

## **GCSE**

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

Unit **A016/01**: Aspects of international relations and End of Empire  
c.1919–1969

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:

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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the <b>cartoon's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid <b>sub-message</b> of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. <b>They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates <b>describe the cartoon</b> and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>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><i>CV=supportive of Lloyd George's attitude to reduce reparations / critical of France's attitude to setting high reparations</i></p> <p><i>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/ the French are being too harsh</i></p> <p><i>Sub message = Treaty is too harsh / reparations are too high</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why Clemenceau did not get everything he wanted at the Paris Peace Conference. They produce a <b>multi-causal response</b> that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> 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 <b>single-causal response</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Clemenceau and his aims at Versailles.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason 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><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><i>NB: Identifying what Clemenceau wanted but didn't get is L1 only. For explanation candidates must get to why he did not get these things. Award the final mark for explanation in a level only if candidates refer to both the term Clemenceau wanted and the term of the final Treaty</i></p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the role of the Assembly in the League of Nations.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example '<i>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"> <li>• <i>vote on admitting new members</i></li> <li>• <i>appoint temporary members of the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>vote on the budget</i></li> <li>• <i>vote on ideas put forward by the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>discuss and recommend action to the Council</i></li> <li>• <i>elect judges to the Permanent Court (along with the Council)</i></li> </ul> <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><b>Q: Explain why the League had some failures in the 1920s.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the League had some failures in the 1920s. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the League had some failures in the 1920s. They produce a single causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the League's failures in the 1920s.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason 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</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 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: How far can the failure of the League in the 1930s be blamed on the Manchurian Crisis? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how the Manchurian crisis <b>OR</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the weakness of the League <b>AND/OR</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> 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><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	<p><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><b>Q: Describe the Nazi-Soviet Pact.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example '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"> <li>• <i>a ten-year non-aggression pact (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>Germany and the USSR agreed not to attack each other</i></li> <li>• <i>hiding a secret clause to divide Poland between them</i></li> <li>• <i>defined Nazi and Soviet spheres of influence in Eastern Europe</i></li> <li>• <i>also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact as they were the foreign ministers who agreed it (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>an unlikely agreement between sworn enemies</i></li> <li>• <i>agreed in 1939</i></li> </ul> <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><b>Q: Why was Stalin concerned about the Munich Agreement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for Stalin's concern about the Munich Agreement. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Stalin was concerned about the Munich Agreement and produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the USSR and the Munich Agreement.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One 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 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how Hitler’s foreign policy <b>OR</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify other reasons for the outbreak of war <b>AND/OR</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> 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><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	<p><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 - The Cold War, 1945-1975

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>7</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>	<p>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 approves of the USA helping South Vietnam, by using bombing to stop Ho Chi Minh taking control. Ho is shown as an octopus, and his tentacles stretch all over South Vietnam, which was America's view that Ho was trying to take over by organising the Vietcong in the South. The US has the scissors of 'Air Strikes' in their hand, which is shown to be a simple way to combat the communists, by bombing their supply lines. In March 1965 the USA began Operation Rolling Thunder, in response to communist attacks on US airbases and the South Vietnam government. The cartoonist clearly approves of this action, because air strikes are shown to be a clean and precise way to target the communists, without 'cutting' or causing damage to the rest of the country. In fact bombing was neither clean nor effective, but as this is April 1965, the cartoonist is not aware of this yet.</i></p> <p><i>CV = the approval of American bombing</i> <i>Main = America's bombing is successful</i> <i>Sub = Any focus on Ho Chi Minh / America is bombing / America is trying to stop Ho Chi Minh US bombing is not working (or anything negative). References to American 'involvement' or 'policy' do not relate to bombing and are credited as sub message.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam in the 1950s under President Eisenhower.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam under President Eisenhower. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA became increasingly involved in Vietnam under Eisenhower. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US involvement in Vietnam under Eisenhower.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>6-8</b></p> <p><b>3-5</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason the USA became increasingly involved was because it was convinced Ho Chi Minh was a communist and was afraid of the domino theory. At the time America was involved in a Cold War with the USSR, and desperately wanted to stop the spread of communism. Under Eisenhower, it became convinced that once one country became communist, others would follow, like a row of falling dominoes. Although Ho claimed to be a nationalist trying to liberate Vietnam from foreign interference, the US believed he was a communist, so feared the domino theory in South East Asia. It was concerned Ho would spread communism from North Vietnam to the South, and then on through Laos and Cambodia.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason it became involved was because after the French left Vietnam, the new leader Diem was weak. Diem was a Catholic in a Buddhist nation, and allowed his family to have lots of the best jobs in government. This led to resentment and he was unpopular with many. As his government was weak, the USA felt they needed to guide him and the country more, so sent more advisers and massive amounts of aid to try and increase his popularity.</i></p> <p><i>NB: allow containment but must be advanced as a separate and distinct factor to the Domino Theory. Candidates must not be credited twice for the same material.</i></p>

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



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(a)	<p><b>Q: What was the Truman Doctrine?</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only. <i>'it was US policy towards 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"> <li>• <i>a policy of the US government for limiting the spread of communism</i></li> <li>• <i>the idea that communism would not be allowed to spread</i></li> <li>• <i>containment</i></li> <li>• <i>it provided aid, money, equipment and advice to countries at risk of becoming communist (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>announced in 1947</i></li> <li>• <i>It was started after the Red Army occupation of Europe, in response to the risk that the communists would take over in Greece (1 only - as more cause than description of TD itself)</i></li> </ul> <p>NB: 'containment' and 'stopping communism spreading' are the same point and should not both receive credit</p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks 6	Guidance
5 (b)	<p><b>Q: Why did Stalin fear the USA by 1946? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Stalin had reason to fear the USA 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why Stalin had reason to fear the USA and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about relations between the USA and USSR to 1946.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p>	<p>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 Stalin feared the USA would try to crush communism now that the USSR had been weakened by war. He knew that the Americans hated and feared communism, due to its different political system, but during the war they were prepared to work with the Soviets to fight a common enemy. After the Nazis had been defeated, the mutual distrust re-emerged and was already clear at the Potsdam conference, where the two former allies found it difficult to agree. Stalin was afraid Truman's new hard-line approach compared to Roosevelt's meant that the US saw his country as an enemy.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was America's development of the atomic bomb. It had a devastating effect when it was used on Japan at the end of the war, and Stalin feared that the real reason for its development was to threaten the USSR. When Truman refused to share America's research with the USSR, and did not reveal its existence until after it was tested, Stalin was even more suspicious and afraid, so began his own nuclear programme to protect the USSR. The nuclear arms race had begun, which then itself increased tension.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Care should be taken not to credit material after 1946, (such as Bizonia or the Truman Doctrine)</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: ‘By 1949, the USA had achieved more success in the Cold War than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1949 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the US successes <b>OR</b> the USSR’s achievements 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>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 AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways I agree. The USA had success in the Cold War from the beginning. By 1947 they were alarmed at Stalin’s control in Eastern Europe, and in response came up with the Truman Doctrine: America would assist countries if they were at risk from communist takeover. As a result, they helped the King of Greece defeat the communists, which was a success for containment. Likewise, in Berlin the USA were successful. Stalin had tried to take control of West Berlin, run by Britain, France and the USA, by blockading it in 1948. The Allies successfully airlifted supplies for 11 months to save it. Stalin could do nothing, for fear of triggering a war, and eventually gave up humiliated. By contrast the Allies looked like the good guys ‘saving’ Berlin from being strangled by communism, another US success.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USSR also had some success. Stalin wanted a sphere of influence in Europe to act as a buffer zone of friendly countries to prevent future attack: twice in thirty years Germany had attacked Russia. By 1949, there were communist governments across the whole of Eastern Europe, meaning that Stalin had the security he wanted. He may have achieved this by encouraging election rigging, banning opposition parties and murdering opposition politicians, but he had achieved it no less. He had also got what he wanted with Germany. At Yalta and Potsdam he had been determined to punish Germany and get reparations to compensate for the terrible loss of life and hardship the USSR had experienced during the war. He got this, as dividing Germany weakened it, and he took reparations from his zone.</i></p> <p><i>However overall, despite some USSR successes, it was the USA who looked strongest by 1949. Although it may look like the USSR was in the driving seat, provoking reactions from the USA like the Berlin Airlift and Truman Doctrine, it was they who came off worst when the USA reacted, shown by having to end the Berlin Blockade achieving nothing. Other than getting their sphere of influence, they were only just catching up with where the USA already was in terms of their allies and atomic weapons, by 1949.</i></p>





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


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the USA's reaction to the Cuban Revolution of 1959.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example <i>'the USA was very unhappy'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>at first they recognised Castro as the new leader of Cuba</i></li> <li>• <i>encouraged US businesses in Cuba not to use USSR imported products</i></li> <li>• <i>Eisenhower authorised the CIA to investigate ways of overthrowing Castro</i></li> <li>• <i>sponsored the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961</i></li> <li>• <i>US trade embargoes on sugar, oil and guns (2)</i></li> <li>• <i>produced anti-Castro propaganda</i></li> </ul> <p>NB: No more than two marks for the Bay of Pigs (or any other relevant factor)</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Why did the Soviet Union become involved in Cuba? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba. 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why the Soviet Union became involved in Cuba, or events in Cuba 1959-61.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>5-6</b></p> <p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was because it was anxious to defend Cuba, the only communist state in the Western hemisphere. It had willingly become communist, rather than becoming communist as a result of invasion by the Red Army, and so was excellent propaganda for the USSR, especially as it was in Uncle Sam's backyard. At the same time, Khrushchev was aware that the USA was very unhappy about a communist state so close, and so Cuba was at great risk of invasion. He had to protect his weak new ally against the strength of the USA, to ensure its survival.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason is because of the nuclear arms race and the missile gap that had emerged. Khrushchev knew that Kennedy had more long range weapons than he did, and bases very close to the USSR in Western Europe and Turkey which made him feel vulnerable. By putting his own medium range missiles in Cuba he hoped to restore the nuclear balance, as these Cuban missiles would threaten most US cities. It would also give the USA a taste of their own medicine by making the US feel vulnerable, as they had placed missiles near the USSR, and the missiles themselves could be easily built and replaced.</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q ‘The USA gained more from the Cuban Missile Crisis than the USSR’. How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the outcomes of the crisis to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to argue that the USA OR the USSR gained more 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</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 definitely agree that the USA gained a lot. When Khrushchev put his missiles on Cuba, America had to react in some way, as this was a threatening and provocative act. Missiles could target most American cities within minutes. The blockade was a sensible option as it was not a direct act of war, and forced Khrushchev into the position of villain or weakening, if he caused a war or retreated. It led to the Russians backing down and the missiles were removed meaning the USA was safe and Kennedy’s reputation was improved because he had stood up to Khrushchev. In that sense, America gained a lot. Kennedy also held his nerve when negotiating the removal of the bases: he waited for Khrushchev to change his negotiating position before agreeing a deal. That meant the US got to remove its missile bases from Turkey in secret, so it looked like only the Russians had backed down, another US win.</i></p> <p><i>That said, Khrushchev also secured his goal, so the USSR did well. In return for removing its missiles, the USA had to give a commitment not to attack Cuba, securing the survival of the regime to this day. One could argue this is why Khrushchev put missiles on the island in the first place, so in removing them, the USSR had lost nothing. It was a propaganda success for Khrushchev too outside the USSR, as the US had made no secret of its dislike of a communist country so close, but they could do nothing about it. The USSR also got the US missiles removed from Turkey, as part of the deal, meaning their people were less at risk from attack by America.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, I’d argue that the USA achieved more. Although both sides had gains, the USA’s gains were more public and without the humiliation of retreating from the naval blockade and removing missiles in public. Their losses were also private. As the Cold War was about propaganda and appearances, this mattered more.</i></p> <p><i>NB: The two ‘sides’ are the USA (success and/or failure) and the USSR</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (c) 	<p>are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the outcomes of the 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><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Cuban Missile Crisis.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><b>3-4</b></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	<p><i>(success and/or failure). Candidates must examine each 'side' in order to attain L4+. Allow references to Kennedy and Khrushchev. The establishment of the 'hotline' can be credited if validly integrated into a valid explanation or judgment. The 'cut off' for considering material is Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964.</i></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 B - A New World? 1948-2005

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>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>



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



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain why the multinational forces could not leave Iraq in 2003 after the Iraqi army had been defeated.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of what went wrong with the invasion of Iraq.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason 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
8 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe how Communist governments controlled people's lives in Eastern Europe after 1948.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'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"> <li>• <i>no freedom of speech/freedom to criticise the government</i></li> <li>• <i>ensorship of the press and media</i></li> <li>• <i>opposition groups/parties abolished and/or imprisoned</i></li> <li>• <i>use of informers</i></li> <li>• <i>limited freedom of religion</i></li> <li>• <i>brutal repression of strikes and protests against government policies</i></li> </ul>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Polish government acted against Solidarity in 1981</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> 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><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Polish government's actions towards Solidarity in December 1981.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One 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>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p><b>Q: How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how Gorbachev's actions <b>OR</b> 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>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> <p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p>





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

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain why the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) used terrorism.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 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><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the PLO used terrorist methods and produce a single-causal response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the PLO and its terrorist methods.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that 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
9 (c) 		10	<p> This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 46 to allocate SPaG marks.</p>
	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> 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><b>Level 4</b> 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><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of how nationalism <b>OR</b> 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</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> <p><i>Guidance for Level 4:</i></p>





## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (a)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the <b>cartoonist's main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon by explaining the <b>main message</b> and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>some understanding</b> of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, explain <b>a valid sub-message</b> and produce a response in context.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. <b>They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates <b>describe the cartoon</b> and produce a very <b>limited</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No response or no response worthy of credit</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 thinks that the Simon Commission will be unsuccessful because the Indian leaders are refusing to work with it. Sir John Simon is the man on the carpet and he is trying to get the interest of the audience with a box of tricks. He was the man appointed by the government in 1927 to investigate how to give Indians more self-government, because there were lots of protests against British rule. This cartoon is from before he published his findings, and already the different groups leading India aren't prepared to work with him. That is why they have their backs turned in the cartoon. Congress refused to work with him, and some in the Muslim League. So the cartoonist is making clear that what he is doing won't work, and the situation in India won't get sorted out, unless he can get more co-operation. The fact that there are many different groups makes clear what a difficult task he will have getting everyone working together, which reflects the existing problems in India between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (b)	<p><b>Q: Study Source B. Why did Churchill make this speech in 1935? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of India in 1935. They interpret the purpose of the speech to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message of the speech and produce a response explaining why this speech was made.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> 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 speech OR they explain the message or purpose without setting it in context.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates describe the speech and produce a very limited response.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> 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>In many ways this source is not typical. By 1935 there was a realisation in Britain that India would no longer accept direct rule from London, so a Government of India Act was agreed which gave India a federal system of government with an elected Parliament. Many politicians in parliament supported these aims, especially in the government, partly because of how much trouble protests in India were causing. Gandhi got a lot of positive publicity when he attended Round Table Talks in London in 1931, which influenced a wider public to believe in the justice of his cause. By contrast this source supports British rule in India continuing, not self-government, and it talks about the horrors that await if it were given home rule. Churchill was a very strong imperialist, and not representative of all politicians or the public as a whole.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, some Conservative politicians agreed with Churchill. In the source, Churchill explains that British rule is good for India and that without it, the country would return to the problems it had centuries ago. This was one argument that people used at the time to justify having an empire: that Britain was a civilising influence on the colonies and made them better places for the locals. These attitudes are one reason it took almost four years for the Government of India Act to get through Parliament, because giving India more independence went against the idea that Britain 'knew best' what its colonies needed. We could expect that many in the wider public agreed with this, as they had been brought up on pro-empire propaganda.</i></p> <p><i>So his views were not representative of what British views towards India were, even if some sympathised with some of them: many were finding India was just too much trouble by 1935.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10 (c)		7	
	<p><b>Q: Study Source C: ‘Gandhi was more important than Nehru in helping India to achieve independence from Britain.’ How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>sound knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>sound evaluation</b> of the source, to <b>evaluate effectively</b> the interpretation that Gandhi was more important than Nehru in helping India achieve independence.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>some knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>some understanding</b> of the source, to <b>evaluate</b> the interpretation that Gandhi was more important than Nehru in helping India achieve independence.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate <b>basic knowledge</b> and understanding of the period, and <b>basic understanding</b> of the source, to <b>comment</b> on the interpretation that Gandhi was more important than Nehru in helping India achieve independence.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate very <b>limited</b> knowledge and <b>evaluate</b> the source <b>superficially</b>.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>In some ways this is true, and the source supports it. Gandhi here is promoting the use of satyagraha which had a clear effect on the British, pressuring them into giving greater independence, leading for example to the Government of India Act in 1935. Its use for a long period is noted by Gandhi, and it is this long term effectiveness which wore the British down. That he admitted the limitations of the approach was typical of Gandhi’s humility. Here he promotes the policy again strongly, because he was trying to convince a wary National Congress to use it against Britain while she was at war, so his language is repetitive and persuasive.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, Gandhi was trying to persuade the National Congress because he understood that this body had influence by 1942 and the best way to organise a campaign of civil disobedience was through them. Nehru was President of this body, and had built its influence since 1928. In that sense, he was equally important, and Gandhi’s speech to the Congress points to this. Nehru also gave important political guidance and leadership to nationalists, overseeing the introduction of the 1935 act and trying to use the start of war to pressure Britain further towards independence. His political skill turned India by 1939 into a federal state which itself left Britain with fewer excuses not to give independence. It was also his caution which made Congress wary of adopting Gandhi’s methods this time, rightly as it turned out as it led to many being imprisoned.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, although Gandhi is usually seen as the figurehead of the movement for independence, his recognition of the influence of Nehru’s Congress and Nehru’s political skills makes me conclude that Nehru, not Gandhi was the more important figure.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (a)		4	
	<p><b>Q: Describe the impact of the Second World War on India.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Viceroy Lord Linlithgow declared India was at war without consulting Congress</i></li> <li>• <i>jobs were created in industries supplying the war effort or in the armed forces</i></li> <li>• <i>Quit India campaign was launched in 1942</i></li> <li>• <i>civil disobedience and protests against Britain were less effective</i></li> <li>• <i>some Indians joined the Japanese in fighting against Britain</i></li> <li>• <i>it removed the illusion that Britain could protect India.</i></li> </ul>

## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (b)		6	
	<p><b>Q: Explain the impact of religious divisions in India on the struggle for independence before 1947.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the part played by religious divisions in the struggle for independence in India. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain the part played by religious divisions in the struggle for independence in India. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of religious divisions and/or India achieving independence.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Religious divisions meant that from as early as 1929 Jinnah and the Muslim League were suggesting a separate state for Muslims in the north east and north west of India. Muslims were worried about India becoming an independent country dominated by Hindus so wanted their own state. Nehru and the mainly Hindu Congress thought that this would weaken India, and so wanted one country containing Muslims and Hindus. This division would influence the path independence took into a two state solution and complicated matters for the British as they had to deal with 2 different sets of Indian demands.</i></p> <p><i>These religious divisions also made the path to independence more bloody. In August 1946 Jinnah called for a Direct Action Day against the proposal of a centralised single state government which began weeks of riots between Muslims and Hindus across India. Tens of thousands were killed. Divisions may also have made the path to independence slower, as it gave the British excuses not to act, and weakened the independence campaigns. For example, in 1922 Gandhi called off his satyagraha campaigns as violence between Muslim and Hindu communities got out of control, a side effect of his protests. In 1940 Jinnah refused to support Congress's non-co-operation with the British which weakened its effect.</i></p>

## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11 (c)		10	
	<p><b>Q: How far do you agree that Mountbatten was to blame for what went wrong with partition in 1947? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the issues around partition and the role of Mountbatten to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the issues around partition and the role of Mountbatten and other factors to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain <b>EITHER</b> Mountbatten's responsibility <b>OR</b> counter-argue the case. They produce a response that demonstrates</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>You could argue that Mountbatten was to blame for what went wrong with partition. There was terrible violence before and after the agreement was made, with hundreds of thousands of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs killing each other. In a sense this was Mountbatten's fault, because he encouraged the speeding up of the hand over process, so there was less time to take proper precautions and put a well-armed force in trouble spots like the Punjab. The original plan had been for the handover to be in stages and take a year, but it was speeded up to take only two months. If there had been more time and preparation, he may have been able to avoid some of the violence.</i></p> <p><i>However, it's easy to blame one man and you have to admit that he and the Indian leaders were working under huge pressure to get the partition sorted out quickly. Violence between the different religious groups had a long history, and was already increasing before 1947, killing tens of thousands across India. This is because of fears about the outcome of the government talks leaving communities isolated and at risk. It is not then surprising that Mountbatten and the British government wanted a transfer of power resolved quickly, because they hoped that afterwards the situation would quieten down. Also, Mountbatten did not have huge numbers of men to patrol the Punjab and other trouble spots. He had only 23,000 soldiers in the Punjab Boundary Force, to keep order, and that was too few when the 15 million population was so divided, angry and armed. The priority for Britain was achieving the handover, and some historians have argued that if he had taken longer, there would have been more violence.</i></p> <p><i>When Mountbatten was parachuted in to replace Wavell as Viceroy of India, he faced an unenviable task. India was deeply divided, tensions were high and violence escalating. Although a staged withdrawal might have put in place more precautions, it could just as easily have enflamed tensions further. With such vicious enmity and fear across the religious and communal divide, there would have been violence whatever he had done. He was not to blame.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they describe Mountbatten's actions or identify counter-arguments. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of partition and/or the problems around it.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p></p> <p><b>3-4</b></p> <p></p> <p><b>1-2</b></p> <p></p> <p><b>0</b></p>	



## Part 2: End of Empire c. 1919-1969

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (a)	<p><b>Q: Describe the impact of the Second World War on Kenya.</b></p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Around 97,000 Kenyans joined up to serve in the armed forces</i></li> <li>• <i>Settlers grew rich supplying the war effort</i></li> <li>• <i>Settlers dominated in government, filling posts normally held by British officials.</i></li> <li>• <i>Taxes were raised to pay for the war effort which hit poor Africans much more than settlers.</i></li> <li>• <i>11,000 African squatters were evicted to a bleak area of the Mau escarpment, to increase wartime food production</i></li> </ul>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (b)	<p><b>Q: Explain how the British dealt with the Mau Mau Rebellion.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain how the British dealt with the Mau Mau rebellion. They produce a <b>multi-causal</b> response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain how the British dealt with the Mau Mau rebellion. They produce a <b>single-causal</b> response.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Mau Mau rebellion or British handling of Kenya.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One of the things the British did was rounded up thousands of Kikuyu and kept them in detention camps. This was to stop the acts of violence against settlers. They turned on civilians as well as wannabe soldiers: in April 1954 they arrested almost half the Kikuyu population of Nairobi and placed them in camps. Kenyans could be imprisoned without trial and the use of torture and even execution was widespread. These drastic measures cut off supplies of recruits, information and support for the Mau Mau.</i></p> <p><i>Another thing they did was created a 25,000 strong Home Guard to offer protection to settlers. Settlers often joined it officially, at other times they simply acted as vigilantes and rounded up suspects and murdered them. By the end of the campaign official reports said that around 11,000 Africans had been killed, but it could have been more like 100,000. What it achieved, along with the detention camps, was reducing the levels of violence against settlers.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12 (c)	<p><b>Q ‘The main reason Kenya achieved its independence was because the British had changed their minds about empires.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for Kenya achieving independence to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 4</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for Kenya achieving its independence to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to support <b>OR</b> counter the issue in the statement 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</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>10</b></p> <p><b>7-9</b></p> <p><b>5-6</b></p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In some ways this is true. By 1960 there was a different feeling in Britain about the idea of having an empire. Many people were either uninterested in the African colonies, or wanted them to have their independence. People no longer felt proud to be an imperial power. The Prime Minister Harold Macmillan gave a speech which talked about the ‘Winds of Change blowing across this (African) continent’ which became famous for showing that the government itself recognised that ruling other nations was a thing of the past. The British were being influenced a lot by America in this change of mind. Her views carried a lot of weight since the end of the Second World War which had left Britain a second rate power and heavily in America’s debt. The Hola camp scandal was the nail in the coffin as this shocked and horrified civilised Britain, and added to the feeling that colonial rule was good for no one.</i></p> <p><i>But although all that is true, this wasn’t the only factor which caused Britain to give Kenya its independence. The actions of KAU and the Mau Mau rebellion also brought change. The Kikuyu had been campaigning since 1925 for a role in government and this increased after the Second World War, when it was led by Jomo Kenyatta. He was a charismatic and popular figurehead until his arrest, and got more support for the movement. When he was released from jail he worked to reassure all groups within Kenya that they could work together to govern themselves and it was his approach that reassured the British that they could give up the reins of power safely without a bloodbath. Mau Mau opposition to British rule was also important, as they showed the British how determined Africans were to rule themselves, and made Kenya a problem that needed a solution.</i></p> <p><i>It’s hard to pick out one reason for a change like this, as there were many. What is clear though, is that one of the reasons for the British changing their minds about empires was the visible opposition to colonial rule that KAU and the Mau Mau uprising provided. If Africans had been happy with it, why would British people have considered giving up the prestige and power an empire provides? The Americans could not have been so critical either. In that sense, native opposition was the most important reason for change.</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they identify other reasons for Kenyan independence or describe how Britain turned against empires. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Kenya's independence or the reasons for it.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	

Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment grid for use with questions 2c and 3c OR 5c and 6c OR 8c and 9c.

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

### Assessment Objectives (AO) Grid

(includes Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar )

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

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

