



**Cambridge Assessment International Education**  
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

---

**HISTORY**

**0470/12**

Paper 1

**October/November 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 1/Level 2 Certificate.

This document consists of **90** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Applying the Mark Scheme**

- When marking a response the overall criteria to be considered should be - ‘How good is this response to this question?’
- The ‘Level Descriptor’ should be used to decide the Level into which the quality of the answer fits.
- Exhaustive lists of possible facts are not given in the mark scheme, as there is often a choice of factual knowledge that candidates may use.
- **WHERE EXAMPLES OF RESPONSES ARE GIVEN, THESE ARE NOT PRESCRIPTIVE, BUT ARE INTENDED AS A GUIDE.** It is not possible to cover every possible type of response within a levels of response mark scheme and examiners are expected to use their professional judgement at all times in ensuring that responses are placed in the correct levels and given an appropriate mark within that level.
- Marking must be positive. Marks must not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant parts of answers. In itself, poor use of historical terminology, spelling, grammar or handwriting does not affect the mark. The overall quality of the answer to the question should be judged.
- If a candidate reaches a particular level s/he must be rewarded with a mark within that level. It is not necessary to work through the levels.
- The full range of marks should be used. Do not be afraid to award full marks or no marks. Failure to do this will seriously affect the distribution of marks. Be prepared to reward candidates who show any level of understanding. The mark scheme starts from a basic acceptable response. Where a band of marks is indicated for a level these marks should be used with reference to the development of the answer within that level.

**Assessment Objectives**

- (a) recall, description
- (b) recall, explanation
- (c) recall, explanation and analysis

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Describe revolutionary events in Berlin in March 1848.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘There was a demonstration by workers in the palace square in Berlin.’  ‘There were protests about pay and working conditions.’  ‘Many of the demonstrators were self-employed craftsmen.’  ‘Demonstrators threw stones at the troops.’  ‘Demonstrators erected barricades.’  ‘There was serious street fighting.’  ‘People were killed.’  ‘Citizens’ deputations asked the King to make political concessions.’  ‘The people asked for their rights to be maintained.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Why did the events of 1848–49 leave Austria, and not Prussia, as the dominant force in Germany?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The events of 1848–49 left Austria as the dominant force in Germany because Prussia missed the opportunity to become the dominant force in Germany. Austria was dealing with revolutions in Hungary and Italy and was in disarray. The Frankfurt Parliament wasted six months debating the fundamental rights of the German people, and gave Austria time to regain control of its territories. Prussia had missed the chance to be the dominant force in Germany.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Frankfurt Parliament missed the opportunity to fill the power vacuum in Germany in 1848.’  ‘The authority of the Frankfurt Parliament was not fully recognised by many individual states.’  ‘The Frankfurt Parliament wasted time debating fundamental rights and privileges.’  ‘Frederick William of Prussia rejected the offer of the new Imperial German crown.’  ‘The Austrian army was superior to the Prussian army.’  ‘The ruler of Hesse-Cassel appealed to Austria for help when he was overthrown.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘Austria was more powerful than Prussia.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><b>'The aims of the 1848–49 revolutionaries across Europe were more similar than they were different.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The aims of revolutionaries in Germany and Italy were similar, as both wanted to unify states in their respective countries to form one nation. In Germany there was growing middle class support for the idea of a new liberal and unified Germany with a German parliament. Similarly, in Italy liberal middle class revolutionaries hoped to achieve a united Italy ruled by Italians, with Austria being driven out of Italy forever.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The aims of the revolutionaries were not always similar. In Hungary revolutionaries disagreed about what they wanted. Kossuth was a liberal Magyar who demanded independence for Hungary from Austria. However, he told the Croats and other minority groups in Hungary that they would not be granted independence from Hungary, nor would they be granted the right to self-government. The Croats did not agree; their aims saw a future independent from Hungary.'</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. 'Italy and Germany both wanted to be free from Austrian authority.'            'Croat nationalists and Magyar nationalists wanted to win their independence from Austria.'            'The revolutionaries wanted freedom of speech.'            'The revolutionaries wanted a free press.'            'In France they wanted a republic.'            'In Germany they wanted a unified Germany.'            'Croats in Hungary wanted independence.'            'Some Italians wanted a republic.'            'Some Italians wanted a constitutional monarchy.'</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. 'The revolutionaries of 1848–49 shared many aims relating to the people.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>



Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>What was the newspaper Il Risorgimento?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. 'It was a newspaper founded in 1847.'            'It was founded by Cavour and Balbo.'            'It was founded in Turin.'            'Il Risorgimento was liberal and nationalist.'            'Il Risorgimento began as a weekly newspaper, and within a few weeks became a daily paper.'            'It was a newspaper edited by Cavour until October 1848.'            'It was founded as a result of new press freedoms.'            'The newspaper called for the unification of Italy.'            'The newspaper called for the introduction of democratic reforms.'            'The newspaper advocated freedom and modernisation.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Why was Victor Emmanuel II eager to participate in the Crimean War?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Victor Emmanuel II was eager to participate in the Crimean War as he hoped to gain powerful allies. Austria had refused to join Britain and France in an alliance against Russia, and Victor Emmanuel saw an opportunity to increase his prestige by joining the Anglo-French alliance and sending troops to the Crimea. He thought this would mean Britain and France would be willing to support him in the fight for Italian independence as he had helped them in the Crimea.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Victor Emmanuel II thought it would increase his prestige with European powers.’  ‘Austria had refused to join Britain and France in an alliance against Russia.’  ‘Victor Emmanuel II could see advantages in an alliance with Britain and France.’  ‘He thought it could mean some help in Italy’s fight for independence.’  ‘He needed help to end Austrian control of Lombardy.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘He thought it would be a good idea.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
2(c)	<p><b>‘Garibaldi played a more important role than Cavour in the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Garibaldi inspired great enthusiasm and devotion in his men. In 1860 the King of Naples and his troops were so frightened by what Garibaldi had achieved in Sicily that they offered little resistance. Garibaldi’s conquests in the south played a major part in unification.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Cavour’s role was very important because he was able to agree a treaty with Napoleon, the Treaty of Plombières. Napoleon agreed France would help Piedmont if it was attacked by Austria. Cavour then provoked Austria and Austria declared war. Austria was defeated and Cavour then formed a union of north west Italy.’</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. <u>Garibaldi</u>            ‘Garibaldi led an expedition to Sicily.’            ‘Garibaldi liberated Palermo.’            ‘Garibaldi liberated the whole of southern Italy.’            ‘His life was dominated by the thought of a united Italy.’            ‘He campaigned to liberate Rome from its French garrison.’            ‘He liberated Naples.’</p> <p><u>Cavour</u>            ‘Cavour founded a newspaper dedicated to the unification of Italy.’            ‘Cavour knew that it was impossible for Italy to expel Austria without outside help.’            ‘Cavour realised that Napoleon would not agree to unlimited expansion of Piedmont.’            ‘Cavour negotiated the Treaty of Plombières with Napoleon.’            ‘He was seen as opposed to Garibaldi’s plans for a united Italy.’            ‘He organised an invasion of the Papal States.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘They both played very important roles.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>What economic and social differences existed between the North and the South by 1850?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘The South had an agrarian-based economy.’            ‘The economy in the South relied heavily on plantations of cotton.’            ‘The plantations in the South relied heavily on slave labour.’            ‘In the South there were plantations for tobacco and sugar cane.’            ‘Cattle were reared in the South.’            ‘Most textiles in the South were produced by cottage and home-based industry.’            ‘Manufacturing in the South was on a small scale compared to the North.’            ‘The South still believed in the importance of ‘honour’.            ‘The South was not free.’            ‘The North had 85% of the industries of the United States.’            ‘The North was dominated by manufacturing and trading interests.’            ‘The manufacturers in the North wanted high tariffs.’            ‘The North was free.’            ‘The North was more accepting of foreign immigrants.’            ‘The North believed in free labour.’            ‘The North believed in liberty.’            ‘The North had more puritanical Christian beliefs than the South.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Why were many northerners opposed to slavery before the Civil War?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Northerners were opposed to slavery before the Civil War because they believed it was morally wrong. They believed strongly in the American principles of equality and liberty, and the very idea of slavery was in complete contrast to these principles. Slavery meant that some people were not free at all, and were therefore not equal to other Americans.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘They believed slavery was morally wrong.’  ‘They believed that slavery was a sin against God.’  ‘They believed that God might punish America for having slaves.’  ‘Slavery went against the American principles of equality and liberty.’  ‘Slave labour was unfair competition for the North.’  ‘Slavery gave the South an unfair advantage in the production of certain goods.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They believed slavery was wrong.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p><b>'The 1850 Compromise was the most important cause of increased North-South disagreements between 1850 and 1854.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The 1850 Compromise was the most important cause of increased disagreement between North and South. No-one was entirely happy with the Compromise. The South felt that they were obliged to make too many territorial concessions, as none of the new states were slave states. California was admitted to the Union as a free state, and Mexico and Utah were accepted as US territories with no pre-agreed slave status. The South was not happy about this.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The Fugitive Slave Law caused disagreement between North and South. The South agreed with this law, as it upheld the rights of slave owners and meant that escaping slaves had to be returned to their owners. This left anti-slavery citizens in the North in a very difficult position, as the law made them and their institutions responsible for enforcing slavery. They felt they had an almost impossible choice – they either had to break the law or go against their own consciences. The law made the North more determined to get rid of slavery.'</p>	10

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>One mark for each point.</p> <p>e.g. ‘The 1850 Compromise made pre-existing sectional divisions more obvious.’            ‘It admitted California as a free state.’            ‘Utah and New Mexico had no specified slave status.’            ‘It ended the slave trade in Washington D.C.’            ‘The South felt it had to make too many territorial concessions.’            ‘The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 caused increased disagreement.’            ‘The Fugitive Slave Act penalised people who were against slavery.’            ‘The Kansas–Nebraska Act of 1854 caused increased disagreement.’            ‘The Kansas–Nebraska Act made it possible for Kansas and Nebraska to be open to slavery.’            ‘The publication of Harriet Beecher-Stowe’s book ‘Uncle Tom’s Cabin highlighted disagreements.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘The Compromise was unpopular with some people.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>



Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p><b>What was ‘the Black Hand’?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘The Black Hand was a Serbian secret society.’            ‘It was a society formed in May 1911.’            ‘It was formed by officers of the Serbian Army.’            ‘It was led by Colonel Dimitrijević (Dimitrievitch).’            ‘It was led by a man with the codename Apis.’            ‘Its membership was mainly army officers, but it also included lawyers, journalists and university professors.’            ‘The Black Hand aimed to create a Greater Serbia.’            ‘It aimed to liberate Serbs outside Serbia from Hapsburg and Ottoman rule.’            ‘It established a network of revolutionary cells throughout Bosnia.’            ‘Its preferred method was terrorist action.’            ‘By 1914 the Black Hand had about 2500 members.’            ‘In 1911 the Black Hand attempted to assassinate Emperor Franz Josef.’            ‘The Black Hand attempted to kill Potiorek, the Governor of the Austrian provinces of Bosnia-Herzegovina.’            ‘The Black Hand was responsible for the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p><b>Why did Austria-Hungary issue an ultimatum to Serbia on 23 July 1914?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Serbia was increasingly becoming a threat to Austria-Hungary. When Serbian terrorists assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, in 1914, Austria-Hungary saw the opportunity to deal with Serbia once and for all. By giving Serbia a list of demands that they knew Serbia would be unwilling to accept, they paved the way for an invasion to crush Serbia and the threat they posed.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Archduke Franz Ferdinand had been assassinated by Serbian terrorists.’  ‘Austria-Hungary blamed Serbia for the assassination of Franz Ferdinand.’  ‘Austria-Hungary wanted Serbia to put a stop to nationalist propaganda against Austria-Hungary.’  ‘Germany had told Austria-Hungary she would support her.’  ‘Austria-Hungary wanted an excuse to invade Serbia.’  ‘Serbia was increasingly becoming a threat to Austria-Hungary.’  ‘Austria-Hungary wanted to crush Serbia.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘Austria-Hungary was annoyed with Serbia.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
4(c)	<p><b>‘Colonial rivalry, rather than the Alliance System, was the main reason for increased tension between the Great Powers before 1914.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Colonial rivalry increased tension between the Great Powers immensely. The Kaiser did not want France to extend her empire in North Africa and so he decided he would interfere in Morocco. He gave a speech in Tangiers, saying that Morocco should remain independent of France. France was furious. Further tension arose when the Kaiser was humiliated at the Algeciras conference; he blamed Britain for supporting France over Morocco.’ (5 marks)</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The Alliance System greatly increased tension between the Great Powers. The Alliance System meant that Germany felt encircled by the Triple Entente, and became convinced that the Entente posed a real threat to German security, with France on her western border and Russia on her eastern border. Germany thus felt it necessary to increase her armaments build up and to draw up war plans.’</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
4(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Germany and France quarrelled over Morocco.’  ‘Kaiser Wilhelm II was jealous of Britain’s empire.’  ‘France wanted to protect its empire in North Africa.’  ‘Kaiser Wilhelm said Morocco should remain independent of France.’  ‘Kaiser Wilhelm sent a gunboat to Agadir.’  ‘Britain, France and Russia formed the Triple Entente.’  ‘Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy formed the Triple Alliance.’  ‘The Alliance System created two armed camps in Europe.’  ‘A dispute between one member of the Entente and one member of the Alliance could escalate to involve all members.’  ‘The Triple Entente encircled the Triple Alliance.’  ‘The Triple Alliance occupied a central position in Europe.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘They were both equally important in increasing tension.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p><b>What did the Treaty of Versailles decide about (i) the Saar and (ii) Danzig?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. <u>The Saar</u>            ‘The Saar was to be run by the League of Nations.’            ‘The coal mines in the Saar would become the property of France for fifteen years.’            ‘Coal profits from the Saar would be given to France for fifteen years.’            ‘A plebiscite would be held in the Saar after fifteen years.’            ‘After fifteen years a plebiscite would determine if the Saar should belong to Germany, to France or remain under League control.’            ‘If the plebiscite said the Saar was to return to Germany, then France would receive compensation for the loss of the mines.’</p> <p><u>Danzig</u>            ‘Danzig was to be a free city.’            ‘Danzig would be run by the League of Nations.’            ‘Poland could use the port of Danzig.’            ‘Danzig would be in customs union with Poland.’            ‘Poland would control Danzig’s foreign affairs.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<p><b>Why did the Allies exclude Germany from the peace negotiations?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Allies excluded Germany from the peace negotiations because they wanted to make decisions quickly and they believed that Germany’s attendance would slow down the negotiations as Germany would not want to accept punishment. Europe was in turmoil, with revolutions occurring in the former Austro-Hungarian and Turkish empires, civil war raging in Russia and Germany facing a mutiny at Kiel and soldiers’ and workers’ rebellions. Negotiations needed to be concluded quickly to ensure that all these problems could be dealt with and Europe could begin to rebuild after the war.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Germany was viewed as a defeated nation.’  ‘Germany would have argued against punishment.’  ‘The Allies believed only the victors should negotiate peace.’  ‘Turmoil in Europe meant decisions needed to be made quickly.’  ‘There were domestic problems in Germany.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They felt Germany had no right to be there.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
5(c)	<p><b>'Of the defeated countries, Austria suffered the most from the Paris peace settlement.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'Austria suffered severe economic problems as a result of the peace settlement. Her empire was broken up, and land distributed to various national groups with territory going to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Romania and Italy. This meant Austria lost industrial resources such as coal, and also important farmland areas. Austria was now a small, landlocked country. All this meant Austria was on the verge of economic collapse and in 1922 had to receive help from the League of Nations.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'Germany suffered most from the peace settlement. Her army was reduced to 100 000 men and no conscription was allowed. Germany was therefore left virtually defenceless. Such a small army would find it difficult to quell a major uprising within Germany itself, let alone defend Germany from attack by another country.'</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Austria had to accept the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian empire.’  ‘Austria was now a landlocked nation.’  ‘Austria suffered severe economic problems as a result of the peace settlement.’  ‘Austria’s army was limited to 30 000 men.’  ‘Austria lost land from her former empire to Italy.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Military restrictions left Germany defenceless.’  ‘Germany had to pay reparations of £6600 million.’  ‘Bulgaria lost land to Greece, Romania and Yugoslavia.’  ‘Hungary had to accept the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian empire.’  ‘Turkey was not allowed to have an air force.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Austria suffered a lot, but so did other countries.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p><b>What were the weaknesses of (i) the Assembly and (ii) the Council in carrying out the work of the League of Nations?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. <u>The Assembly</u>            ‘The Assembly only met once a year.’            ‘Decisions in the Assembly had to be unanimous. This meant they had to be agreed by every member of the Assembly.’            ‘It was difficult for the Assembly to take decisive action.’            ‘One small state could hold up a vital decision.’</p> <p><u>The Council</u>            ‘Each permanent member of the Council had a veto. This meant that one permanent member of the Council could stop League action even if the others all agreed.’            ‘Britain and France were permanent members of the Council and they often disagreed.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p><b>Why was the absence of the USA significant for the League in the 1930s?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The absence of the USA was significant for the League because it made it more difficult for the League to deal with aggressive nations. When Japan invaded Manchuria, the League discussed imposing economic sanctions on Japan, but the absence of the USA meant they did not do this. Economic sanctions would have been meaningless as Japan would still be able to trade with her main trading partner, the USA. In addition, economic sanctions would have meant European countries cutting back their trade in the Far East, and leaving the way open for the USA to take over this trade. This meant that economic sanctions were not imposed, and so Japan got away with blatant aggression towards Manchuria.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The USA would not be involved with economic sanctions.’  ‘The USA could still trade with aggressor nations.’  ‘The prestige of the League was reduced.’  ‘The USA had the military resources to remove the Japanese from Manchuria.’  ‘The USA could take over any trade in the Far East.’  ‘The USA was unlikely to support the banning of coal and oil exports to Italy during the Abyssinian Crisis.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘The USA was a very powerful country.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
6(c)	<p><b>‘The League of Nations was successful in achieving its aims in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘The League aimed to settle disputes peacefully, and it achieved this aim in dealing with a dispute between Finland and Sweden over the Aaland Islands. Both Sweden and Finland claimed the Aaland Islands in the Baltic Sea. The League investigated and awarded the islands to Finland, but with safeguards for the Swedish islanders. Sweden accepted the judgment.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The League aimed to discourage aggression, but it failed to achieve this aim in dealing with the dispute between Poland and Lithuania over Vilna. Poland took control of Vilna in a clearly aggressive action. Lithuania appealed to the League, who told Poland to withdraw, but Poland refused to do so. The League was not prepared to act against Poland as they saw them as a valuable ally, and thus gave out the message that aggression could pay.’</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
6(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The League settled the dispute over the Aaland Islands peacefully.’  ‘The League settled the dispute over Upper Silesia peacefully.’  ‘The League improved living conditions for refugees in Turkey.’  ‘The League helped to improve working conditions for children.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The League failed to deal with Polish aggression in Vilna.’  ‘The League failed to deal with Italian aggression in Corfu.’  ‘The League failed to deal with Lithuanian aggression in Memel.’  ‘The League failed to deal with aggression between Bolivia and Paraguay.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘There were successes in the 1920s, but the League also failed to achieve some of its aims.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p><b>What decisions about Poland were made at the Yalta Conference?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘A provisional government was to be established in Poland. It was to comprise of the pro-Soviet Lublin Poles and the exiled London Poles.’  ‘There was to be a provisional government, to be known as the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.’  ‘Poland’s border was to be moved westwards into German territory.’  ‘Free elections were to be held in Poland.’  ‘Elections in Poland were to be multi-party elections.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>4</p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	<p><b>Why did the death of Roosevelt make a difference to the Potsdam Conference?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The death of Roosevelt affected the Potsdam Conference because Roosevelt’s successor Truman was much more anti-communist than Roosevelt. Roosevelt had tried to work with Stalin and compromise where possible, but Truman believed there was little room for compromise. He did not trust Stalin at all and believed that Stalin wanted to take over control of Europe. This soured relations between them at Potsdam and made negotiations very difficult.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Roosevelt had been seen as pro-Russian.’          ‘Roosevelt’s successor Truman was much more anti-communist.’          ‘Roosevelt’s successor Truman was very suspicious of Stalin.’          ‘Roosevelt had tried to work closely with Stalin.’          ‘Roosevelt’s successor Truman was inexperienced in international affairs.’          ‘Roosevelt’s successor Truman had no intentions of working closely with Stalin.’          ‘Stalin did not trust Roosevelt’s successor Truman.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘It upset the balance.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	<b>6</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
7(c)	<p><b>'The actions of Stalin between 1946 and 1949 were responsible for starting the Cold War.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'Following Yalta, it was expected that there would be free elections in eastern European countries after their liberation. Stalin made sure that the new governments were communist controlled. In Czechoslovakia the Communists became the largest single party in a coalition. In 1947, Masaryk, a non-Communist politician, was murdered and in 1948, when they felt their position was under threat, the Communists banned other parties and made Czechoslovakia a Communist, one party state. Stalin's actions made it clear he wanted to take over Europe.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The USA interpreted the Soviet takeover of eastern Europe as the start of Stalin's plan to spread communism worldwide. Truman responded with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, to help countries whose economies were suffering after the war. Stalin saw this as an insult and a threat to his regime, as he felt the USA was doing this to ensure capitalist domination.'</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
7(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Stalin wanted to spread communism.’  ‘Stalin ensured new governments in eastern Europe were communist controlled.’  ‘In January 1947 rigged elections ensured a totally communist government in Poland.’  ‘It was caused by the Berlin Blockade.’  ‘Truman was strongly against communism.’  ‘Truman introduced the Marshall Plan.’  ‘Churchill’s Iron Curtain speech created ill feeling.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Stalin was partly responsible, but there were other factors as well.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p><b>What was the Berlin Wall?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. 'It was a barrier built in 1961.'            'It was a wall 87 miles long.'            'It was a physical division in Berlin.'            'It was a barrier along the frontier between East and West Berlin.'            'It was a wall dividing Berlin from 1961 to 1989.'            'It was a wall built to prevent the movement of people from East to West.'            'It represented the division between capitalism and communism.'            'It was a symbol of the Cold War.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>
8(b)	<p><b>Why was Solidarity important in the decline of Soviet power in Eastern Europe?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b></p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. 'Solidarity was important in the decline of Soviet power because it showed other countries in the Eastern bloc that oppressive Communist governments could be threatened if people stood together. In the 1989 elections in Poland anti-communist candidates won a convincing victory. This inspired peaceful anti-communist revolutions in Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia; they followed the example set by Solidarity in Poland.'</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p>6</p> <p>4–5</p>



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b></p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Solidarity undermined the claim of communism to be a system which benefited ordinary people.’            ‘Solidarity showed a Communist government could be resisted.’            ‘Solidarity showed that oppressive Communist governments could be threatened if people stood together against them.’            ‘Solidarity inspired people in other Communist controlled countries to resist.’            ‘Solidarity gained support in the West.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Solidarity was a threat.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
8(c)	<p><b>‘Gorbachev’s reduction of Soviet defence spending was the main reason for the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Gorbachev’s reduction of Soviet defence spending meant that the Red Army would no longer be used as a military presence to keep control of countries in the Eastern bloc. If there was resistance to communism in these countries each individual country would have to deal with the situation; Red Army troops would not be sent to restore order. This meant that people in the western bloc felt more confident about resisting communist rule.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Solidarity had forced a strong Soviet Union backed Communist government to give way through the action of industrial workers and the use of non-violent methods. In free elections Solidarity won massive support and became an example for the rest of Eastern Europe and this inspired people in Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia to stage their own peaceful anti-communist revolutions.’</p>	10

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Soviet Union could no longer afford to maintain a military presence in communist eastern bloc countries.’            ‘Eastern bloc countries realised Soviet troops would not be sent if they resisted communism.’            ‘Soviet troops would no longer be used to keep Warsaw Pact countries under control.’            ‘Gorbachev withdrew the support of the Red Army to Eastern Europe.’            ‘The success of Solidarity inspired other eastern bloc countries to resist communism.’            ‘The economy of the Soviet Union was failing.’            ‘Gorbachev introduced perestroika and glasnost.’            ‘Gorbachev made it clear he would not prevent attempts at democracy in Warsaw Pact countries.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Gorbachev’s reduction of defence spending was important, but there were other important reasons.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p><b>Describe the use of poison gas in trench warfare.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Poison gas was first used by the Germans in April 1915.’            ‘The first gases were mainly lung irritants such as chlorine or phosgene.’            ‘Initially gas was released when the wind was blowing in the right direction towards the enemy.’            ‘Gas shells were introduced later.’            ‘Some gases caused damage to the nervous system.’            ‘Some gases caused paralysis.’            ‘Mustard gas was first used in 1917.’            ‘Mustard gas caused burns and blisters to the skin.’            ‘Mustard gas formed foam in the lungs that could prove fatal.’            ‘Mustard gas could blind people.’            ‘Gas attacks were used to disable enemy troops.’            ‘Mustard gas remained active in the soil for several weeks.’            ‘The use of poison gas caused panic among troops.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	<p><b>Why were many German soldiers able to survive the artillery bombardment prior to the Battle of the Somme?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Many of the shells supplied to the Allied gunners were of poor quality and simply not powerful enough to penetrate and destroy the barbed wire defences of the Germans. Many of the shells did not even explode. Where they did explode they lifted the barbed wire into the air and tangled the barbed wire into an even more impenetrable mass. The German soldiers remained unaffected in their dugouts.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Somme was the strongest part of German defences.’  ‘The Germans knew an attack was imminent.’  ‘The Germans were on higher ground.’  ‘The Germans were dug into a trench system.’  ‘The German dugouts were 10 metres underground.’  ‘The Germans had all the food and supplies they needed.’  ‘Their dugouts were fortified with concrete.’  ‘The Germans had stretched barbed wire more than 30 metres wide along the front.’  ‘The Allied gunners had poor quality shells.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They were protected.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
9(c)	<p><b>‘The Battle of Verdun demonstrated that, on the Western Front, defenders would always prevail over attackers.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Battle of Verdun certainly demonstrated that defenders would prevail over attackers on the Western Front. The French were taken completely by surprise when the Germans attacked Verdun, and at one stage a French army of just 200 000 men was faced by a German army numbering over one million soldiers. In spite of such overwhelming odds against them, the French managed to hold out against the constant German bombardment until eventually the Germans called off the offensive as they simply could not break through.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The Battle of Verdun demonstrated that attackers could prevail against defenders. The German attack on Verdun took the French completely by surprise and within days the Germans had captured the outer forts of Verdun, including capturing Fort Douaumont, the largest and highest of the 19 forts protecting Verdun. At one point in the battle the Germans came within 2 miles of Verdun Cathedral; their attack was highly effective.’</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
9(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘At Verdun 200 000 French troops held out against over a million German soldiers.’  ‘The French had underground concrete forts.’  ‘Pétain kept one road open for supplies and reinforcements.’  ‘Verdun was on a salient and could be attacked on three sides.’  ‘The Germans quickly captured the outer defences of Verdun.’  ‘The Germans captured the strongest fort, Douaumont, without firing a shot.’  ‘The Germans came within 2 miles of Verdun Cathedral.’  ‘The French persuaded the British to develop a new offensive elsewhere.’  ‘Both attackers and defenders suffered large numbers of casualties at Verdun.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Defenders usually held the advantage over attackers, but not always.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
10(a)	<p><b>Describe the Allied landings at Gallipoli, April 1915.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘British, French, Australian and New Zealand troops launched an attack.’  ‘Out of date maps were used.’  ‘Troops were put ashore one mile north of their intended landing beach.’  ‘The landings were made in the dark and this meant assault formations became confused.’  ‘The Allies had not practised landings so it was chaotic.’  ‘The British troops landed at Cape Helles.’  ‘The Australian and New Zealand troops landed at what later became known as Anzac Cove.’  ‘On landing the Allied troops were faced with high hills and cliffs.’  ‘There was barbed wire on the beaches.’  ‘The Turkish troops were ready and waiting for the Allied troops.’  ‘The first Allied troops charged up steep hillsides under concentrated machine gun fire.’  ‘The Allied troops managed to capture some Turkish trenches.’  ‘Many of the Allied troops were killed.’  ‘Some Allied troops managed to dig trenches on the beaches.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>



Question	Answer	Marks
10(b)	<p><b>Why can poor decision making be blamed for the failure at Gallipoli?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Poor decision making meant that the highly ambitious Gallipoli campaign had little chance of success. Little consideration was given to exactly how many soldiers and guns would be needed for a successful campaign. General Sir Ian Hamilton was advised by Greek military leaders how many men would be needed to take Gallipoli, but Lord Kitchener only gave approval for half the number advised to be deployed. Advice was ignored.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Landings were not practised.’  ‘Out of date maps were used.’  ‘The navy failed to remove Turkish mines.’  ‘Decisions made did not take into account the extremes of weather.’  ‘Decisions made seriously underestimated the strength of the Turkish army.’  ‘Armed forces were not released from the Western Front.’  ‘Kitchener believed the war would be won on the Western Front, not in the east.’  ‘Kitchener only approved the deployment of a limited number of troops.’  ‘Army and navy operations were not combined.’  ‘The Gallipoli campaign plan was too ambitious.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘Poor decision making caused lots of problems.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
10(c)	<p><b>'Britain won the war at sea.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'In August 1914 the British were successful at the Battle of Heligoland Bight. A large British force targeted German shipping at the German naval base in Heligoland. 712 German sailors were killed, and 6 German ships were lost. In comparison the British lost only 35 sailors and, while some ships were damaged, none were sunk. The British won this encounter at sea.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'In November 1914 the Germans won the Battle of Coronel. A small fleet of German cruisers sank two British cruisers off the coast of Chile. 1600 British men were killed. The Germans did not lose any ships, and no German sailors were killed and just three wounded. This defeat was especially humiliating for the British as it was their first naval defeat since 1812.'</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
10(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The British were successful at the Battle of Heligoland Bight.’            ‘Britain was successful at the Battle of the Falkland Islands.’            ‘Britain was successful at the Battle of Dogger Bank.’            ‘Britain maintained its control of the North Sea after the Battle of Jutland.’            ‘Germany defeated Britain at the Battle of Coronel.’            ‘Germany lost fewer ships than Britain at the Battle of Jutland.’            German unrestricted submarine warfare was highly successful.’            ‘Both Britain and Germany claimed victory at the Battle of Jutland.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Britain won in some ways and lost in others.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
11(a)	<p><b>What actions had Stresemann taken by the end of 1923 to save the Weimar Republic from collapsing?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Stresemann ended passive resistance in the Ruhr.’  ‘Stresemann ordered striking workers in the Ruhr to return to work.’  ‘Stresemann resumed reparation payments to the Allies.’  ‘Stresemann got rid of the old worthless mark.’  ‘Stresemann stabilised the German economy by introducing the Rentenmark.’  ‘Stresemann began to rebuild Germany’s prosperity.’  ‘His government dealt successfully with threats such as the Munich Putsch.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
11(b)	<p><b>Why, following the American stock market crash, did the Weimar Republic face an economic crisis?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘German economic recovery had been based mainly on American loans. When the American stock market crashed, America went into recession and had to recall the loans made to Germany. Germany had to repay considerable amounts of money to America and also continue to pay reparations. The basis of German recovery had been destroyed.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The German economic revival was dependent on American loans.’  ‘American loans given to Germany were recalled.’  ‘Germany had to repay a substantial amount of money to the USA.’  ‘There was a worldwide depression.’  ‘German trade was adversely affected.’  ‘Germany still had to pay reparations.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p> <p>e.g. ‘The American stock market crash affected most countries badly.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
11(c)	<p><b>'Up to 1923 the Weimar Republic was more threatened by left-wing opponents than by right-wing opponents.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The Spartacists were a left-wing threat to the Weimar Republic. They staged an attempted rebellion against Ebert's government in Berlin in 1919, and succeeded in taking over the headquarters of the government's newspaper and the telegraph bureau and organised a general strike. Whilst ultimately unsuccessful, the Spartacists showed how vulnerable the new Weimar government was.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The Kapp Putsch demonstrated the threat from right-wing opponents. In March 1920 a group of Freikorps led by Dr Kapp tried to take power in Berlin. The Weimar government had no option but to flee Berlin, and Kapp declared himself as the head of a new national government. The army refused to act against Kapp. The Weimar Republic had to acknowledge that they faced real threats from right-wing extremists.'</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
11(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Spartacists posed a threat in 1919.’  ‘In 1920 there was communist agitation in the Ruhr.’  ‘In 1921 the KPD supported an uprising in Merseburg.’  ‘Right-wing opponents were a threat with the Kapp Putsch.’  ‘A right-wing terror group assassinated Rathenau.’  ‘Hitler led an attempted rebellion in Munich.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘There were threats from both left-wing and right-wing opponents.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
12(a)	<p><b>What actions did the Nazis take against religious opponents?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘They tried to gain control of the Protestants by setting up a single ‘Reich Church’ under a Nazi bishop.’ (2 marks)  ‘Many were arrested.’  ‘Many were put in concentration camps.’  ‘Niemöller was sent to a concentration camp.’  ‘Schneider was sent to Buchenwald concentration camp.’  ‘No action was taken against Cardinal Galen.’  ‘Three Catholic priests were executed for distributing copies of Galen’s sermons.’  ‘Bonhoeffer was hanged.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>4</p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
12(b)	<p><b>Why were the Nuremberg rallies important for Nazi control?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Nuremberg rallies were important for Nazi control as they emphasised that Germany was well-ordered and powerful under the control of the Nazis. The colourful displays and marches, together with the compelling speeches of Hitler and other leading Nazis, gave the German people a sense of belonging to a great and successful movement. This would encourage loyalty to, and support for, the Nazis.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The rallies showed Germany as well-ordered and powerful.’  ‘They were an opportunity for the Nazis to give rousing speeches.’  ‘They symbolised the solidarity between the German people and the Nazi Party.’  ‘They reinforced the personality cult of Hitler.’  ‘They were an opportunity for propaganda.’  ‘They showcased the power of National Socialism.’  ‘They encouraged support and loyalty for the Nazis.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They gave a positive view of the Nazis.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6



Question	Answer	Marks
12(c)	<p><b>To what extent was Nazi Germany a totalitarian state? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘to what extent’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Nazi Germany was a totalitarian state. By July 1933 all political parties apart from the Nazi Party had been banned and Germany therefore became a one-party state. There were some small underground opposition groups of Communists and Social Democrats, but the Gestapo ensured that these groups were never able to make any serious challenge to the Nazis. Political life in Nazi Germany was strictly controlled.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Germany was not a totalitarian state in respect of Nazi control over society. There were groups of young people who refused to conform and accept Nazi control. Members of the Swing movement deliberately rebelled against the Nazis. They had long hair, dressed in American and English fashion, and listened to jazz music. They also accepted Jews at their clubs. Their behaviour went against everything the Nazis expected from young Germans. Clearly Germany was not a totalitarian state if some young people behaved in a manner that was objectionable to the Nazi regime.’</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
12(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Nazi Germany was a one-party state.’  ‘Nazi Germany was a police state.’  ‘Schools in Germany were controlled by the Nazi Ministry of Education.’  ‘Mass media and culture were subject to censorship.’  ‘The economy was mostly in the hands of private enterprise.’  ‘The Catholic Church was not fully controlled by the Nazis.’  ‘The formation of a Protestant Reich Church was not successful.’  ‘Groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates rebelled against Nazi control.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Nazi Germany was mostly a totalitarian state, but this was not so in every aspect of life.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
13(a)	<p><b>In what ways did the Petrograd Soviet undermine the Provisional Government?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. 'The Petrograd Soviet had existed since 1905.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had control over the railways.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had control over the troops.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had control over the factories.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had control over power supplies.'            'The Petrograd Soviet could control what went on in Petrograd.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had control over postal and telegraph services.'            'The Petrograd Soviet had the support of the workers.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
13(b)	<p><b>Why was the Kornilov Affair a problem for Kerensky?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Ordinary people in Russia were becoming increasingly disenchanted with the Provisional Government. Kornilov marched towards Moscow, intending to get rid of the Provisional Government. Kerensky had some troops who supported him but they were no match for Kornilov’s troops. Kerensky had no option but to ask for help from his Bolshevik opponents; they saved the city. This meant that the Bolsheviks were seen as heroes and their popularity increased.’ (5 marks)</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Kornilov tried to seize power.’  ‘Kornilov wanted to get rid of the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government.’  ‘Kerensky’s troops were no match for those of Kornilov.’  ‘Kerensky used the Bolsheviks to defend Petrograd against Kornilov’s troops.’  ‘The Bolsheviks organised an army called the Red Guard.’  ‘Kerensky had to arm the Bolsheviks.’  ‘The Bolsheviks kept their arms after the defeat of Kornilov.’  ‘The Bolsheviks emerged as heroes.’  ‘The Bolsheviks gained in popularity.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘It showed Kerensky’s weaknesses.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
13(c)	<p><b>‘The New Economic Policy was more successful than War Communism.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘The NEP was a success because it meant Lenin regained the support of the peasantry. Peasants were allowed to sell surplus grain for profit and paid tax in foodstuffs on that profit. The requisitioning of grain was ended. The peasantry were motivated to produce more, and the success of the policy was clear as food production levels had returned to pre-war levels by 1925.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Although the NEP was successful in some ways, it caused splits in the Bolshevik Party because it was seen as a retreat from the true ideology of communism. It allowed free enterprise and personal profit which were not part of communist ideology.’</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
13(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The NEP meant that industrial production improved.’  ‘The NEP improved food distribution.’  ‘During the NEP, food production returned to pre-war levels.’  ‘The NEP allowed foreign trade.’  ‘Due to the NEP, Lenin regained support from the peasantry.’  ‘Due to the NEP, Lenin gained support from the workers.’  ‘War Communism provided an economy to meet the needs of the war.’  ‘War Communism meant a large army could be fed.’  ‘War Communism meant a large army could be equipped.’  ‘The NEP went against Communist ideals.’  ‘War Communism caused terrible hardship.’  ‘Under War Communism, peasants had to hand over surplus food to the government.’  ‘Under War Communism, the output of heavy industry fell.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘They both had success and failure.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
14(a)	<p><b>In what ways were the ‘show trials’ useful for Stalin?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘He could put old Bolsheviks on trial in public.’  ‘Leading Bolsheviks were made to confess to their crimes.’  ‘The ‘show trials’ formed part of Stalin’s Purges.’  ‘At the ‘show trials’ charges were made that defendants had conspired with western powers to overthrow Stalin, break up the Soviet Union and restore capitalism.’  ‘He could try major opponents such as Rykov, Bukharin and Zinoviev.’  ‘He could use the ‘show trials’ for propaganda purposes.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
14(b)	<p><b>Why did Stalin maintain control over art and culture in the Soviet Union?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Stalin wanted to maintain control over art and culture to ensure that he was always portrayed in a positive light, with his policies being praised and the Russian people being shown that the Soviet Union was a good place in which to live. Art and culture portrayed Stalin as a caring leader looking after his people, and stressed all the great achievements of the Soviet Union under his rule. He hoped that the use of such propaganda in art and culture would gain him continued support from the people.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Stalin wanted all art to give people the message of Socialist Realism.’  ‘Stalin wanted art to praise his policies.’  ‘Stalin wanted art and culture to always show him in a positive light.’  ‘Stalin wanted art and culture to show the USSR as a good place in which to live.’  ‘Stalin wanted art and culture to show how communism was developing.’  ‘Stalin wanted art and culture to focus on the lives of ordinary working people.’  ‘Art and culture could be used for propaganda purposes.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘Stalin wanted to be in charge of art and culture.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6



Question	Answer	Marks
14(c)	<p><b>‘Trotsky’s mistakes, rather than Stalin’s strengths, were the main reason for Stalin’s victory in the leadership contest.’ How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Trotsky made the mistake of underestimating Stalin. Trotsky assumed that he would naturally be Lenin’s successor, and therefore made little effort to gain support within the party. His arrogant manner offended many leading members of the party, and he did not think it necessary to actively seek the support of the rank and file members of the party. Meanwhile Stalin consolidated his own position, seeming to be the friend and ally of many different groups within the party.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘Stalin was able to achieve victory due to the roles he held in government. He was the General Secretary of the Communist Party and this allowed him to put his supporters in positions of power. This meant that he was able to remove from the Party people likely to support his opponents, and to remove Trotsky from the Politburo.’</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
14(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Trotsky was arrogant.’  ‘Trotsky offended other senior party members.’  ‘Trotsky did not build up support in the ranks of the party.’  ‘Trotsky’s policy of world revolution was unpopular.’  ‘People were worried that Trotsky’s policies could involve the Soviet Union in conflict abroad.’  ‘Trotsky missed Lenin’s funeral.’  ‘Stalin used his position as General Secretary.’  ‘Stalin’s policy of ‘Socialism in One Country’ was more popular.’  ‘Stalin appeared as chief mourner at Lenin’s funeral.’  ‘Lenin’s Last Testament was suppressed.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Trotsky’s mistakes contributed greatly, but there were other reasons.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
15(a)	<p><b>What new consumer goods became widely available to Americans during the boom years?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. 'Ready to wear clothes became widely available.'  'A range of electrical goods became widely available.'  'Refrigerators became widely available.'  'Washing machines became widely available.'  'Radios became widely available.'  'Vacuum cleaners became widely available.'  'Flush lavatories became widely available.'  'Electric irons became widely available.'  'Electric razors became widely available.'  'Phonographs became widely available.'  'Cars became widely available.'  'Telephones became widely available.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
15(b)	<p><b>Why were mass-production techniques crucial to the economic boom?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mass-production techniques were crucial to the economic boom because they meant that consumer products could be produced much more quickly than by hand and were therefore cheaper. The lower prices meant that many ordinary Americans could afford to purchase the new consumer products. This stimulated growth in these industries.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mass-production techniques made it easier to manufacture goods than by hand.’  ‘Mass-production techniques meant goods could be produced more quickly.’  ‘Mass-production techniques meant goods were cheaper.’  ‘Mass-production techniques meant more people could afford consumer goods.’  ‘Mass-production techniques meant a greater range of consumer goods became readily available.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mass production techniques helped the economy.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	<b>6</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
15(c)	<p><b>'During the 1920s workers in the traditional (older) industries suffered more than those in agriculture' How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'Workers in the traditional industries suffered very much in the 1920s. Many people were employed in the coal industry, but too much coal was being produced, which reduced prices. At the same time, people were switching to new power sources like electricity, gas and oil. Although coal was used to generate electricity, new efficient technology meant electricity producers did not use a lot of coal to produce a lot of energy. As a result of these changes, many coal mines closed and miners lost their jobs. Where mines stayed open, miners often faced wage cuts and therefore a drop in their standard of living.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'Workers in agriculture suffered very much in the 1920s. American farms were producing far more food than Americans needed, and the price of grain collapsed. As incomes dropped, farmers could not afford to pay their rents or mortgages. Many were evicted from their farms or had to sell to clear debts. As a result many farm labourers lost their jobs. Some six million workers in agriculture were forced off the land in the 1920s.'</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
15(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Workers in coal mining had their wages cut.’  ‘Workers in coal mining lost their jobs when mines closed.’  ‘Wages in the tin and copper industries dropped.’  ‘Workers in the cotton and wool industries were among the lowest paid factory workers.’  ‘Female cotton operatives only earned \$9 a week.’  ‘Many small farmers could no longer afford rents or mortgage payments.’  ‘Many black American agricultural labourers lost their jobs.’  ‘Six million rural Americans were forced off the land in the 1920s.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Workers in older industries and in agriculture both suffered a great deal.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
16(a)	<p><b>In what ways did Roosevelt help American industry during the First Hundred Days of his Presidency?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Roosevelt introduced the Emergency Banking Act.’            ‘Roosevelt helped to resuscitate industrial production.’            ‘Roosevelt set up the Public Works Administration Act (PWA) to help industry.’            ‘Roosevelt introduced the National Industry Recovery Act (NIRA).’            ‘Roosevelt set up the National Recovery Administration (NRA) to help industry.’            ‘New public works projects generated orders for building materials.’            ‘The NRA aimed to increase the prices of factory goods to help factory owners make more profit.’            ‘The PWA ensured building industries had plenty of work so they could make money again.’            ‘Government money was used for projects to generate work for industries.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
16(b)	<p><b>Why did the Tennessee Valley Authority become a showcase for the New Deal?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) became a showcase for the New Deal because it introduced projects for the revival of agriculture in a very depressed region cutting through seven states. The Tennessee Valley had been badly affected by both flooding and soil erosion. The farming land had become a dust bowl. 33 dams were built to control the Tennessee River and to help irrigate the dry land, new forests were planted and measures taken to improve the quality of the soil. Agriculture could now thrive again in the region.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The TVA created thousands of jobs.’  ‘The TVA provided cheap electricity.’  ‘The TVA built dams to prevent flooding.’  ‘The TVA made irrigation possible.’  ‘The TVA improved the land.’  ‘The TVA improved waterways in the area.’  ‘The TVA planted forests.’  ‘New industries were attracted to the area.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘The TVA helped many people.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
16(c)	<p><b>'The New Deal restored the faith of the American people in their government.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The New Deal certainly helped to restore the faith of the American people in their government, as it showed that the government was determined to help people when they really needed it. Many unemployed people found work thanks to the New Deal. The PWA employed thousands of workers to help build dams, bridges, hospitals and schools. Many people again had jobs and therefore could provide adequately for their families.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The New Deal did not restore the faith of most African Americans in their government. African Americans still found it very difficult to find jobs, and by 1935 35% of African Americans were living on relief. Those who had jobs often had menial jobs other Americans did not want.'</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
16(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The New Deal helped people to keep their homes.’  ‘The New Deal helped the unemployed.’  ‘The New Deal restored confidence in the banking system.’  ‘The New Deal showed the government was willing to help people.’  ‘Industrial workers had their faith restored.’  ‘Farm tenants and sharecroppers did not have their faith restored.’  ‘Some New Deal agencies discriminated against black Americans.’  ‘The Social Security Act did not help to restore the faith of all women.’  ‘Native Americans were still a poor and excluded group in American society.’  ‘Unemployment remained high.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Some people had their faith in the government restored by the New Deal, but others did not.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(a)	<p><b>What did Chiang Kai-shek do to counter the threat posed by the Communists before 1934?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘The Communists were part of the KMT, but in 1925 they were expelled.’  ‘In 1927, Chiang ordered the arrest of leading communists in Shanghai. The Communist Party protested and Chiang ordered the army to take control.’  ‘Violent attacks led to 1000 arrests, 300 public executions and 5000 missing communists.’  ‘By the end of 1928, an estimated 300 000 people had been killed in anti-communist action.’  ‘Between 1930 and 1934, Chiang launched 5 extermination campaigns against the Jiangxi Soviet.’  ‘KMT troops attempted to wipe out Communist strongholds.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(b)	<p><b>Why did Mao claim the Long March was important?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mao claimed that the Long March was important because it was an important propaganda force. The Communists appeared as heroes during the Long March, passing through incredibly difficult terrain, surviving on very little food and travelling thousands of miles over the course of a year. To add to their difficulties, they had to fight battles against Chiang’s modern army en route. It was a remarkable achievement that anyone managed to survive, and showed the determination of the Communists and their commitment to their cause.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Long March was good propaganda.’  ‘The Long March showed the determination of the Communists.’  ‘The Long March gave the Communist party time to rebuild.’  ‘The Long March meant that the peasants grew to support the Communists.’  ‘The Long March showed the Communists as heroes.’  ‘The Long March saved the Communist revolution in China.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘It helped the Communists.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
17(c)	<p><b>'The Nationalists were responsible for their own defeat in the Civil War.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? <b>Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The Nationalists were responsible for their own defeat in the Civil War. Many of the Nationalist troops were poorly trained and lacking in discipline. They often had to go days without food and water, and their pay was often stolen by their officers. This meant that morale was very low indeed, and many deserted the Nationalist army and joined the Communists, taking with them supplies and weapons.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'Mao's tactics were the reason why the Nationalists were defeated in the Civil War. Mao knew his main army was smaller and less well equipped than the Nationalists, so he deliberately avoided fighting 'set piece' battles against them. Instead Mao used guerrilla tactics, picking off Nationalist units one at a time, and also causing supply problems. These tactics were highly effective.'</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
17(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘People did not believe the Nationalists could solve China’s economic problems.’  ‘Chiang was seen as corrupt.’  ‘The Nationalists focused on the urbanised cities.’  ‘The Nationalists did not seem to care about the peasants.’  ‘Chiang’s soldiers treated the people of the areas they went into badly.’  ‘Mao was seen as looking after China’s interests.’  ‘Mao treated the peasants well.’  ‘Mao used guerrilla warfare.’  ‘Mao won the hearts and minds of the peasantry.’  ‘Mao was viewed as a great leader after the Long March.’  ‘America withdrew support from the Nationalists and remained neutral.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘The Nationalists were responsible in some ways, but there were other factors that ensured their defeat.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
18(a)	<p><b>What problems did the Communist government face when it came to power in 1949?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Agricultural production had fallen due to war.’  ‘There were food shortages.’  ‘Industrial production had fallen due to war.’  ‘There was high inflation.’  ‘There was high unemployment in the towns.’  ‘China had no reserves of foreign currency.’  ‘Most of China’s population could not read or write.’  ‘The Chinese people were averse to change.’  ‘Infrastructure was in need of repair.’  ‘Most of the world refused to recognise the Communists as China’s legal government.’  ‘Only Russia would give aid to help rebuild China.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
18(b)	<p><b>Why did the Communists encourage the peasants to change to co-operative farming?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mao was concerned that ownership of small plots was preventing the use of modern methods of farming, which meant it was not efficient and did not produce enough crops. Mao wanted co-operative farming so that there were bigger farming units which could employ machinery and the latest farming methods, and thus improve production.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Farming methods were still traditional.’  ‘Very little machinery was used.’  ‘Mao disapproved of private ownership of land.’  ‘It would ensure more modern methods of farming could be used.’  ‘The Communists believed this would mean an increase in food production.’  ‘Co-operative farming was part of a socialist society.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They thought it would help peasant farmers.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6



Question	Answer	Marks
18(c)	<p><b>How successful were Mao’s economic policies in the first fifteen years of Communist rule? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how successful’</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Mao’s First Five Year Plan was very successful. Ambitious targets were set, and according to official figures, by the end of the plan most sectors had exceeded their targets. Steel production increased from 1.3 million tonnes in 1952 to 5.2 million tonnes in 1957, while coal production soared from 63 million tonnes in 1952 to 124 million tonnes in 1957.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The Great Leap Forward was a disastrous economic policy. Backyard furnaces were rapidly established, but much of the iron and steel produced in them was of such low quality that it could not be used. Coal was needed to fire the furnaces, and this led to shortages for China’s rail system.’</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
18(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The First Five Year Plan was a great success.’  ‘Infrastructure was developed.’  ‘Railways and roads were built.’  ‘Inflation was stopped.’  ‘Soviet technicians were a key to economic success.’  ‘Agricultural production grew very slowly.’  ‘The supply of consumer goods was limited.’  ‘The Great Leap Forward was not successful.’  ‘By 1961 China was having to buy food from abroad.’  ‘Backyard furnaces produced low quality iron and steel.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Mao’s economic policies were a success in some ways, but not in others.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
19(a)	<p><b>Describe education for non-whites under National Party rule.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Non-whites were taught a different curriculum from whites.’  ‘Non-whites were often taught in their ethnic language.’  ‘Non-whites were to be educated for life in the homelands, not in the white cities.’  ‘Education for non-whites was under-funded.’  ‘Non-whites were taught in large classes.’  ‘Non-whites were taught in poor quality buildings.’  ‘Non-whites were taught by less-qualified teachers.’  ‘Non-whites were banned from attending previously mixed universities.’  ‘New colleges were set up for Africans, Coloureds and Indians.’  ‘Many mission schools were closed down.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
19(b)	<p><b>Why did the Defiance Campaign of 1952 occur?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Defiance Campaign occurred because the ANC had realised that polite opposition to apartheid was having no real effect. By participating in non-violent civil disobedience they thought they would be arrested and the country’s prisons would be flooded with prisoners. They thought this would result in coverage in the mass media, which would draw attention in South Africa and in the wider world to how wrong apartheid was. Ultimately they believed this would then force the government to enact change.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘It was an effort to bring about change through non-violent civil disobedience.’  ‘It was part of the ANC programme of action involving mass resistance tactics.’  ‘The Defiance Campaign aimed to get rid of the apartheid laws.’  ‘The Nationalists would not take notice of polite and unassertive opposition.’  ‘It was a reaction to the 1951 Separate Representation of Voters Bill.’  ‘It aimed to show whites in South Africa how wrong apartheid was.’  ‘It aimed to bring the attention of the world to the evils of apartheid.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘People wanted to make a difference.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
19(c)	<p><b>'The impact of apartheid by 1964 was greater for whites than for non-whites.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'The impact of apartheid on white businessmen was considerable. Businesses benefited from the very low wages they paid non-white employees; their businesses made great profits. This meant that they enjoyed a very high standard of living, living in large houses, driving expensive cars and enjoying excellent public services.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'Apartheid had an adverse impact on non-whites. Their education was badly affected. The money allocated to the education of non-whites was reduced, meaning that they were taught in large classes, with poor quality buildings and less-qualified teachers. The curriculum taught was different from that taught to whites. This all meant that the life and job opportunities for non-whites were greatly reduced.'</p>	<b>10</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
19(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘White businessmen benefited from apartheid.’  ‘The impact of apartheid meant many whites enjoyed a high standard of living.’  ‘Whites enjoyed excellent public services.’  ‘Afrikaner farmers were given massive state support.’  ‘The medical and legal professions increasingly came under Afrikaner control.’  ‘White income on average was ten times greater than that of non-whites.’  ‘The real value of non-white incomes decreased.’  ‘Housing for non-whites was poor and overcrowded.’  ‘The life expectancy of non-whites was lower than of whites.’  ‘Public facilities for non-whites were poor or non-existent.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Both whites and non-whites were greatly affected.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
20(a)	<p><b>What was the importance of Steve Biko to the anti-apartheid movement?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. 'Biko was a powerful writer.'            'Biko was an eloquent speaker.'            'Biko founded the South African Students' Organisation (SASO) for black students in 1969.'            'Biko is regarded as the founder of the Black Consciousness Movement. This movement encouraged pride and confidence in being black.'            'Biko encouraged solidarity and assertiveness among black people.'            'Biko encouraged black people to keep up their struggle against oppression.'            'Biko founded the Black People's Convention.'            'Biko inspired the 1976 Soweto uprising.'</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
20(b)	<p><b>Why did the South African government pass the Bantu Homelands Constitution Act of 1971?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The Bantu Homelands Constitution Act of 1971 was passed as it would enable the South African government to portray itself as a progressive regime, willing to listen to the desires of black South Africans who wanted self-government. Homelands could be given independence and could then be developed as black South Africans wanted them to be.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The South African government claimed it would allow black South Africans the chance to develop as they wanted.’  ‘The South African government said it would enable the development of independent nations.’  ‘It meant the South African government could portray itself as a progressive regime.’  ‘The South African government could claim it acknowledged the wishes of black South Africans for self-government.’  ‘It saved the South African government a considerable amount of money.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They thought they could claim it was helpful.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6



Question	Answer	Marks
20(c)	<p><b>'International sanctions provided the most effective opposition to apartheid before 1980.'</b> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of 'how far'</b></p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b></p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b></p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. 'International sporting sanctions provided effective opposition to apartheid. In 1970 the South African cricket tour to England was cancelled by the MCC, and the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement meant that the Commonwealth banned sporting contacts with South Africa. South Africa was banned from the Olympics from 1964. These sporting sanctions highlighted that the international sporting community would not tolerate the participation of a country that had an oppressive regime of apartheid, and raised international awareness of the situation. People felt that increasing pressure should be put on South Africa to change.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>'The actions of black workers were an effective opposition to apartheid before 1980. In the first three months of 1973 there were 160 strikes involving 61 000 black workers. They were calling for improved wages and conditions. The strikes obviously affected the businesses adversely and as the black workers became increasingly militant, white employers were very worried about the longer term effects on their businesses if there was no change in the apartheid system.'</p>	<p><b>10</b></p> <p>10</p> <p>7–9</p> <p>4–6</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
20(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The 1970 South African cricket tour to England was cancelled by the MCC.’            ‘The Commonwealth banned sporting contacts with South Africa in 1977.’            ‘The United Nations set up a Special Committee on Apartheid.’            ‘The United Nations declared apartheid to be a crime against humanity.’            ‘The United Nations called for an arms embargo against South Africa.’            ‘The only successful sanctions against South Africa before 1980 were in the world of sport.’            ‘The international community was reluctant to impose economic sanctions.’            ‘In 1960 the Pan African Congress (PAC) began a national campaign against the pass laws.’            ‘The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) provided effective opposition.’            ‘The Black Consciousness Movement provided effective opposition.’            ‘The Soweto uprisings were featured in the international media.’            ‘Black workers took strike action.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘International sanctions were effective, but so were other methods of opposition.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
21(a)	<p><b>What was the outcome of the Suez Crisis of 1956 for Arab nations?</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Nasser had gained complete control of the Suez Canal.’  ‘Nasser gained a large number of British military stores.’  ‘Egypt’s reputation amongst Arab nations was enhanced.’  ‘Nasser was seen as a hero amongst Arab nations for standing up to Britain and France.’  ‘Arab nations gained funding for the Aswan Dam.’  ‘Arab nations acquired supplies of weapons from the USSR.’  ‘Many Arab nations became more anti-Western.’  ‘The USSR became Egypt’s main ally.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
21(b)	<p><b>Why did Israel go to war with Egypt in 1956?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b> 6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b> 4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Israel went to war with Egypt in 1956 because of great concerns over Nasser’s attitude. In 1956 Nasser announced that Egypt was going to nationalise the Suez Canal and that the Straits of Tiran would be blockaded. Blockading the Straits of Tiran would prevent Israeli ships from reaching the Port of Eilat. The Straits of Tiran were Israel’s outlet to trade with Africa and Asia, so their economy would be adversely affected. Israel needed to break the blockade.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b> 2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Nasser had announced the nationalisation of the Suez Canal.’  ‘Nasser had blockaded the Straits of Tiran.’  ‘Nasser’s actions meant that Israeli ships could not reach the port of Eilat.’  ‘Cross-border attacks by the Fedayeen were becoming more violent.’  ‘Nasser was arming and training the Fedayeen.’  ‘Israel wanted to teach Nasser a lesson.’  ‘Israel wanted to force Egypt to recognise the state of Israel.’  ‘Israel was worried about the increasing military strength of Egypt.’  ‘Israel was concerned about the rise in Arab nationalism in Egypt.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b> 1</p> <p>e.g. ‘They were concerned about Egypt.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b> 0</p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
21(c)	<p><b>How far were the decisions taken by Nasser responsible for the outbreak of the Six-Day War in 1967? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘Nasser closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping, which meant that the Israelis could not access the Gulf of Aqaba. The Israelis said that this was a deliberate act of aggression against Israel. They said that in 1957 the USA, France and Britain had guaranteed free passage for all shipping through the Gulf and therefore Egypt had no right to close it. Israel could not ignore what it saw as Nasser’s aggressive actions.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The Arab leaders set up the PLO in 1964; its aim was to win back the land which Palestinians had lost in 1948–9. Fatah, a guerrilla group and part of the PLO, began raiding Israel from bases in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. The Syrians, in particular, supported Fatah with men and arms. This provoked the Israelis to teach the Syrians a lesson.’</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
21(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Nasser put troops into Sinai.’  ‘Nasser asked the UN to remove troops from Egypt.’  ‘Nasser closed the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping.’  ‘The PLO was formed in 1964.’  ‘There were border skirmishes between Fatah and Israeli forces.’  ‘Syria became more violently anti-Israeli.’  ‘The USSR gave information, which was inaccurate, to Syria and Egypt of Israeli troops massing on the Syrian border.’  ‘The USA suggested Israel took action to open the Straits of Tiran.’  ‘War was triggered by an Israeli air strike.’</p>	2–3
	<p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘Nasser’s actions did help to cause the Six-Day War, but there were also other reasons.’</p>	1
	<p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	0

Question	Answer	Marks
22(a)	<p><b>Describe the part played by the United Nations in the Arab-Israeli conflict between 1956 and 1967.</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 One mark for each relevant point; additional mark for supporting detail</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘From 1956 a UN force patrolled the Israeli-Egyptian border.’  ‘The UN acted as a peacemaker.’  ‘During the Suez Crisis the UN called for a ceasefire.’  ‘The UN ordered the British and French forces to leave Suez.’  ‘During the Suez Crisis the UN sent its Emergency Force (the UNEF) to the canal.’  ‘In 1957 Eisenhower negotiated for the UNEF to be stationed in the Sinai, forming a physical barrier between Israel and Egypt.’  ‘The UN passed Resolution 242 in November 1967.’  ‘The UN Resolution of November 1967 called for Israeli withdrawal from occupied lands.’  ‘The UN Resolution of November 1967 called for Arab recognition of Israel.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p>1–4</p> <p>0</p>

Question	Answer	Marks
22(b)	<p><b>Why has the United Nations been unable to find a peaceful solution in the Middle East?</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains TWO reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains ONE reason</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">4–5</p> <p>(Four marks for one explanation, five marks for full explanation)</p> <p>e.g. ‘The United Nations has failed to find a peaceful solution in the Middle East because it has been unable to present a united front and this has undermined attempts at peace. The UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council have each had their own focus. The General Assembly has concentrated its efforts on dealing with the refugee crisis, also known as the ‘Palestinian problem’, while the Security Council has been more reluctant to intervene on these issues, but wanted rather to concentrate more on resolving conflicts. This has meant a divided approach, which has not helped with finding a peaceful solution to the problems.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">2–3</p> <p>(One mark for each identification/description)</p> <p>e.g. ‘Both sides in the conflict have only wanted to work with the UN when they could gain something.’  ‘The UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council have presented a divided approach.’  ‘Israel has felt that the UN has an anti-Israeli bias.’  ‘The role of the UN has been reduced by American intervention.’  ‘The nature of the conflict has changed from a conflict between nations to one between ethnic groups.’  ‘UN Resolution 242 has contributed to the failure.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p> <p>e.g. ‘There are no easy answers to the situation in the Middle East.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">0</p>	<b>6</b>



Question	Answer	Marks
22(c)	<p><b>How far have the Israeli Labor Party and Likud disagreed about how to achieve peace in the Middle East? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains with evaluation of ‘how far’</b> 10</p> <p>As Level 4 plus evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explanation of both sides</b> 7–9</p> <p>A L4 answer will have a minimum of three explanations (2 on one side; 1 on the other). This will be worth a mark of 7. Fuller explanation of one issue to be given two marks. An answer which only has one explanation on one side of the argument cannot be awarded more than 8.</p> <p><b>Level 3 One-sided explanation OR one explanation of both sides 5-6 marks</b> 4–6</p> <p>More detailed explanation of one issue to be given two marks.</p> <p>e.g. ‘There have been some fundamental disagreements between the Labor Party and Likud over how to achieve peace in the Middle East. Likud have been determined to achieve a ‘Greater Israel’, and have therefore denied the claims of either Jordanians or Palestinians over the West Bank. The Labor Party have adopted a rather more conciliatory approach, by being prepared to negotiate with Jordan over the West Bank after 1947 and the 1967 Six-Day War. The Labor Party has felt that only by there being a peaceful resolution would there be security for Israel, and so have been prepared to negotiate.’</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>‘The Israeli Labor Party and Likud have agreed in some ways about how to achieve peace in the Middle East. Both of the parties have adopted a hard-line approach, believing that this was the best option to ensure Israel’s security. They have both argued that the Palestinians are a people with no national rights, and therefore no right to self-determination, and have also agreed that the Palestinians have no right to independence.’</p>	<b>10</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
22(c)	<p><b>Level 2 Identifies AND/OR describes</b></p> <p>(One mark for each point.)</p> <p>e.g. ‘They have both denied the right of Palestinians to self-determination.’            ‘They have both rejected the idea of an independent Palestinian state.’            ‘For much of the period after 1948, neither party would negotiate directly with the PLO.’            ‘Likud wanted to create a ‘Greater Israel.’            ‘Likud denied any claim of either the Jordanians or Palestinians over the West Bank.’            ‘The Labor Party believed that Israel’s security would be preserved by a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.’            ‘The Labor Party was prepared to negotiate with Jordan over the West Bank.’            ‘In 1992 the Labor Party campaigned on a platform of negotiating a territorial settlement with the Palestinians.’</p> <p><b>Level 1 General answer lacking specific contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>e.g. ‘They have agreed in some ways but not in others.’</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p>	<p>2–3</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>