

GCSE History B (Modern World)

Unit 1, 40451

Sample Answers





GCSE History Specification B

Unit 1: International Relations: Conflict and Peace in the Twentieth Century

Exemplar responses to the June 2010 examination

Topic 1: The Origins of the First World War

01 In 1911 the Black Hand was formed in Serbia. By 1914 it had around 2500 members.

Describe the part played by the Black Hand in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914. (4 marks)

The Black Hand was a terrorist group formed in Serbia which aimed to oppose Austria-Hungary. It was set up because of the Bosnian Crisis in 1908 where Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia. As a sign of their opposition to Austria-Hungary, they planned to assassinate Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in Bosnia on the 28th June 1914. Only 120 guards were in place over 6 kilometres to protect the Archduke's procession and most of the guards faced the procession rather than the crowd. One of the assassins threw a grenade which bounced off the Archduke's arm and wounded 20 people in the street. Gavrillo Princip was the man who killed the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, Franz Ferdinand, and also his wife Sophie, with two shots from a gun. Clearly the assassination was the Black Hand's plan on this national holiday for the Slav people.

Level 3: 4 marks. This answer contains a standard description of the assassination itself which would gain 3 marks and then some additional information on the reasons for the action of the Black Hand.

02 Source A suggests a reason why Britain went to war with Germany in 1914.

Do you agree that this was the main reason why Britain went to war with Germany in 1914? Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your own knowledge.

(6 marks)

I mostly agree with the view presented in the source, as although Britain initially entered the war to protect the sanctity of treaties (regarding Germany's invasion of neutral Belgium), Britain was more concerned about her own safety and security. Over the years Britain had grown increasingly wary and concerned about Germany's actions. Britain did not want to get involved in European affairs, however they feared the possibility of one power dominating Europe, as they could turn and then challenge Britain. I also believe that one of the reasons that Britain went to war with Germany was to protect itself.

Source A shows the Kaiser reaching out for Europe with the phrase 'he won't be happy till he gets it'. As this was a British postcard, it highlighted how the British people felt about the Kaiser and his aims. There was clearly the belief that the Kaiser wanted to conquer all of Europe, and this image may have been published to bring attention to this belief. The source is almost like a warning, perhaps to the government, advising them to watch Germany closely and, if possible, stop it. The phrase used could be interpreted in a

way that the public believed conflict was inevitable if the Kaiser was not stopped immediately. Britain and Germany had also been engaged in the naval race; Britain felt threatened by Germany's increasing naval power and could not understand why it needed it. This may not have been a direct reason for Britain entering the war against Germany, but it was a contributing factor as they feared that Germany wanted to challenge the British navy. There is no evidence that Britain entered the war for France or Russia, despite their agreements but, as the source hints, it seems most likely that Britain fought against Germany for its own protection and security.

Level 4: 6 marks. This answer begins with good understanding and knowledge of Britain's aims in foreign policy which is enough to merit Level 3. It then considers the provenance of the source and reaches Level 3 on the provenance route when it questions possible reasons or motives behind the publication of the cartoon. The answer has reached full marks at this stage, but for good measure the knowledge at the end is also enough to warrant another Level 3, but no increase in the mark for this particular answer.

03 Which of these two bullet points had the greater effect on the development of the alliance system in Europe:

-the Moroccan Crises, 1905–1911

-the Bosnian Crisis, 1908–1909?

You must refer to both bullet points when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

I believe that the two Moroccan Crises had a greater effect on the development of the Alliance system because it involved more countries, and also, during the Bosnian Crisis, the only formal alliance was between Germany and Austria-Hungary.

In Morocco, at Algeiras in 1906, it strengthened the alliances. For example, Germany received the full support of Austria-Hungary, and also Italy opposed the Kaiser's action, meaning Germany relied more on Austria-Hungary. Furthermore, it strengthened the Entente Cordiale, which the Kaiser had intended to weaken, as Britain and France both now had a reason to dislike Germany. In addition to this, it led to the signing of the Anglo-Russian agreement in 1907, because Britain and Russia had both supported France. It also made Britain more likely to stop the Kaiser's plans in the future. Also, it was the first time the powers had argued over land, therefore tension increased and it was clear to everyone Europe was dividing into two camps. In Morocco, in 1911, it alarmed Britain and made sure they would fight against Germany, as they believed the Kaiser was trying to create his own naval base at Agadir. Furthermore, it led to Britain and France signing a secret naval agreement in 1912, stating Britain would look after the north coast of France. It led to France turning their back on Europe by building the Maginot line.

However, on the other hand, the Bosnian Crisis did affect the alliance system. For example, although Germany were annoyed that Austria-Hungary had not consulted them, they still gave Austria-Hungary their full support. This made Austria-Hungary more confident and would influence their future actions. Also, at the time, it weakened Serbia and Russia's friendship, in the long term it was strengthened because Russia did not back down in 1914. It also brought the Triple Entente closer because they all had a common enemy in Germany.

Level 4: 9 marks. The second paragraph is an excellent assessment of the effect of the Moroccan Crises apart from the blemish of the reference to the Maginot Line. It clearly points out how the crises affected the development of both alliances and why. The paragraph on Bosnia is not as thorough, but still contains some assessment of its effect on the relationship between Austria/Hungary and Germany and Russia and Serbia. As both bullet points have been assessed the answer must be awarded at least mid Level 3. In this case, the assessment was judged to be in sufficient depth to warrant Level 4. Although there is a tentative attempt to reach a judgement on the two factors, this was felt to lack some development and was not judged strong enough for the award of full marks.

Topic 2: Peacemaking 1918–1919 and the League of Nations

04 In 1918, France wanted to prevent Germany from ever attacking France again.

Describe the limits placed on Germany's armed forces by the Treaty of Versailles.

(4 marks)

The Treaty of Versailles limited Germany's armed forces to a very small amount in order to try to prevent another German attack. The army was limited to 100,000 volunteers and conscription was banned. The navy was limited to 6 battleships, and Germany was banned from having submarines, military aircraft and armoured vehicles. The Treaty also said that the Rhineland should be a de-militarised zone.

Level: 4 marks. This answer was awarded full marks because it has specific, accurate detail of at least four of the limitations placed by the Treaty on Germany's armed forces. In fact there are five qualifying points made in the answer.

05 Study Source B.

Source B gives one of Lloyd George's aims for the peace treaty at the end of the First World War.

Do you agree that this was Lloyd George's main aim at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919?

Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your own knowledge.

(6 marks)

Source B gives one of Lloyd George's aims for the peace treaty. It is a primary source and an extract from a speech that David Lloyd George, British Prime Minister, made in 1918. The source says that the British Prime Minister's main aim of the treaty was to force Germany to pay large reparations for the war.

David Lloyd George was one of the 'big three' at the peace talks in Paris. Lloyd George had been re-elected with the promise that he would make sure that Germany was severely punished – because this is what the British public wanted to see. They were angry, and wanted Germany severely punished. However, Lloyd George was a pragmatist and saw problems with Germany being punished too severely and being too weak. He didn't want to see France too strong because this would cause an unbalance of power. After World War I Britain was bankrupt and needed to start trading again, Germany was a good trading partner and this would benefit Britain. Lloyd George knew that if Germany was left too weak the people would want revenge and another war might be inevitable. He also feared that an impoverished Germany might leave it at risk of a Communist Revolution – and he feared Communism. However, Britain did not want to see Woodrow's '14 Points' achieved either because they included 'Freedom of the seas' and 'Freedom of colonies'. Britain had one of the largest and strongest navies in the world and one of the largest empires. If Britain lost these, they would lose a lot of influence.

I disagree that Lloyd George's main aim at the Peace Talks were to make Germany pay large reparations. Britain did not want to see Germany too weak, partly for trading reasons, so Lloyd George would not want to see Germany pay large reparations to France. This source cannot be totally trusted because Lloyd George is saying this during his election campaign. British people wanted to see Germany severely

punished and so Lloyd George, for personal reasons, would benefit from saying that. I think that he was saying what the British people wanted to hear, in order to secure his position as Prime Minister.

Level 4: 6 marks. This answer proceeds through each level in turn, beginning with some general level 1 points on the source and its provenance in the first paragraph. Some knowledge is introduced in the second paragraph, first at level 2, then it reaches level 3 with the discussion about the dangers of the effect of a weakened Germany on Britain's trade and how this affected Lloyd George's aims. Further level 3 knowledge points are made by the references to the fear of communism and Lloyd George's attitude to Wilson's Fourteen Points. At this stage the answer has comfortably reached the top of level 3. The last paragraph pushes it into level 4 by examining Lloyd George's motive for the speech in the context of the general election and how this could have affected its content.

06 Which of the following was the more important reason for the failure of the League of Nations:

- the membership of the League, 1919–1939
- the Manchurian Crisis, 1931–1933?

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

The membership of the League was an important factor which added to its failure. When the League was initially set up, Russia and Germany were forbidden to join – Russia because members were afraid of communism, Germany because it was the main aggressor in the War. This weakened the League. Russia would have been a useful power – it was large and would have been able to spare forces to enforce military sanctions. Its geographical position would also have been useful in disputes. For example where Britain and France could not send troops to Manchuria. Russia would have. Russia would also have been used to impose economic sanctions more effectively. Sanctioned countries could still have traded with Russia. Germany would also have benefited from being a member immediately. Its problems could have been solved and tensions between countries and Germany would have lessened, possibly reducing the risk of conflicts in the future – WWII. However, the most important membership issue was the USA not joining. This was for a number of reasons. Firstly, Wilson had the initial idea for the League. His input would have benefited the decisions the League made dramatically. They may have been made more quickly, this may have made conflict such as Manchuria resolve more quickly and to a better result than Japan leaving the League. Also, the USA was now more powerful than any country in the world and would have been able to impose military sanctions effectively. Conflicts such as the re-militarisation of the Rhineland, the Abyssinian Crisis and Manchuria may have been resolved, or may not have happened in the first place out of fear for the USA. Finally, they would have been able to impose economic sanctions. This would have made the League's decisions more effective as the sanctioned country would lose a lot of trade. An example of this is Abyssinia where Italy continued to trade with the USA – had the USA joined this would not have been a problem.

The Manchurian Crisis (1931–33) had a negative effect on the League, following the Wall Street Crash of 1929, Japan was in need of new trade and tradeable recovery. Manchuria provided this. An increasing population and pressure from the army also needed Japan to expand. Manchuria seemed a perfect location. The Japanese claimed the South Manchurian railway that they owned was attacked by the Chinese. This gave them the excuse to invade. Manchuria appealed to the League for help. The League sent Lord Lytton to make a report – the 'Lytton report'. This took a year to write and when the League finally condemned Japan they simply left the League and took Jehol, another province in China. This action from the League showed its weakness. It could not handle pressure from a permanent member because they were not willing to use military force and decisions took too long to make. This poor action from the League had various repercussions in the future. Mussolini saw that he could get away with aggression and in 1934 invaded Abyssinia. This attack also gave Hitler the opportunity to remilitarise the

Rhineland. Had the League acted successfully on Manchuria these events may have been avoided and ultimately the Second World War may not have happened.

In conclusion, I believe that the membership of the League was its main cause for failure. Had the USA and Russia joined, forthcoming events would have been avoided or resolved and most importantly peace may have been maintained. Although Manchuria had the foundations for events to come, a strong membership may have prevented the Manchurian Crisis and WWII may never have happened.

Level 4: 10 marks. This answer follows the 'model answer' style, beginning with a paragraph on the first bullet point, then one on the second and finally a comparison of the relative contributions of both bullet points. Membership of the League is explained and then assessed by linking the absence of the USSR and the USA to the failure of the League to deal with crises in the 1930s. On Manchuria, the answer explains why the League was unable to solve the crisis and then reaches assessment by linking this to future events and how Mussolini and Hitler were influenced by the League's inability to deal with Japan. The depth of the assessment would merit a level 4. This answer then concludes with a judgement of the relative importance of the two bullet points, choosing one of them and explaining why that was judged to be the more important reason leading to the award of full marks.

Topic 3: Hitler's foreign policy and the origins of the Second World War

07 In 1939 Germany remilitarised the Rhineland.

Describe how Hitler achieved this.

(4 marks)

1936, Germany remilitarised the Rhineland. But, how did this come about and how did he get away with it? Well, firstly it is important to look at other events to understand how Hitler managed this feat. In 1936, the Abyssinian Crisis was well underway, and with the world's attention's focused primarily on that, it gave Hitler a sort of 'shield' to act upon'. And when the Hoare-Laval pact was discovered, it dishonoured Britain and France even more – which meant that Hitler had a window of opportunity, whilst the two main countries who opposed this were busy cleaning up their own other messes respectively. With this at the front of his mind, despite knowing his army could not stand up to any sort of opposition, he judged it perfectly. Both Britain and France were too busy to oppose, and when France finally did openly concern about this as well, Britain were prepared to let Germany do it, as they believed it was only Germany reversing the wronged terms of the Treaty of Versailles e.g. demonstrated by Samuel Hoare's speech, 'they were only going into their own back garden,' and that is how Hitler achieved this.

Level 3: 4 marks. There are errors in this answer, but there is still enough accurate detail and important points made to warrant full marks. This is because the candidate shows awareness of the gamble that Hitler took, the importance of its timing at the height of the Abyssinian Crisis and the reason Britain was not interested in opposing.

08 Study Source C.

Source C gives two of Hitler's aims in foreign policy.

Do you agree that these were Hitler's main aims in the foreign policy in the 1930s?

Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your own knowledge. (6 marks)

In Source C, it gives two of Hitler's aims in foreign policy – the equality of rights, in context as to how Germany was dealt with compared to other nations and the abolition of the Treaty of Versailles.

To begin with I agree with the source as this was the thought of not just Germany and its citizens – but also across some of Europe as well. This thought being that Germany had been treated too harshly in relation to the Treaty of Versailles: with Hitler playing on this, his statement only represented the views of the German public - there was nothing wrong with that.

Never the less, I also disagree with the source as these were not the only 'main aims' of Hitler's foreign policy in the 30s. On top of 'equality' and the abolition of the treaty of Versailles, he also wanted 'lebensraum' (living space for the people of Germany), and perhaps most importantly to make Germany a 'great power' again. I know this from the way Hitler took Czechoslovakia, as this was not related to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and provided further living space for the German people also. This demonstrated the overall theme of Hitler's foreign policy – he was always aiming to push for 'something big'.

The reason why this source cannot be looked into much is because its provenance – it is solely from Hitler's point of view, which would be biased and so henceforth cannot be trusted. I agree with the statement in all fairness, but he used this to get on the sides of the German people by 'propaganda'. The way in which he took Czechoslovakia and Poland demonstrated that these weren't his only 'policies'.

Level 4: 6 marks. This answer begins with a level 1 statement which does little more than repeating the source. The second paragraph contains some level 2 general comments on both the source and its provenance. Paragraph 3 challenges the view in the source by producing alternative aims and reaches level 3 by supporting these with reference to Hitler's actual policies. The final paragraph begins with a level 2 statement on the provenance but then goes on to reach level 3 on provenance by developing the idea introduced in paragraph 2 and suggesting a motive for Hitler's statement and thus explaining its biased nature.

09 Which of these two reasons was the more important reason for the outbreak of the Second World War:

- **Hitler's occupation of Czechoslovakia, March 1939**
- **the Nazi-Soviet Pact, 1939?**

You must refer to both reasons when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

After the Munich Agreement, Hitler occupied the Sudetenland, part of Czechoslovakia. Despite his promise to Chamberlain, Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia by encouraging the Slovaks to press for independence and then sent his troops in claiming to be restoring order. This was important as it meant the end of appeasement, Hitler had personally promised Chamberlain at Munich that he would not invade Czechoslovakia and Chamberlain felt personally betrayed. Hitler could no longer be trusted and Britain signed an agreement promising to protect it if Germany invaded. Hitler would not be appeased again. It also led to the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939. The invasion of Czechoslovakia also meant it was now almost inevitable that Poland would be invaded, as Germany surrounded 3 sides (after the Nazi-Soviet Pact). Another consequence of the invasion of Czechoslovakia is Hitler withdrew his 10 year non-aggression Pact with Poland and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. This meant he was preparing to attack Poland and believed Britain would again appease him, however as Czechoslovakia could not be justified by Hitler, there were no German-speakers and he wasn't just reversing the Treaty of Versailles, it meant the end of appeasement, a change in British foreign policy and set up the trigger for war.

The Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939 was the agreement between Germany and the USSR that neither would go to war with the other or interfere if the other went to war, however the pact also secretly divided Poland between the two countries. The Pact was important as it meant Hitler now surrounded Poland on 3 sides, meaning attack was almost certain. However it also gave Hitler the confidence to attack Poland as he knew the USSR would not oppose him. He also felt with the USSR as his ally, Britain would become worried and would not attack him over Poland. This led to Hitler invading Poland despite Britain's promise to protect it, the trigger of the Second World War. USSR was an ally lost for Britain. Hitler thought this would dent Britain's confidence and they would not oppose. However I believe Hitler's occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 was the more important reason for the outbreak of war because it was that that meant the end of appeasement, with just the Nazi-Soviet Pact, Britain might have appeased Hitler over Poland however because he knew Hitler could not be trusted and would not stop, he went to war with Germany. Also, even if the Nazi-Soviet Pact had not taken place, Hitler still covered 2 sides of Poland and would probably still had the confidence to invade, the Nazi-Soviet Pact simply reassured him.

Level 4: 10 marks. This answer begins with an explanation of the occupation of Czechoslovakia and its immediate results. There is a hint of assessment with the reference to Britain's agreement 'to protect it', but unfortunately the answer does not explain 'it', though there is later reference to the promise to Poland in the next paragraph. Full understanding is made clear later by an assessment of the danger to Poland followed by an explanation of how the occupation of Czechoslovakia resulted in Hitler's rejection of agreements, changed British foreign policy and led to war. The beginning of the second paragraph describes the main points of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, explains why it was signed and assesses clearly why it led to war. At this stage the answer has reached the top of level 3 for two assessments. From 'However' onwards, there is a comparison of the contribution of the two reasons, mentioning both of them and explaining why one was more important than the other.

Topic 4: The origins of the Cold War 1945–1955

10 By 1955 two rival alliances existed.

Describe the membership and aims of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

(4 marks)

NATO and the Warsaw Pact were both military alliances - members of each alliance would defend and work together with each other against the opposing alliance. NATO included Western Powers like Britain, France and the USA who were determined to contain and block communism in every way possible. The Warsaw Pact included the USSR and its communist allies in East Europe, the states of East Europe (the Soviet sphere of influence) were seen as a 'buffer' against attack on the USSR. Both alliances bombarded each other with propaganda, blocked each other's moves, helped other countries fight against their opponents and often criticised/argued in the UN. But officially, these were defence alliances in case they were attacked.

Level 3: 4 marks. This answer covers both NATO and the Warsaw Pact so is eligible for full marks. It comfortably achieves this by describing the nature of the alliances, their aims and giving examples of the members of NATO.

11 Study Source D.

Source D shows Stalin's expansion of communism.

Do you agree that this was the main reason for the start of the Cold War?

Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your own knowledge.

(6 marks)

Source D shows that Stalin has taken over many parts of Europe and turned them communist. This could be seen as a main reason for the start of the Cold War, as it was what leaders such as Truman and Churchill feared that communism would spread and that it was dangerous, something to be feared. The cartoon shows France, with Stalin next to it with a knife preparing to turn it communist, as this cartoon was published in France, this source is biased as it is trying to make the French people fearful of communism, showing Stalin as evil and countries that are communist stabbed and bleeding. This cartoon is obviously shown from the capitalist point of view.

Another reason for the start of the Cold War could be the Atomic Bomb as this increased tensions between the USSR and the US. Stalin had not been told of the intention to use the bomb in Japan and it made him fearful of the power the USA had. The Cold War could have started because of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, the different ideologies caused tensions between the leaders. However one may believe that the main reason for the Cold War was soviet expansion of communism in Eastern Europe as this prompted the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. It was the start of real tensions as the USA opposed communism and tried to contain it as Stalin tried to spread it through the world.

Level 4: 6 marks. The answer begins with a level 2 explanation of the cartoon in the context of the question and then an analysis of the provenance, examining a likely motive of the cartoonist in order to explain the bias in it and reaching level 3. The second paragraph uses knowledge to examine other reasons for the start of the Cold War, comfortably reaching level 3 for the knowledge included in the answer. As level 3 has been reached on both provenance and knowledge, the answer is awarded full marks.

12 Which had the greater effect on the development of the Cold War in the years 1948 to 1953:

- **the Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 1948–1949**
- **the Korean War, 1950–1953?**

You must refer to both bullet points when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

The Berlin Blockade was Stalin's attempt to gain West Berlin and (hopefully) the entire of Germany. He had tried to do this by starving the people within West Berlin by blocking the road from West Germany to West Berlin. The Berlin Airlift was the American and British response to this. As they believed in the policy of containment (the prevention of communism spreading) they did not want to lose West Berlin or the West of Germany therefore to prevent the Berliners from starving they brought in fuel and other essentials such as food in by air through the air corridors. This had an effect on the development of the Cold War because it was the first time that the USSR and the USA were competing against each other for land. The consequences of the Berlin Airlift and Blockade were that it led to the formation of NATO and eventually the Warsaw Pact – each of these further divided Europe and intensified tensions between them which therefore greatly contributed to the Cold War.

The Korean War was the war between North Korea (which was communist) and South Korea (which was capitalist). It started when North Korean troops attacked South Korea, claiming that some South Korean troops had crossed the 38th parallel. They quickly advanced with the supply of the USSR's modern weapons and soon most of South Korea was under the control of North Korea. Later America and the UN sent in troops to support South Korea. The American troops quickly advanced and took control and South Korea plus North Korea up to the Yalul river on the border of China. This worried the Chinese and so they too sent in troops, they advance into South Korea. Later peace agreements were made and North and South Korea was still divided by the 38th parallel. This had an effect on the development of the Cold War because it made the USA feel as if they were losing the Cold War because communism was spreading. Therefore many of their troops were sent to support South Korea. This intensified the tension between the USSR and the USA and effected the development of the Cold War because it was the first war between capitalism (South Korea) and communism (North Korea). The consequences of this were that it led to further competition between the USA and the USSR. It also showed China as being a valued ally to Stalin as they had fought in a war supporting communism and advanced against American and UN troops.

In conclusion, one can say that the Berlin Blockade and Airlift had a greater effect on the Cold War because unlike the Korean War where the USA's involvement was as a member of the UN and the USSR only encouraged the war by supplying weapons, the Berlin Blockade and Airlift was the two countries working directly against each other which had the greater increase in tensions between the two super-powers and therefore had a greater contribution to the development of the Cold War between 1948 and 1953.

Level 4: 9 marks. There is description and explanation of why the Berlin Blockade involved the USA and USSR in the opening paragraph which ends with a good assessment of its effect on the Cold War which is achieved by analysing the importance of the events and using specific knowledge to point out its consequences. There is too much description of the events of the Korean War, though towards the middle of the paragraph the answer does explain why China and the USA became involved and then attempts to assess its consequences. The final paragraph has a meaningful comparison between the two bullet points, making a relevant judgement on the issue in the question. This raised the answer to level 4, but the assessment of the Korean War was judged as not being strong enough for full marks.

Topic 5: Crises of the Cold War 1955–1970

- 13 In October 1962 an American spy plane took photographs of launch pads for long range missiles being set up on Cuba.

Describe how President Kennedy prevented Soviet missiles from being placed on Cuba.

(4 marks)

In 1962, after a spy plane had taken pictures of missile launch pads on Cuba the American President Kennedy decided that action had to be taken. He aimed to prevent more missiles being stationed on Cuba, and so with a variety of options available to him which would test both American and Soviet resolve, he eventually decided. He would form a blockade all around the island, three miles away from the Cuban coast, with his navy. Then, if any Soviet ships were to come, they would be instructed to refuse them access. And, if that didn't work? Sink them. Whilst this happened, he also sent a message to Krushchev, telling him to turn his ships around. Despite the threat of nuclear war being a real possibility, at the last minutes the Soviet missile ships averted. This shows then the blockade had worked, and proved a great success for Kennedy, restoring his prestige after the Bay of Pigs Scandal.

Level 3: 4 marks. This answer gained full marks by describing the nature of Kennedy's blockade, the dangers of this and how the crisis was concluded peacefully. Detail is limited, particularly on two of these, but there is sufficient for full marks.

- 14 **Study Source E.**
Source E suggests a reason for the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961.

Do you agree that this was the main reason?

Explain your answer by referring to the purpose of the source, as well as using its content and your own knowledge. **(6 marks)**

The purpose of the source is explaining (probably to the UN) and justifying their actions of building the Berlin Wall – it will therefore be biased to the Soviet side as they will try and make out that the West is the aggressor. I do not believe this was the main reason for the building of the Berlin Wall, firstly because if there were spies they had dealt with it since Berlin had be divided (1948) and they were probably using spies of their own in retaliation. I think it was to stop all the people regularly leaving communism – it was impossible to fight it (as seen in the Hungary Rising), so they simply left. Others hated it or saw the deliberate luxuries placed by the West on the border – shops, supermarkets and more freedom (the West had pumped millions in). It was such a temptation. Ulbricht could not allow this as many highly skilled workers and managers were moving and it was undermining communism completely seeing his people defect to the wretched capitalism. So he erected the wall in August 1961 so they could physically not escape, border guards had orders to kill anybody trying to escape.

Level 4: 6 marks. The evaluation of the motive behind the source explained in the first sentence is enough to merit level 3. The remainder of the answer is based on knowledge, starting with some general level 2 information, then reaching level 3 with a good explanation of why people were leaving East Berlin and the effect that this was having on East Germany, putting this forward as an alternative reason for the building of the wall. Both level 3s mean the answer was awarded full marks.

15 Which of these two events was the greater challenge to Khrushchev's policy of 'peaceful co-existence':

- the Hungarian Rising, 1956
- the U2 Crisis, 1960?

You must refer to both events when explaining your answer.

(10 marks)

In 1956 the Hungarians started to grow frustrated with the communist influence and restricted freedom. They lived in fear of the secret police and hated the presence of the red army, who they were forced to pay for. Unrest grew, and the Kremlin ordered the Hungarian leader, Rakosi, to be retired. However his replacement, Eric Gero was no better to the Hungarian public. At first, Khrushchev allowed a new government to be formed by Imre Nagy, and some reforms to be introduced. There was even talk of Hungary leaving the Warsaw Pact. However, Khrushchev decided that the reforms were too much of a threat and sent his troops and tanks back in. There was 2 weeks of violent resistance, but the Soviets won, and Nagy and his ministers were imprisoned and executed.

In 1960 a U2 spy plane piloted by Gary Powers was shot down over the USSR. Powers failed to self destruct or take the cyanide capsule he was given and was arrested. At first the Americans denied they were spying, but after Powers was paraded on TV they were forced to accept it. Powers was sentenced to 10 years in a Soviet prison but was exchanged for Rudolph Abel in 1962.

The Hungarian Rising of 1956 could be considered more important as it came when relations were thawing slightly. It showed the Americans that Khrushchev was prepared to use excessive force to retain his hold over Eastern European states, and many people (over 10,000) were killed. However, America was never involved and it was quite far away from the USA, so the Americans may not have taken too much notice, and so it might not be that important.

The U2 crisis caused a sharp downturn in East-West relations and intensified the propaganda battle. It also provided clear evidence to the rest of the world of spying. These all make the U2 crisis a large challenge to Khrushchev's peaceful co existence policy. However, everyone already knew really that spying was taking place, and the prisoner exchange of 1962 showed that both sides were not that alienated, and provided evidence of some degree of co-existence. The Russians also seemed content with the propaganda victory, and did not see any reason for a further retaliation, so this may not have been too bad for the 'peaceful co-existence'.

Overall, I think that the Hungarian Uprising was the greater challenge to Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence. To start with, the 10,000+ killed in the Hungarian Rising does not suggest a peaceful co-existence policy at all but a rather violent and aggressive policy of a country who desperately wants to keep control. It shows he would go to great lengths to keep states hard line communist, further alienating east and west. Finally, by allowing some reforms to take place and then going to such lengths to reverse them shattered the West's illusions that co-existence could be maintained and showed that maybe Khrushchev was lying, and never really thought it could be achieved.

Level 4: 9 marks. The opening paragraphs of this answer are mostly descriptive with a little explanation but do not reach more than level 2. The assessment is a little unbalanced: the section on Hungary is very good and reaches a sound assessment after some good explanation and analysis, the part on U2 is less well developed and suffers because of the lack of reference to the effect the crisis had on the Paris Summit. Nevertheless the student uses knowledge of the prisoner exchange to assess the effect of U2 so this would qualify for the top of level 3. There is a sound judgement at the end which lifts the answer to level 4. Although comparison between the two was attempted, it was felt that more was needed for full