

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

Unit **A012/01**: Aspects of international relations and Russia, 1905–1941

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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

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

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




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

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

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

© OCR 2017

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning of Annotation
BP	Blank page
SEEN	Point has been noted, but no credit has been given (big)
	Not Relevant
L5	Level 5
L4	Level 4
L3	Level 3
L2	Level 2
L1	Level 1
IRRL	Significant amount of material which doesn't answer the question
	
EVAL	Evaluation
DEV	Development
	Unclear

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: What is the cartoonist's message? Use details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (SM+CK) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	7 7 5-6 3-4 2 1 0	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance, demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist's message is mainly one of criticism of the two Presidents who allowed the Cuban Missile Crisis to get so bad that a nuclear war could have happened, although there is also a hint of optimism and approval that they are now working together to prevent it in the future. In this Crisis both leaders could have caused a nuclear war, Kennedy by reacting with aggression to the USSR placing missiles on Cuba, and Khrushchev by forcing his way through the US naval blockade. How close they got is shown by the fact that the huge hand is almost out of the box, and this implies a criticism that the leaders did not act sooner to negotiate and prevent the risk of war. They seem relieved and exhausted by the effort of 'shutting war down' in the cartoon which highlights the last minute and quite desperate attempts to negotiate by letter and even using the President's brother.</i></p> <p><i>Yet the cartoon also shows some approval and optimism that the future will be less dangerous. Both leaders are shown working together and agreeing that together they must prevent war in the future by finding 'a lock' for the chest. As it was produced only a month after the crisis ended the cartoonist is aware that both sides made concessions and agreements to prevent war breaking out, and he clearly believes this air of cooperation will continue.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist Message: criticism of the leaders for risking nuclear war, OR praising the leaders for preventing nuclear war Main Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev have worked together to prevent nuclear war <i>in the CMC</i> OR Kennedy and Khrushchev risked nuclear war Sub Message: Kennedy and Khrushchev are working together/nuclear war is a terrible thing/nuclear war almost got out of control/neither President wanted a nuclear war</p> <p>NB: CK needs to support the message given NB: Do not credit the 'hotline' as CK NB: All relevant description of the October 1962 crisis can be credited</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the USA took action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of US action against Cuba in the years 1959 to 1961.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason the USA took action was that they were concerned at the changes Castro was making in Cuba. When he seized power from Batista he nationalised US-owned agricultural businesses and gave away their land to his peasant supporters. This created powerful opposition to Castro in the USA and the government responded by banning sugar imports from Cuba, which was vital to Cuba's economic survival. The whole situation escalated when Castro nationalised US-owned oil refineries without compensation, so the US responded with a full scale trade ban. The USA wanted to disrupt Cuba's trade to weaken its economy and in turn, weaken Castro's hold on power, which they saw as dangerous to its own economic and political interests.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason they took action was that they were concerned about the developing relationship between Khrushchev and Castro. When he first came to power it was not clear that Castro was a communist, however by the summer of 1960 he had allied Cuba with the Soviet Union and signed a trade deal. This worried the USA very much, as they felt threatened by a Soviet satellite 'in their backyard'. The Cold War was hotting up, and any advance of communism could damage the USA, so Kennedy broke off diplomatic relations with Cuba in January 1961. He also gave the go-ahead for the Bay of Pigs invasion with Cuban exiles in an attempt to remove Castro from power.</i></p> <p>NB: Explanations are likely to identify what Castro and/or the USSR did and show why that worried the US</p>



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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>Q: What disagreements were there between the leaders at the Potsdam Conference in 1945?</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'future of Europe'</i>.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>how Germany should be treated, harshly or leniently</i> • <i>how much reparations to take from the defeated Germany</i> • <i>details about the boundaries between the different zones of occupation in Berlin and Germany</i> • <i>Soviet influence in eastern Europe (1). Stalin showed no signs of wanting to remove his Red Army from eastern Europe and Truman suspected his intentions (2)</i> • <i>future of Poland (1): Stalin had arrested the Polish government in exile, the so-called London Poles (the non-communists) to prevent them taking power (2)</i> • <i>Stalin wanted a foothold in the Mediterranean and Japan (1), but Truman rejected this (2)</i> <p>NB: credit what disagreements there where and not why there were disagreements (for example do not credit personality clashes or the circumstances around the US atomic bomb programme)</p> <p>NB: supporting detail <u>can</u> include the reasoning behind the disagreement</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (b)	<p>Q: Explain why Berlin was a cause of tension between East and West from 1945 to 1949.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of why Berlin was a cause of tension between 1945 and 1949. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (1D/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about Berlin between 1945 and 1949.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One reason was that Berlin was deep in the heart of Soviet controlled East Germany and Stalin resented that a large part of it was being run by the Western Allies. Berlin had been split into sectors at the end of the war in the same way that Germany had been split into zones, as it was the capital city. Stalin disagreed with the West's ideology of democracy and free-market capitalism, and did not want people in his zone to be attracted by the fruits of capitalist system. It would also make his own exploitation of East Germany more evident, as the West was not stripping its zones of resources as reparations for war.</i></p> <p><i>Berlin was also a cause of tension because of the Berlin blockade. In retaliation to the West unifying its zones and reforming the currency in 1948, Stalin prevented the Allies accessing West Berlin by land and sea. He closed off all roads, canals and railways forcing the Allies to come up with a plan to resource their 2 million people. They did, the Berlin Airlift, but the blockade massively raised the tension between the two sides and meant that one aggressive move could have resulted in military conflict.</i></p> <p>NB: do not credit material focussed on Germany as a whole (e.g. currency changes, Bizonia, etc.) NB: do not accept splitting of Berlin into 4 unless it is connected with its geographical position in the Eastern zone</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(c) 		10	 This question also carries 6 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: The following were equally to blame for increasing Cold War tensions in Europe before 1950:</p> <p>(i) Soviet expansion in eastern Europe;</p> <p>(ii) the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid.</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War before 1950 to explain how far they agree. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the events in the Cold War to 1950 to explain how far they agree. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>7-9</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>In many ways I agree. The USSR increased Cold War tensions by expanding Soviet control into eastern Europe. Stalin had been allowed a 'sphere of influence' in Europe according to the Yalta conference, and he was determined to surround the USSR with 'friendly' countries. He interpreted this as countries that were under his influence, and from 1945 to 1948 he made sure that these countries were run by communists. At times communists seem to have won elections honestly, at other times they gained power with the helping hand of the Red Army and underhand methods. Whichever way, the West was shocked and alarmed that eastern Europe should fall so completely under Stalin's influence, which is what motivated their actions in introducing containment. Stalin's desire for control and security frightened the USA and increased tension massively.</i></p> <p><i>However, the USA did not have to respond in the way it did, and you could argue that the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid provoked Stalin. In 1947 President Truman announced that the USA would help any country at risk of a communist takeover. This was the Truman doctrine and was the start of the US policy of containment. The government did not keep this policy a secret and it not surprisingly raised tensions with the USSR who saw it as a direct attack on their ideology and threat to their security. Stalin could see that it worked too, as it led to the communists losing the civil war in Greece because the Americans funded the monarchists. Equally, when the USA offered money for rebuilding Europe through the Marshall Plan Stalin was suspicious, as he felt that the USA was trying to buy loyalty and discredit him to his allies because he had nothing to offer. The US attitude was provocative and bound to antagonise the Soviets, increasing tension.</i></p> <p><i>It is very difficult to argue one of these is more important than the other as both were motivated by the same reasonable goal of achieving security for a nation and way of life, but both knowingly made the other side feel threatened. Both sides were also acting out of mutual suspicion: as neither of</i></p>


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of Soviet expansion OR the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify events that show Soviet expansion AND/OR describe the Truman doctrine and Marshall Aid. They produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 (general points) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Cold War.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><i>them trusted the other, they suspected and were suspicious of each other's actions, making both factors equally to blame.</i></p> <p>NB: Answers must first reach L4/9 in order to be credited as L5/10</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the anti-Vietnam War protest movement in the USA after 1965.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, for example ‘<i>campaigned in many cities</i>’.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>included many civil rights campaigners (1) opposed to the money spent and so many blacks being drafted (2)</i> • <i>supported by famous singers and celebrities (1) including Muhammad Ali (2)</i> • <i>included student groups (1) opposed to the draft (2) (maximum of two marks for groups included)</i> • <i>reached its height in 1968-70</i> • <i>protests often involved burning the US flag</i> • <i>protests often involved violent clashes with the police (1) for example at Kent State University 4 students were shot dead (2)</i>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (b)	<p>Q: How was the Tet Offensive a turning point in the Vietnam War? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of how the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War. They produce a response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, offering more than one explanation.</p> <p>Level 2 (1 exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one way in which the Tet Offensive was a turning point in the Vietnam War.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the Tet offensive and/or how it can be seen as a turning point.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One way it was a turning point was that after the Tet Offensive the government decided to negotiate for peace and withdraw its troops from Vietnam. Until that point, it had told the people of America that it was winning the war in Vietnam, and would continue to fight until the Vietcong were crushed. However, the Tet Offensive showed that the VC was still strong enough to attack in more than 100 places at the same time, and this convinced the government that the war was unwinnable. As a result, Johnson decided to negotiate and make plans to withdraw troops.</i></p> <p><i>Another result was that the media seems to have turned against the war. Before Tet, when most newspapers and the TV reported the war they concentrated on US successes and what they were being told by the military. However, Tet seems to have changed that because it showed that the war was not going as well as official sources said. This made journalists less willing to believe what they were told by the military, and made them more critical, concentrating on more negative aspects of the war. This then influenced the public mood, and even government, after Tet.</i></p>

<p>3 (c) </p>	<p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify or describe the reasons the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam, and they produce a basic response.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the war in Vietnam and the USA's involvement.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	
---	---	---	--

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. What is the cartoonist's message? Use the details of the cartoon and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (CV+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoonist's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 4 (MM+CK) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon, by explaining the cartoon's main message and produce a sound response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (SM+CK) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret a valid sub-message of the cartoon and produce a response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (SM/MM/CV) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the cartoon in a valid way.</p> <p>Level 1 (SF) Candidates describe the cartoon and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The cartoonist's message is criticising the leaders' approach to Berlin as it is a very dangerous situation yet neither President seems prepared to back down. Both are shown as determined to get what they want, arguing with their fists clenched. The danger is clear from the thoughts they are having about bombing the other with nuclear weapons, shown by the mushroom clouds in their thoughts. The caption makes it seem as if they are putting each other to the test to see who will give in, which is exactly what was happening at the time. Berlin was a city still divided between the capitalist and communist powers which was creating huge tension as many East Germans were using it as an escape route to the capitalist West. Khrushchev was under pressure from the East German leader to use force to prevent this movement, and at the same time thought he could bully the young new US President and prove his and communism's superiority. As a result, he insisted that the West withdraw US troops from the city. When Kennedy refused, tension grew, shown clearly in the cartoon, and there was a risk that the crisis could escalate and result in military aggression. The cartoonist believes that they are acting irresponsibly, and that they should be more aware of the risks they are running by confronting each other in this way.</i></p> <p>Cartoonist Message: criticism of leaders +MM (must relate to Berlin) Main Message: risk of war over Berlin as neither leader was prepared to back down; tensions are rising in Berlin; tensions may lead to war in Berlin (place important). Sub Message: leaders are arguing; Berlin is causing problems for them, mocking the leaders (no place), Berlin is at the centre of the Cold War, leaders are fighting over Berlin</p> <p>CK: The USSR had concerns over the number of people leaving East Germany via Berlin; at the Vienna Summit Khrushchev issued an ultimatum about the future of Berlin; the two leaders started to fallout at the Vienna Summit in June 1961; in the dispute over Berlin, Kennedy announced he was going to increase US preparedness for war.'</p> <p><i>NB Do not credit CK about building of wall as that was August 1961; the cartoon is about the build-up of tension. Do not credit blockade/airlift as too long ago.</i></p>

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



Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (b)		8	
	<p>Q: Explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Soviet Union crushed the Hungarian Uprising of 1956. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Hungarian Uprising and the reason it was crushed.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>6-8</p> <p>3-5</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>The main reason the USSR crushed it was because they were concerned that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact. This was a military alliance just created in 1955 which would help protect the Soviet Union should they be attacked by the West. The Soviet Union could not allow a hole in their protective frontier of buffer states so stepped in when it became clear that the new Hungarian leader Nagy wanted to remove his country.</i></p> <p><i>Another important reason is that Khrushchev wanted to send a message to Eastern Europe that there were limits to the changes the Soviets were prepared to accept. Since Khrushchev himself had attacked Stalin's memory earlier in the year, there had already been demonstrations against the Soviet-backed government in Poland. Next in Hungary popular uprisings led to the fall of two communist leaders. When Nagy came to power he wanted much greater political freedoms, including free elections. It would be very dangerous for the Soviets to allow this, for fear they would lose control over the government, and it would also encourage other East European countries to demonstrate for similar freedoms.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagy liberal reforms • Nagy abolished the one party state • Nagy announced freedom of speech in Hungary • Nagy announced freedom of religion. • Cardinal Mindszenty, leader of the Catholic Church was released. • The Western powers were involved in the Suez Crisis. • They knew the Americans weren't going to stop them • It was getting out of control as there were many Hungarian protestors on the streets • The power and dominance of the Red Army <p>NB This question is about WHY the Soviets crushed the uprising, not HOW they did. The answer must be connected to the reasons behind the response.</p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by Al Qaeda and its supporters.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg <i>'attacks on US', 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'terrorism'</i></p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>use of suicide bombers</i> • <i>attacks on US military (1) for example October 2000 attack on USS Cole (2)</i> • <i>attacks on US embassies (1) in Kenya and Tanzania (2)</i> • <i>attack on World Trade Centre (Twin Towers) in New York (1) and the Pentagon (1) after hijacking four aircraft (2). Max 2 marks.</i> • <i>attacks on Western tourists</i> • <i>Madrid train bombing in 2004</i> • <i>Hi-jacking</i> • <i>Kidnapping (1) with Boko Haram (2) (or Al Shabab)</i> • <i>Truck bomb attack on World Trade Centre in 1993 by Ramzi Yousef</i> • <i>Attack on USS Cole in Yemen</i> • <i>London bombings- 7/7</i> • <i>Use of social media/internet</i> • <i>Create 'Cells'</i> • <i>Radicalisation (1) through the use of the media/teachings/fundamentalist Islam (1)</i> <p><i>NB: 'Bombing', 'shooting', 'terrorism' and 'propaganda' are just general points and need to be qualified</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why have some people resorted to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why some people resort to terrorism. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one reason why some people resort to terrorism.</p> <p>Level 1 (ID/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about why some people resort to terrorism and terrorism in general.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>NB: This question is about why terrorists 'resorted' to terrorism. Not just why people supported the cause.</p>	<p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Many of the people who resort to terrorism do so because they feel they do not have a voice. They feel powerless and have concluded that no one will listen to them unless they use force. For example, the Provisional IRA believed that even though they lived in a democratic country, the government was biased against them. As Catholics Republicans were also in a permanent minority in the North compared to Protestant Unionists they also felt the electoral system did not represent them. As a result the British government would not listen to their demands for an independent, united Ireland, and the Northern Irish government would not listen either because it was full of Unionist politicians. They saw violence as the way to get what they wanted as it would get the attention of the governments and pressurise them.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons the PLO resorted to violence was because of the strength of their enemies. They were fighting against Israel for control of a homeland in the Middle East, but the USA was supplying Israel with weaponry, so the PLO had little chance of success in a conventional war, even though it was supported by Arab states. As a result some Palestinians turned to terrorist attacks as a way of weakening their enemy, disrupting their lives and business because they were too strong to defeat in any other way. Bitterness and resentment against the Israelis was also bred in the poverty of the refugee camps the Palestinians lived in while they were trying to regain land Israel had claimed. This anger was channelled by the PLO who gave idle and restless refugees status and recognition if they joined their ranks.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <p><i>a) PLO are aggrieved because they have lost land b) The IRA felt they were powerless c) Al Qaeda feel they are opposed by an over mighty enemy.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Al Qaeda terrorists did not 'resort' to terrorism in the same way as PLO and IRA so can accept that they thought this would buy them a route to Jannah/Heaven as they had been radicalised.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (c) 		10	 This question also carries 3 additional marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar; use the separate marking grid on page 42 to allocate SPaG marks.
	<p>Q: How successfully have governments responded to terrorism? Explain your answer using examples from terrorist groups you have studied.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to analyse how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period, to justify a valid conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period, to reach a conclusion.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of explain how governments have OR have not successfully responded to terrorism, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some</p>	<p>10</p> <p>7-9</p> <p>5-6</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>Often governments have not dealt successfully with terrorism. In 1971, the British government introduced Internment in Northern Ireland to disrupt IRA activities. This meant they could arrest and hold anyone suspected of terrorism without charge. Not only did it fail to catch the IRA's key leaders, it also increased support for the IRA in Ireland and the USA, because it was only used against nationalists and was often accompanied by torture. This was a massive own goal. Equally, when Israel got tough with the PLO they often created bad publicity for their own cause. In 1982 they launched a full scale invasion of Lebanon to destroy the PLO's bases there, which they achieved. However, there were around 19,000 civilian casualties, including a massacre in 2 refugee camps, which massively damaged support for Israel around the world, even with their ally the USA.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand at times they have successfully limited terrorist's freedom of action. For example in 1985 the British signed an agreement with the Republic of Ireland to increase co-operation between the two countries' security forces. This made it much more difficult for the IRA to move people, arms and equipment between the North and Republic of Ireland. The USA has also had success against Al Qaeda, destroying their training camps and heavy weapons in Afghanistan, finding and targeting Bin Laden and setting up Special Forces bases all over the world to target the organisation. Even in the Middle East, the Israeli government's 'Get tough' approach may be considered to be part of the reason Arafat was willing to compromise some of the PLO's aims in the Oslo Accords.</i></p> <p><i>Terrorism is very difficult for governments to handle effectively as the terrorists are often versatile and skilled propagandists, and governments are criticised for negotiating with them. That said, they have had some success. However the main reason for this is usually more to do with changes in the terrorist organisations themselves, eg the emergence of Sinn Fein as the political wing of the IRA, rather than because they have successfully prevented terrorists actions. As a result, I conclude that overall they have not always responded well enough.</i></p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>understanding of the past.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to identify/describe how successfully governments have responded to terrorism. 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 governments' responses to terrorism.</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>NB: If only one terrorist group is mentioned- bottom level only- All levels</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><u>Other IDs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The British Government tried to starve the IRA of publicity</i> • <i>Internment</i> • <i>Good Friday Agreement and other significant attempts to sort out Irish issue- Anglo-Irish Agreement, 1994 meetings with John Major</i> • <i>Covert operations such as informers</i> • <i>Working with the government of Eire</i> • <i>Secret talks with IRA</i> • <i>Israel launched a full-scale assault on PLO bases in the Lebanon in 1982.</i> • <i>Commando raids on Tunis in 1998.</i> • <i>Oslo Talks</i> • <i>'War on Terror' in Afghanistan</i> • <i>Use of intelligence – spy satellites and bugging against possible Al Qaeda sympathisers.</i> • <i>Guantanamo Bay detention camp</i>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (a)		4	
	<p>Q: Describe the methods used by the Americans and British against the Iraqi insurgency of 2003 to 2006.</p> <p>One mark for each relevant point; one additional mark for supporting detail.</p> <p>Allow one mark to a candidate who offers a general point only, eg 'bombing', 'shooting', 'propaganda', 'counter-insurgency'.</p> <p>0 marks = no response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	4	<p>Answers could include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>laser guided air strikes to target key insurgents</i> • <i>ground war to retake lost land (1) for example, Fallujah (2)</i> • <i>cordon and search operations</i> • <i>use of informants to identify weapons stashes</i> • <i>speeded up transfer of power from coalition forces to an Iraqi government</i> • <i>raids on suspected insurgents</i> • <i>Use of high tech weapons to target insurgency groups</i> • <i>Engagement with the Mahdi Army at Najaf</i> • <i>Internment at Abu Ghraib</i> • <i>Operation Sinbad - Basra 2006</i> • <i>Operation Iron Hammer 2003 – using US air force</i> • <i>Operation Phantom Fury- Fallujah, 2004</i> <p><i>NB: Do not accept Operation Phantom. This was in 2007</i></p>

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

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6 (b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 3 (2 exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They produce a response explaining multiple impacts that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (one exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the international impact of the Iraq war. They explain one consequence.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate only limited knowledge about the international impact of the Iraq war.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6</p> <p>5-6</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of AOs 1 and 2.</p> <p><i>One international impact was the damaged reputations of both America and Britain. Many suspected the motives of the Bush Administration in getting involved in the war, and when it became clear that most of the big rebuilding contracts went to US or non-Iraqi firms it made it even easier to criticise Western involvement in Iraq as being self-serving. The coalition also seemed unable to control the insurgency, which made it look weak and made people question US military might, damaging its reputation further.</i></p> <p><i>A connected and equally important consequence was that the war increased support for militant Islam around the world. To many in the Arab world the war seemed to be a Crusade against Muslims and the large loss of civilian life was evidence of the West's careless attitude. Terrorist cells and attacks in the US and UK often claim to be revenge for Western involvement in Iraq, and Intelligence reports believe the Iraq war has had a key role in increasing the threat of terrorism in the West.</i></p> <p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created a humanitarian crisis with refugees • Soured relations between the USA and some European nations • Altered US approach to foreign policy • Helped Obama win US presidency • Led to the rise of Isis • Rise in Oil Price • Ruined international reputation of Blair/Bush

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to agree AND/OR disagree that the main reason for the invasion of Iraq was because of Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors. They produce a basic response, only identifying or describing factors.</p> <p>Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq or Saddam Hussein's lack of co-operation with UN weapons inspectors.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><u>Other IDs possible</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>There was a strong anti-Saddam lobby in the USA</i> • <i>Saddam had suspected links with Al Qaeda</i> • <i>Saddam's human rights violations</i> • <i>Iraq's oil wealth</i> • <i>To bring democracy to the Middle East</i> • <i>Establish a long term military presence in the Middle East for the USA</i> • <i>Pressurise Saudi Arabia over its links with terrorism</i>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (a)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source A. ‘Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR because Stalin was a more skilful politician’. How far do you agree with this interpretation? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer</p> <p>Level 4 (2-Sided + Source evaluation) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the period, and sound evaluation of the source, to evaluate effectively the interpretation that Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR because Stalin was a more skilful politician.</p> <p>Level 3 (2-Sided) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the period, and some understanding of the source, to evaluate the interpretation that Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR because Stalin was a more skilful politician.</p> <p>Level 2 (1-Sided) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding of the period, and basic understanding of the source, to comment on the interpretation that Trotsky failed to become leader of the USSR because Stalin was a more skilful politician.</p> <p>Level 1 (Stock Ev/ Limited response/ CK) Candidates demonstrate very limited knowledge and evaluate the source superficially.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>6-7</p> <p>4-5</p> <p>2-3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>The source shows that this was the case. Trotsky explains that after Lenin’s death he had limited influence on the leadership of the communist party and was side-lined into roles he had little influence over. The source makes it clear that Stalin was determined to make Trotsky look ineffective by ‘sabotaging’ what he did, and Trotsky’s ‘opposition’, presumably Stalin and Molotov, gave him jobs where he drowned ‘in routine’ and was ‘isolated’. This shows Stalin’s political skill in isolating Trotsky. Stalin also out-witted him in other ways, for example telling him the wrong date for Lenin’s funeral. As a result Trotsky missed it and Stalin was made to look like he was Lenin’s closest ally instead of Trotsky. This shows Stalin’s devious and skilful actions which helped his rise to supremacy.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, he was bound to blame Stalin and not himself, in his autobiography because he would want to make himself look good and Stalin look devious. Trotsky ignores his own weaknesses here, for example we know that he was arrogant and offended many senior party members which lost him their support. He also failed to take Stalin seriously and did not do enough to attack him and his ideas. Trotsky’s ideas about international revolution also worried people who did not want to see the USSR in new conflicts abroad. None of these are mentioned as reasons for Stalin’s victories, maybe because the extract is too short, or perhaps because Trotsky’s arrogance blinded him to his own weaknesses.</i></p> <p>NB: Bottom of level if no use of source</p> <p>Source evaluation: concerning provenance of the source. E.g. ‘The source was written by Trotsky himself and thus fails to mention his own weaknesses.’</p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (b)		7	
	<p>Q: Study Source B. How useful is this source as evidence about communist rule in the USSR in the mid-1930s? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 4 (2-sided + CK) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding and evaluation of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a fully developed response in context.</p> <p>Level 3 (1-sided + CK) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the period. They interpret the source, assess its utility and produce a developed response in context.</p> <p>Level 2 (Either side basic or CK) Candidates demonstrate basic knowledge and understanding about the period to comprehend surface features of the source and to make basic claims about its usefulness.</p> <p>Level 1 (Surface details/ description/ Not answering question) Candidates describe the source 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 source is useful because it shows the personality cult that Stalin had created around himself to increase his popularity and control. This developed after 1929, and often involved him being shown in photographs or posters with children, as here, and built up his image as the 'father' of the nation. Songs and poems were written praising him for giving all good things to the people. This proved remarkably successful, as despite all the hardships and punishments of the 1930s many Russians still held him in high regard. The children here are wearing the neck-scarfs of the Young Pioneers so this poster is also promoting them and tells us of the importance the youth had in Stalin's Soviet Union.</i></p> <p><i>However, this source is obviously propaganda to brainwash the people, so it is hardly reliable for telling us what people felt about Stalin or even how effective communist rule was. Its date of 1936 is no co-incidence as this was the start of the purges and Stalin wanted to maintain support amongst ordinary people while their work colleagues and family members were disappearing to labour camps accused of political crimes. However, the source itself does not tell us about the terror used to maintain control by the Soviet leadership: that the NKVD was ever-present and arrests and torture for undisclosed crimes were an everyday occurrence. There is no hint of the gulags either, or the pressure to work like a Stakhanovite and put up with poor living and working conditions. Overall, the source has too many limitations to be entirely useful for learning about communist rule in the 1930s.</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7 (c)		6	
	<p>Q: Why was this speech made in 1936? Use the source and your knowledge to answer the question.</p> <p>Level 4 (P + CK) Candidates demonstrate sound understanding of the source and sound knowledge and understanding of the situation in 1936. They interpret the purpose of the speech being made to produce a response explaining its intended impact.</p> <p>Level 3 (M + CK) Candidates demonstrate some understanding of the source and some knowledge and understanding of the context. They interpret the message intended and produce a response explaining why it was made.</p> <p>Level 2 (M (2) or P (3) or CK) Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of the source and basic knowledge and understanding of the broader context, but they do not relate it to the purpose or message OR they explain the purpose or message without setting it in the context of 1936.</p> <p>Level 1 Candidates describe the speech and produce a very limited response.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	6 4-5 2-3 1 0	<p>This is an example of a top level response that may be used as guidance demonstrating evidence of all three AOs.</p> <p><i>This speech was made because Zinoviev was forced to make it. He was on trial with Kamenev and others for crimes against the party, specifically for being part of an assassination plot against Stalin. Having admitted his 'crimes' it would justify Stalin in removing him and others who were influential opponents in the party. That is why the speech was made. This was the first 'show trial' where Stalin forced his rivals in the Communist Party to admit to crimes that they hadn't committed. They began after Stalin secretly ordered the assassination of Kirov, the leader of the Leningrad Soviet, who is mentioned here, as an excuse to attack his rivals. He then forced, probably through torture or holding their families hostage, confessions like this one out of his political enemies to discredit them. Great 'show trials' were arranged where loyal old-Bolsheviks like Kamenev, Bukharin and here Zinoviev 'admitted' to their crimes against Stalin and the party, and were then executed or sent to gulags. Stalin wanted to send a message to his political rivals in the party and he also wanted to justify his actions to gain the approval of the people.</i></p> <p>Purpose: <i>Zinoviev was forced to make it Set an example to the people of Russia</i></p> <p><i>Legitimisation of Stalin's actions in removing opponents To bolster Stalin's position; increase support for Stalin; pass blame onto Trotsky or Zinoviev</i></p> <p>Message: <i>To show Stalin as a good leader The message is that Zinoviev/ Trotsky killed Kirov To show that Stalin did not kill Kirov</i></p> <p>CK: Must be relevant to the Purpose given <i>The Purges; Show trials</i></p>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(a)		4	
	<p>Q: What problems did Russian peasants face at the beginning of the twentieth century?</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 'harsh living and working conditions'.</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>famine and starvation (1)</i> • <i>life expectancy low, at 40 years of age (1)</i> • <i>they used ancient strip farming techniques</i> • <i>no basic education</i> • <i>land in short supply(1) because by the early 1900s the population was growing rapidly (2)</i> • <i>subdivision of family land amongst sons resulted in ever smaller plots</i>

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Explain why Stolypin's policies were successful.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain the success of Stolypin's policies. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One expl) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain the success of Stolypin's policies. They produce a single-causal response.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of Stolypin's policies.</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>Stolypin's policies were successful in reducing the unrest in Russia. This was because he came down hard on strikers and revolutionaries, hanging over 1,000 and exiling 20,000. Many revolutionaries fled abroad. This killed off opposition in the countryside until after 1914. His use of hanging was so common that the noose became known as 'Stolypin's necktie'.</i></p> <p><i>His policies were also successful because he used 'the carrot' as well as 'the stick'. He tried to win over peasants who were unhappy that their life options were limited by the mir, allowing wealthier peasants called kulaks to opt out of the mir communes and buy land. These peasants were then less troublesome, and as they ran larger more efficient farms, they helped to boost food production levels.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stick: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Came down hard on strikers, protestors and revolutionaries • Over 20,000 exiled and over 1000 hanged – noose know as 'Stolypin's necktie' • Killed off opposition to the regime in the countryside until 1914 • Carrot: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolished Redemption payments • Tried to win the peasants over with land – Land Reform Law • Allowed wealthier peasants, the kulaks, to opt out of the mir communes and buy up land • Kulaks prospered and created larger and more efficient farms – therefore more loyal to the Tsar • Production increased significantly, which meant that there was now more food available, particularly in the cities

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8(c)	<p>Q: How far was the First World War the main reason for the March Revolution in 1917? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the March Revolution in 1917. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the March Revolution in 1917. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts, and features of the period to reach a conclusion. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the role of the First World War OR other reasons in causing the March Revolution, explaining one side of the argument. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>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 First World War was a very important reason for the March Revolution. This is because it increased the unhappiness of all classes with the Tsar's government. The war went badly, with huge casualty figures and little success to maintain morale. The Tsar took personal control of the armed forces in September 1915, so from then on he was blamed for its failures. Back at home there were food and fuel shortages overcrowding and inflation, all of which frustrated workers. The middle classes weren't any happier, blaming the government when Russian soldiers were poorly equipped and when they couldn't get supplies of raw materials to fulfil war contracts. Even the Council of the United Nobility called for the Tsar to step down in late 1916: the loss of their sons and damage to their estates caused by peasant conscription was too much for them. It was the collision of these forces in early 1917 which led to the March Revolution.</i></p> <p><i>However, even before the war the Tsar's rule was on shaky ground. He had survived a revolution in 1905 but did not change his style of government as a result. He had given the people a Duma that he said he would work with, but then limited its power so it was practically ineffective. This made many in the middle classes question his leadership. Despite Stolypin's reforms many peasants continued to live in abject poverty in the countryside, and the number of strikes amongst industrial workers grew again after Stolypin's assassination, showing they were still deeply unhappy with their low wages and high cost of living. The lack of judgement and leadership the Tsar showed is clearly seen by the faith he and his wife placed in Rasputin, a man so hated that he was murdered by a group of aristocrats in late 1916. These were the problems that existed even before the war, so clearly the Tsar's hold on power was already weakening before it happened.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, the fact that he had survived the nine years since the 1905 revolution suggests that the Tsar's leadership was not totally doomed. Without the war, he may have clung onto power for longer. However, I would argue his hold on power was weak enough before the war, that he was bound to lose it sooner or later. The war simply accelerated that loss, revealing his weaknesses more clearly, and uniting opposition to his rule.</i></p>

	<p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates show some relevant knowledge as they describe the role of the war AND/OR other factors in causing the March Revolution in 1917. 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 March Revolution or its causes.</p> <p>Written work contains mistakes in spelling, grammar and punctuation, which sometimes hinder communication.</p> <p>Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>3-4</p> <p>1-2</p> <p>0</p>	<p><u>Factors:</u> <u>One side:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Failures of the WWI</i> <p><u>Other side other factors:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mutiny of the Army</i> • <i>Formation of Soviets</i> • <i>Duma setting up an alternative government</i> • <i>The Tsarina and Rasputin</i> • <i>Strikes</i> • <i>Unrest in the Countryside</i> • <i>Food Shortages</i> <p><i>Must explain Failures of WWI to access Level 4</i></p>
--	---	--------------------------------	--

Part 2: Russia, 1905-1941

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(a)	<p>Q: What happened in the Kronstadt Rising in 1921?</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 'sailors revolted'.</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>an important Soviet naval base revolted against war communism</i> • <i>sailors investigated conditions for workers in nearby Petrograd (St Petersburg)</i> • <i>crews of 2 battleships held an emergency meeting (1) and passed a resolution against Bolshevik leadership (2)</i> • <i>they made 15 demands of the Bolsheviks (1) including freedom of speech and elections to new Soviets (2)</i> • <i>set up their own Provisional Revolutionary Committee</i> • <i>it was crushed by the Red Army</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sailors mutinied</i> • <i>They demanded fresh elections</i> • <i>Called for 'equal rations for all working people' and the end of grain requisitioning</i> • <i>Strikers demonstrated in sympathy in Moscow and Petrograd, calling for the overthrow of the Communists</i> • <i>Kronstadt sailors had been the most loyal Bolsheviks during the 1917 Revolution</i> • <i>Lenin said it was 'the flash-bulb that lit up reality'</i> • <i>Trotsky led 50,000 troops against the sailors, who lasted for 2 weeks under intense artillery fire</i> • <i>March 18th surrender of the rebels – 2,000 shot as a warning to others</i> <p>Answers can make reference to the causes of the rising, the events of 1st March 1921, the Kronstadt Revolutionary Committee and an account of the attacks on the mutineers by Trotsky between 7-16th March.</p>

Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9(b)		6	
	<p>Q: Why did the Provisional Government fail? Explain your answer.</p> <p>Level 3 (2+ exps) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge to explain why the Provisional Government failed. They produce a multi-causal response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period.</p> <p>Level 2 (One expl) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain why the Provisional Government failed. They produce a response that explains one reason only.</p> <p>Level 1 (IDs/desc) Candidates demonstrate limited knowledge of the Provisional Government and its failure.</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 reason it failed was because it was unable to solve any of the problems Russia had at the time. It continued to fight in the war alongside the Allies but this went disastrously, leaving people to question the quality of its leadership. The army rallied for an offensive in June, but fell apart in the face of a German counter-attack, and deserters filled the roads home. This continuation of the war stretched resources even further, and fuel, food and everyday necessities got even scarcer. This had been one of the causes of the strikes which unseated the Tsar. The new government had done no better than him.</i></p> <p><i>Another problem was that the Bolsheviks were successful in turning many people against the government. Support increased quickly after Lenin published his April Theses and many in the soviets and army were attracted to this message. This message contrasted with what the Provisional Government were providing, and the Bolshevik's support increased further after they helped deal with Kornilov. By September 1917 the Provisional Government was looking weak while the Bolsheviks only got stronger.</i></p> <p>Key IDs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision to continue the war • Decision to not distribute land to the peasants • Failure to feed the starving workers in the cities • June Offensive • The Petrograd Soviet • Lenin's April Theses • Kornilov's revolt, September 1917


Q	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (c)	<p>Q: ‘The following were equally important reasons why the Bolsheviks won the civil war: (i) the lack of unity of the Whites; (ii) War Communism.</p> <p>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer referring only to (i) and (ii).</p> <p>Level 5 (Both sides exp + conc) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding to explain why the Bolsheviks won the civil war. They produce a fully developed response that demonstrates thorough understanding of the past through detailed explanation and analysis of the relevant key concepts and features of the period to justify a valid conclusion. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 4 (Both sides exp) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding to explain why the Bolsheviks won the civil war. They produce a developed response that demonstrates understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of some relevant key concepts and features of the period to reach a conclusion. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate. Meaning is communicated very clearly.</p> <p>Level 3 (One side exp) Candidates demonstrate some knowledge and understanding to explain one of the given reasons for why the Bolsheviks won the civil war. They produce a response that demonstrates some understanding of the past. Written work is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are mostly accurate. Meaning is communicated clearly.</p>	<p>10</p> <p>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 lack of unity of the Whites was a serious problem. ‘Whites’ was the term used to describe the many forces fighting against the Bolsheviks, but they were not a strong alliance. They included groups with totally opposing aims, like the landlords and capitalists who were fighting to regain land and money lost in the revolution, and the Socialist Revolutionaries, who wanted all land to be given to the peasants. With such different aims obviously they would find it difficult to work and fight together. The Bolsheviks were able to make the most of their enemies’ lack of unity in anti-White propaganda. White forces were also widely spread, surrounding the Bolshevik heartlands, so found it more difficult to co-ordinate their campaigns. Unlike the Bolsheviks, they could not benefit from strong internal lines of communications, and had to resource and transport supplies much further. This significantly weakened their campaigns.</i></p> <p><i>Having said that, War Communism was just as important, as this ensured that the Red Army was well supplied and equipped. The Bolsheviks rationed food and forced peasants to hand over surplus food rather than sell it, to make sure the communists got the supplies they needed. If peasants didn’t cooperate they were shot, so this was a powerful incentive and prevented some of the problems the Tsarist army had faced. They were also well equipped, as the Bolsheviks took over the factories of Moscow and Petrograd and planned and organised production. With strict discipline for workers and strikers being shot, the Bolsheviks secured the necessary supplies of guns and ammunition to fight the Whites. Without these supplies, Trotsky’s Red Army could have easily been undermined by the weight of forces against them.</i></p> <p><i>On balance, of these two factors, the lack of unity of the Whites is probably most important. There was a lot of support for the various White forces, so if they had been more effective, no matter how well supplied the Reds were, they could have been crushed. As it was, the Reds were able to exploit their enemies’ disunity, and war communism meant their victory was quicker.</i></p>

9(c)	<p>Level 2 (IDs/desc) Candidates use some relevant knowledge to describe ONE OR BOTH of these reasons for why the Bolsheviks won the civil war.</p>	3-4	
	<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 these reasons and the Bolshevik victory in the civil war.</p>	1-2	
	<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>	0	

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	4		7
7 (b)	1	2	4		7
7 (c)	1	2	3		6
8/9 (a)	4	0	0		4
8/9 (b)	3	3	0		6
8/9 (c)	4	6	0		10
Totals	30	30	15	6	81

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2017

