sanctions on coal sales as they feared the loss of mining jobs at home.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, the crises the League faced, such as in Manchuria, revealed its weaknesses, rather than creating them, and so one crisis alone cannot be blamed for its failure. If the League had been strongly led by countries able and prepared to act, the Manchurian crisis would not have been so damaging, and would not have signalled to the world that the League was a paper tiger, escalating international problems later in the 1930s.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (c) 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the weakness of the League AND/OR describe the Manchurian crisis, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Manchurian crisis or the weakness of the League in the 1930s.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i> <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i> <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>



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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the Nazi-Soviet Pact.</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 'an agreement between Germany and the USSR'.</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>a ten-year non-aggression pact (2)</i> • <i>Germany and the USSR agreed not to attack each other</i> • <i>hiding a secret clause to divide Poland between them</i> • <i>defined Nazi and Soviet spheres of influence in Eastern Europe</i> • <i>also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact as they were the foreign ministers who agreed it (2)</i> • <i>an unlikely agreement between sworn enemies</i> • <i>agreed in 1939</i> • <i>an agreement signed by Hitler and Stalin</i> • <i>initiated by the Germans</i> <p><i>NB: Do not credit reasons why the Pact was agreed.</i></p>

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

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: ‘Hitler’s foreign policy was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the outbreak of war in 1939 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the outbreak of war in 1939 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how Hitler’s foreign policy OR other reasons led to the outbreak of war in 1939 and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Hitler’s foreign policy was certainly one of the main reasons war broke out in 1939. Since 1933 he had been breaking the Treaty of Versailles, first with secret rearmament, then publically rebuilding his military after 1935, and then remilitarising the Rhineland in 1936. Every time he did this, Britain and France had reasons to allow him to continue, until he invaded Czechoslovakia in 1939, when they could no longer give him the benefit of the doubt. Hitler was clearly building an empire and had to be stopped, so when he invaded Poland in 1939 they declared war. If Hitler hadn’t bullied countries to gain land and invaded others, then this would have not happened. His foreign policy was to blame.</i></p> <p><i>But Hitler could have been stopped sooner, so you could also blame the countries who didn’t stop him before, for why war broke out in 1939. Britain and France both appeased Hitler which made him grow in confidence and military might so by 1939 he felt confident to attack Poland, which triggered war. Britain in particular wasn’t convinced before 1938 that Hitler needed to be stopped. Some felt that he was simply correcting the mistakes that Versailles had made and would settle down once he had taken the land lost. Others, like Prime Minister Chamberlain, didn’t want a war so soon after the terrible Great War. Economic issues also held Britain back as before 1938 she was concentrating on her own problems not rearming to fight Hitler. But appeasing Hitler was like a red rag to a bull, it simply encouraged him, which is why he broke the Munich Agreement and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia and then Poland.</i></p> <p><i>Without a doubt, it was Hitler’s foreign policy that caused war. As that was only encouraged and not created by appeasement, it is more important. That said, appeasement influenced the timing of war’s outbreak: by 1939 it was clear that appeasement had failed, so war to stop Hitler was inevitable.</i></p> <p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (c) 	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the outbreak of war AND/OR describe Hitler's foreign policy, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy and other reasons for the outbreak of war.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i> <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i> <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p><i>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</i></p>

Part 1: Section B - 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 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message (viewpoint) and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 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 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 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 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>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist is saying that the USA is losing the war in Iraq and the President is being criticised for not having a better strategy for winning. The hole Uncle Sam is digging represents the difficult situation America is in now it has invaded, and the only way out the President suggests is to 'keep digging'. However, digging a deeper hole isn't an answer as it won't help him climb out, in other words doing more of the same kinds of actions won't help America win the war. By 2005 America had been at war in Iraq for over three years, but if anything the war seemed to be getting worse as the country had descended into chaos and civil war and an insurgency had set in attacking the government and American forces. The US government was being criticised for not having a plan for how to get out. Also in the cartoon, Uncle Sam is far from happy, showing the general frustration Americans were feeling that they seemed unable to end the war and bring their troops home.</i></p> <p>CV = criticism that Bush's policies are not working</p> <p>Main Message = criticism levelled at US not Bush</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> = Bush's policies are not working (flat) = America should get out of Iraq = America is not happy with the President = America's policies have made things worse <p>Sub message = focus is on Iraq not the US = America cannot get out of Iraq / America is stuck in Iraq</p> <p>Do not credit digging for oil, looking for weapons of mass destruction, 'America is digging its own hole'. The focus of the cartoon is the occupation of Iraq and not the invasion. Interpretation around invasion = sub message</p>

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



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the multinational forces could not leave Iraq in 2003 after the Iraqi army had been defeated.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq.</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 they could not leave Iraq was that they left it too late to plan how to rebuild and run Iraq after Saddam Hussain was removed. They had a plan to conquer, but not to rule. For example, most major reconstruction contracts had not been signed when the war started and the coalition forces temporary government had no offices, telephones and computers when it was first set up. This left the military struggling to maintain the peace and govern a country where law and order had broken down and infrastructure was in tatters. The people felt that the government was ineffective and its foreign backers were only there to serve themselves so some joined rebel groups which made it difficult for Western forces to leave.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason they could not leave Iraq was the mistakes that were made by the people in charge. Bremer became head of the CPA in May 2003 but he had no experience of the Middle East. He immediately banned the Ba'ath party and all party members above a certain rank lost their jobs. This was a serious mistake, as the government lost 30,000 experienced administrators who could have helped to make the new government work. The Iraqi armed forces and security services were also dissolved. This put 300,000 armed young men out of work, and cut off the pensions of tens of thousands of ex-army officers. This was disastrous as many of these men were very bitter, and so they put their skills and weapons to the service of the insurgency, worsening the law and order situation.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe how Communist governments controlled people's lives in Eastern Europe after 1948.</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>'fewer civil rights'</i> or <i>'introduction of Soviet style communism'</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>no freedom of speech/freedom to criticise the government</i> • <i>censorship of the press and media</i> • <i>opposition groups/parties abolished and/or imprisoned</i> • <i>use of informers</i> • <i>limited freedom of religion</i> • <i>brutal repression of strikes and protests against government policies</i> <p>NB: Do not credit Cominform / Comecon / Warsaw Pact</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in 1981</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in December 1981. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in December 1981 and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Polish government's actions towards Solidarity in December 1981.</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 it acted against Solidarity is that the union had become too popular and well supported. By 1981 almost half of all workers had joined it. This strength meant it was a threat to the government. Jaruzelski's predecessor had agreed to many of its demands, which led to a massive increase in its popularity to over 9 million. After tense negotiations with Lech Walesa to form a 'government of national understanding' broke down, Jaruzelski clearly feared what the union would do next, so imprisoned over 10,000 of its leaders and suspended Solidarity.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for acting is that Jaruzelski was concerned about what the Soviet Union would do if he did not do something about Solidarity soon. The union had produced an 'open letter' telling workers in countries throughout the Communist bloc that they were campaigning for their rights too, and this made the Soviet leadership fear for the future of their control elsewhere. Brezhnev had already ordered the Red Army to carryout 'training manoeuvres' on the Polish border. Jaruzelski feared that if he did not act, the Soviet Union might extend this to invade to 'restore order', something he wanted to avoid.</i></p> <p>NB: The focus is on the reasoning why the Polish government acted, not why the USSR wanted action. Explanations must link back to Poland.</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 36 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of these reasons and their role in the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how Gorbachev's actions OR the USSR's economic problems led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</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>Gorbachev's actions were very important. When he introduced glasnost and perestroika in the USSR, it allowed more open debate on government policy, including criticisms of it, and changes to the economy. As people in Eastern Europe saw this, they demanded similar reforms in their own countries. When they heard that Gorbachev was also planning on withdrawing Soviet troops from Eastern Europe, they realised that their leaders could not count on Soviet force, so they could be free of the worst aspects of communism. From May 1989 onwards, people rebelled against communist rule in Eastern Europe, and without the backup of the Red Army, communism collapsed. Without Gorbachev's actions, demand for change wouldn't have been so obvious, and Eastern bloc countries could also have relied on Red Army troops to deal with protesters.</i></p> <p><i>But economic problems were also important. This is why Gorbachev introduced many of his reforms. For years the Soviet economy had been very weak, spending too much money on weapons, and it was in need of major reform to improve the quality of industries and raise the standard of living for the Soviet people. Previous leaders had just buried their heads in the sand. Gorbachev wanted to change things. As a result, he introduced perestroika, which introduced market forces and private business, which inspired people in Eastern Europe to want these changes too, as their economies were also a shambles. Crucially, to save money, he also cut spending on defence, including deciding to remove the Red Army from Eastern Europe, removing the prop for unpopular communist governments. With this gone, their days were numbered.</i></p> <p><i>As I've explained, Gorbachev's actions were largely the result of economic problems, so you could argue that as they came first they were more important than him. But I don't agree. The economic problems had existed for a long time. It took a man who wanted to do something about them, and crucially, the way he did something about them that made all the difference.</i></p>



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how these factors led to the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Gorbachev's actions, the USSR's economic problems or the collapse of Soviet control of Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Guidance for Level 4:</p> <p><i>Basic explanations for each 'side' = 7</i> <i>Developed explanations for each 'side' = 9</i> <i>One 'side' developed and one 'side' basic = 8</i></p> <p>Must obtain L4/9 in order to access L5</p> <p>NB: <i>There must be an attempt to make glasnost / perestroika relevant to Eastern Europe in order for responses to be credited as explanation</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by the Provisional IRA.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'attacked Britain and its government'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>attacks on the Northern Ireland police force (RUC) and British army</i> • <i>planting bombs in Northern Ireland or on the British mainland</i> • <i>attempting to kill members of the British Government including the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher</i> • <i>attacks on loyalist politicians and organisations</i> • <i>secret negotiations using their political wing, Sinn Fein</i> • <i>the dirty protests by IRA prisoners</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) used terrorism.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the PLO and its terrorist methods.</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 direct warfare had failed to achieve the aims of Palestinian Arabs: to destroy Israel and create a Palestinian homeland. In 1947 the Zionists had declared the state of Israel to exist and despite neighbouring Arab states attempting to smash Israel, she survived by defeating them. When large numbers of Palestinians fled to refugee camps, some joined political movements against Israel, and by 1969 the PLO had appeared, an umbrella organisation led by Yasser Arafat. It used terrorism to make its voice heard, after open warfare continued to fail to defeat Israel.</i></p> <p><i>Terrorism was also a very effective weapon against a superior power. Israel was a rich country and often had backing from one of the world's superpowers, America. As a result it could afford the best and latest technology, and even built up secret nuclear weapons as well as defences. The Palestinians in comparison were small and had fewer resources. Terrorist activities like commando raids, artillery attacks on kibbutz and firing rockets at Israeli towns spread fear and got around Israel's military superiority.</i></p>

Part 1: Section 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 36 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p>Q: ‘Nationalism is usually more important than religion in motivating terrorist actions’. How far do you agree? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the motivations for terrorist actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how nationalism OR religion motivates terrorism and explain their answer. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>I agree that nationalism may seem more important, but it’s often more complicated than that and difficult to separate the two.</i></p> <p><i>Nationalism has often been more important. Take for example the case of the IRA in Ireland. They and their supporters were almost always Catholics, and their opponents were almost always Protestants. But they weren’t fighting about religion, they were trying to achieve a united republic over the whole of Ireland, without British interference. That’s nationalism. The only way religion really came into it was that some of them may have wanted revenge for past injustices against people of their faith. The same is true of the PLO: they were and are mainly Palestinian Muslims fighting against Jewish Israelis, but religion isn’t the main issue, it’s that they are arguing over the same land which they believe should be a homeland for their nation. In 1947 Zionists declared the state of Israel to exist on Palestinian land. The Palestinians believe that land is theirs. As a result, they attack Israel and Israelis.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, religion does matter and can be the most important factor. Osama Bin Laden believed that the Islamic religion was under threat from enemies everywhere and that it was the duty of every Muslim to take part in jihad. His ideas formed the basis of Al Qaeda’s actions and resulted in them terrorising Western democracies, communist nations, the state of Israel and especially the USA. But at the same time, even Al Qaeda has nationalist influences, as it benefits from the idea that all Arabs no matter where they live are part of a single group united by their faith, and so it gets support from Arabs around the world. This support is crucial, as it funds them and provides activists prepared to commit terrorism.</i></p> <p><i>So the two are definitely linked, and because of that it’s difficult to argue that one is more important than the other: they are both equally important.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		6	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message (viewpoint) and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 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 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 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 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>5</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist approves of the Montgomery Bus Boycott and the things that are being done to make sure it works. In 1955 black people in Montgomery made a stand against segregation on the buses by refusing to use them unless segregation was ended. As the cartoon shows, they used other methods to get to work, including using a car pool system, where they shared transport. Black people who had cars allowed them to be used as taxis, and others were bought with donations. Unfortunately, not all white people were as friendly as this attendant, and refused to sell petrol to the car pools, as well as the police arresting the drivers on fake charges. The cartoonist wants to encourage the white working class to see black people as fellow workers, shown by the friendly relations between the working men in the picture. He shows he thinks the car pool is a good idea by including the label on the car 'Montgomery Improvement Association', which indicates that the boycott is well organised. What he is saying is that if the boycott ends successfully, Montgomery will be a better place to live for all.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source B. Why was this photograph published in 1951? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the situation for African-Americans in 1951. They interpret the purpose of the photograph to produce a response explaining its intended impact and why it was published.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the situation for African-Americans in 1951. They interpret the message of the photograph and produce a response explaining why it was published.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge of the situation for African-Americans in 1951, but they do not relate it to the message or purpose of the cartoon. OR they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates use surface details of 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>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 photograph was published to highlight the inequality in America between black and white Americans to get people to support change and improvements for African Americans. Some people felt that the way that black Americans were treated was little better than slavery. The photograph is clearly focusing on the poster at the top of the wall which is advertising that Imperial Laundry washes only white people's clothes, and sees that as a selling point. The fact that this is being promoted is not unusual because in the early 1950s there was a lot of racism against black Americans in the USA. This was worst in the south, where this photograph was taken, because strict segregation laws made it legal for black and white people to have different treatment. The law said that blacks and whites should have different toilets, entrances to cinemas and even drinking fountains. In practice this meant they got worse facilities, and treatment, and reinforced racist attitudes and beliefs that black people were inferior.</i></p> <p><i>The content of this photograph shows that these attitudes persisted, despite NAACP campaigns for change and the contribution of black people to the war effort. However, the fact that it has been published in a national magazine shows that some Americans want to highlight these attitudes, expose them and bring change.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source C. ‘The struggle for civil rights was achieved because of the actions of some brave individuals.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your own knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that the struggle for civil rights was achieved because brave individuals made a stand.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that the struggle for civil rights was achieved because brave individuals made a stand.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that the struggle for civil rights was achieved because brave individuals made a stand.</p> <p>Level 1 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>I agree with this, and the source supports it. Some of the brave individuals were ordinary people who we don't know very much about, like the one mentioned here. He made a stand as a pastor and maybe encouraged people in his church to go to a freedom school, or join a boycott, or in some other way stand up for their rights. However, because he did that, he lost his job, his home, was threatened and shot at. Martin Luther King had his house bombed, was arrested many times and in the end was killed; all because he spoke out about the way black Americans were being treated. Thousands of other black people joined in non-violent protests like the sit ins, and were then picked on, lost their jobs or were in fear of their lives. But if they hadn't done that, the American government wouldn't have been pressured into action.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, it wasn't just brave individuals who brought the change. In the 1950s and 1960s the media spread news of protests like and that gave more people the courage to get involved, because others were already doing so. Media reports of brutal police treatment of protesters like in Birmingham in 1963 also put pressure on the federal government to get involved, ordering the release of people arrested. The fact that such treatment was broadcast internationally was shameful for the USA, and this also piled the pressure on the government to pass civil rights legislation later in the year. The journalist has also written in a very poetic way, using a lot of repetition, so it may not be totally accurate history. As a journalist, making a point is often more important than sticking to the hard facts, so this source has limitations when I evaluate it.</i></p> <p><i>So overall, it was a mixture of both. The fact that there had been brave individuals before however who had not achieved much change makes me think that it was the media that was most important. TV was the thing that made the protests of the 1950s and 1960s different from earlier ones.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)	Q: Describe the work of the House un-American Activities Committee	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>investigated anyone accused of disloyalty to the USA, especially communists</i> • <i>It wanted to expose communists and those who sympathised with communism in the USA</i> • <i>it questioned a lists of Hollywood actors, writers and producers provided by the FBI</i> • <i>It was frustrated by the 'Hollywood 10' who refused to answer its questions using the 1st Amendment</i> • <i>investigated a government official Alger Hiss on charges of spying and found him guilty of perjury in 1948 (2)</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain the consequences of McCarthyism in the USA.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the consequences of McCarthyism. They produce a response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain a consequence of McCarthyism.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of McCarthyism.</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>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 that thousands of people lost their jobs and had their lives ruined after being accused of being a communist sympathiser, or a Communist Party member. False accusations led to them being 'blacklisted', which meant they couldn't work; for example, over 100 lecturers were fired as universities came under pressure from McCarthy. The House Un-American Committee even blacklisted 324 Hollywood personalities and studio bosses wouldn't employ them, which virtually ended their acting careers.</i></p> <p><i>Another consequence was that there was a witch hunt within government for communist supporters. After the 1952 election President Eisenhower appointed McCarthy as head of a White House committee to investigate Communist activities in the government. Throughout 1952 and 1953 McCarthy targeted high-profile figures, including the celebrated war leader General George Marshall, and the government's top Asia expert Professor Owen Lattimore. All of this weakened the government in handling foreign affairs in the future, as some of their best advisers on the communists were accused of being sympathisers.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)		10	
	<p>Q: 'The Cold War caused McCarthyism in the USA in the early 1950s.' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for McCarthyism 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 the reasons for McCarthyism 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 the reasons for McCarthyism, explaining that it was OR wasn't caused by the Cold War. They explain one side of the argument and produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways this is true. There was already a 'Red Scare' by 1950. This was the result of the Cold War, and developments in China and Russia. After the Second World War, Russia spread its influence across Europe and many countries in Eastern Europe became communist. America was worried that more countries would become communist, and it hated this idea as it was deeply opposed to everything communism stood for. When the USSR tested its first atomic bomb in 1949, years ahead of when the USA predicted it would, America became paranoid about spies leaking secrets to the Russians. In the same year China also became communist, which sent America into overdrive, it felt like communism was going to take over. It was this mounting fear and spread of communism which McCarthy exploited.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, you can't ignore the personality and actions of McCarthy himself. He was a little known Republican Senator before 1950, but he got himself a lot of publicity by falsely claiming he had a list of 200 Communist Party members who worked in the US State Department. This was hot news in a climate of Red Scare, and he knew it. Other Republicans realised this was a vote winner, and supported him in 'rooting out the reds.' Fear of communism became a big issue in the 1952 elections, mainly because the Republicans and McCarthy in particular wanted it to be so they could beat the Democrats. After the Presidential election he then stirred up a real anti-communist frenzy because he was given a key role finding communists in government departments.</i></p> <p><i>So no, 'McCarthyism' wasn't totally because of the Cold War. There would have been a Red Scare in the early 1950s without McCarthy, because of what was happening internationally. However, it turned into a witch hunt or 'McCarthyism' because of the way McCarthy played on people's fears. Once he was given more power, his ambition and ruthlessness took over, and he turned a fear into a frenzy.</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 Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify or describe the reasons for McCarthyism. 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 McCarthyism or the reasons for it.</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>	

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	<p>Q: What were the Mississippi murders of 1964?</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>3 young civil rights workers were murdered by KKK</i> • <i>a response to trying to set up a 'freedom school' in the area</i> • <i>carried out by a lynch mob of local Klan members</i> • <i>took place in Neshoba County, Mississippi in June 1964 (2)</i> • <i>James Chaney, Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman were shot (2)</i> • <i>bodies were buried in one of the Klan member's quarries.</i>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)	<p>Q: Explain why Martin Luther King chose to lead marches in the south of the USA.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why MLK led marches in in the South of the USA. 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 why MLK led marches in in the South of the USA. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of MLK's marches and actions.</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 because he wanted to draw attention to the racism, because these were the places that most needed to change. For example, when he organised a civil rights march in Birmingham Alabama in 1963, he did it to protest because the city had not yet desegregated public places and he knew the police force was very racist towards African Americans. He had already led a successful protest in Montgomery some years before, against bus segregation. Now he wanted to put pressure on another Southern town to change its ways and he knew the TV and media would follow him there to add to the pressure.</i></p> <p><i>He also knew that these were the places most likely to generate good publicity for the cause. In Selma Alabama he organised a voting rights march in a place where he knew the police chief was very racist. He probably wasn't surprised when the chief responded to the march with terrible violence and arrests, but America was appalled. The media called it 'Bloody Sunday' and the TV pictures of the violence horrified the public. By showing how badly black people were treated, Martin Luther King was aiming to get more support for laws to improve black people's civil rights.</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)		10	
	<p>Q: 'President Kennedy did more to improve African-Americans' civil rights than President Johnson'. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of President Kennedy and Johnson's actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of President Kennedy and Johnson's actions to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to argue that either Johnson OR Kennedy's actions were more important. They explain one side of the argument and</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>Kennedy's policies were important. When he came to power in 1961 he was a young, idealistic President and straight away promoted many African Americans into his government. He seemed interested in black civil rights, for example he pressured the Governor of Alabama to protect the 'freedom riders' who were being attacked by racist mobs. His brother Bobby who was Attorney General worked on getting black Americans their voting rights. All of this must have encouraged black Americans that the President was on their side and inspired them to continue their desegregation campaigns. Then in June 1963 Kennedy announced that civil rights laws were going to be passed, which was a real breakthrough, as it would be the first time that the federal government had passed laws on this for the whole country to live by.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, it was President Johnson who was able to get this law passed. Kennedy was assassinated before it could happen, but some people think he wouldn't have managed it anyway. Johnson had a much better relationship with Congress than Kennedy had, and he managed to persuade Southern Democrats and Republicans to accept it. The other important bill that Johnson got passed was voting rights in 1965, as soon as he won the election. As a result of this law, black Americans were given the same voting rights as whites, and it also ended the literacy tests that voters had had to complete before they voted. These discriminated against poor blacks in particular. This law was really important, as it led to many more black people voting, and as a result, they voted for black politicians who would stand up for them, and voted out white racists.</i></p> <p><i>Clearly both of these Presidents had a role to play in improving African American's civil rights. However, I think that overall it was Johnson's government that was more important. This is because he was the one who actually got the civil rights laws passed, and maybe only he could have done, and Kennedy also dragged his heels for a couple of years before doing anything major.</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(c)	<p>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 use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe how Kennedy and/or Johnson's actions improved the civil rights of African- Americans.</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 Kennedy and/or Johnson's actions.</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>	

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid for use with questions 2c and 3c OR 5c and 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	3		6
7 (b)	1	2	4		7
7 (c)	1	2	4		7
8/9 (a)	4	0	0		4
8/9 (b)	3	3	0		6
8/9 (c)	4	6	0		10
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 2016

