



**General Certificate of Secondary Education
2013**

History

Unit 2: The Cold War 1945–1991

Higher Tier

[GHY22]

MONDAY 10 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

Tasks and questions requiring candidates to respond in extended writing are marked in terms of levels of response. In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the “best fit” bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement. The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **high performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates’ responses to all tasks and questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These tasks and questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar

Spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar is taken into account in assessing candidates’ responses to specific questions in Unit 2. The following guidance is provided to assist examiners:

- **threshold performance:** Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.
- **intermediate performance:** Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.
- **high performance:** Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

Higher Tier

Mark Scheme

The detail given in the Mark Scheme is for **teacher guidance** and candidates are not expected to cover **every** point suggested.

Section A

Answer **all** of this section.

In **Question 1(d)** a maximum of **5 additional marks** is available for the use of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

1 This question is about the Berlin Blockade, 1948–1949.

(a) Study Source A.

What does **Source A** tell us about Stalin's attitude to West Berlin?

Target AO3: Understand source material as part of an historical enquiry.

No rewardable material [0]

Able to identify detail from Source A about Stalin's attitude to West Berlin.

Award [1] for each piece of information

Candidates should include some of the following points:

- Stalin felt that he should stamp his authority on West Berlin
- he believed that this would cut off the people of West Berlin from western help
- he needed to make West Berlin entirely dependent on the USSR
- he believed that this action would force the Allies out of Berlin.

Any other valid point [4]

(b) Study Sources B and C.

How far does **Source C** support **Source B** about the actions of the USSR in the city of Berlin in 1948?

Target AO3: Understand, analyse and evaluate a range of source material to show similarity and difference as part of an historical enquiry.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Candidate is able to select one piece of information from either source which is linked to the question but fails to develop similarity and difference. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Candidate is able to select two pieces of information from the sources to show similarity or difference. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

Candidate is able to select three pieces of information from the sources to show similarity and difference. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Candidates may make the following points:

Points of Agreement

- Source B says that the USSR “wants to force us out of the city of Berlin”. Source C agrees, saying “we decided to force them out”
- Source B says “we will not be moved.” Source C supports this when it says that the “Allies did not want to leave”
- Source B states that the Berlin Blockade was “part of a plan by the USSR”. Source C says that the Blockade was “prepared for weeks in advance”.

Disagreement/Other points

- Source B says that the actions of the USSR were “sudden”. Source C states that “the Blockade was prepared for weeks in advance”
- Source B says that the Blockade was “a move to test our ability and will to resist”. Source C says that it was done because West Berlin “felt like a thorn in our side”
- Source B says that the USSR was trying to “find the weak spots in the western alliance and extend their control”. Source C says that the economic reforms of the west were “damaging the East German economy” and making people there discontented. They had to take action
- Source B mentions Greece and Turkey. Source C does not.

Any other valid point

[6]

To access full marks candidates should note both points of agreement and of disagreement/omission

(c) Study Source C.

How useful and reliable is **Source C** to an historian studying events in Berlin in 1948 and 1949?

Target AO2: Use historical sources critically by comprehending, analysing and evaluating them.

Award [0] for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

A vague general account of the content of Source C with little attempt to address the question. Candidates at this level may discuss the content of the source but may not give any indication of the reliability and utility of Source C and will make little or no use of own knowledge. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[5])

Answers at this level will discuss the utility and/or reliability of the source in explaining events in Berlin in 1948 and 1949. Candidates may comment on the date of the source and discuss the implications of this. They may begin to make observations on **authorship**, the fact that this source is the testimony of a USSR officer who was stationed in Berlin between 1945 and 1949 and who would have observed the development of events in this period. They may comment on the nature of the source, an interview given many years after the events of 1948–1949, and how this affects reliability and/or utility. They may refer to the content of the source and/or use some outside knowledge to support their answers. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers at this level will discuss more fully the utility and reliability of Source C to an historian studying events in Berlin in this period. They will refer closely to the content of the source and may use outside knowledge to support their answers. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

*Some of the following points may be made:

Useful

- the author is a Major in the USSR army who was stationed in Berlin between 1945 and 1949, when the Blockade was planned and enforced
- gives the historian a first-hand account of his experience of events in Berlin during this period
- gives good detail of the reasons for the actions of the USSR at this time. Is very honest about their worries and motives, for example, impact of Allied economic reforms on economy and people of East Germany.

Reliable

- one-sided, gives the USSR's view of events only
- the author is an officer who would have been briefed by his commanding officer and may be giving the "official" USSR version of events
- the interview is given almost fifty years after the Blockade so he may not remember all details accurately
- however, from our own knowledge we do know that the USSR was worried about the effect of the West's economic policies
- may exaggerate the fears of the USSR to justify their actions in imposing the Blockade.

Overall

- very useful and fairly reliable but we would need other sources to confirm the details given by the Major.

* Some of these points may be made in Level 2.

Any other valid point

[8]

- (d) Using **Sources A, B and C** and **your own knowledge**, explain why there are different interpretations of the reasons for the Berlin Blockade, 1948–1949.

Target AO2 and AO3: Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis. Understand analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

Limited response, with a weak general answer that does not really address the question. Candidates at the lower end of this level may extract limited information from one source which outlines one view about the reasons for the Blockade of Berlin in 1948–1949 (AO3). They may include some general points from their own knowledge which will enable them to achieve marks in the mid-upper end of this level (AO2). Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

Answers at this level may indicate an understanding of the different views of the Blockade of Berlin in 1948–1949 (AO3) but may show limited knowledge or understanding of the reasons for these (AO2). They may refer to the view given by Truman in Source B that it was part of a Russian plan to extend communist control and to the differing view in Source C that the Blockade was imposed because of the discontent caused by the economic reforms carried out by the Allies in West Berlin (AO3). Candidates can access marks at the higher end of this level if they attempt to use these sources to reach a conclusion about the reasons for the USSR's decision to blockade the city of Berlin in 1948–1949 (AO3), for example, it was a "thorn in our

side” (Source C). Candidates will make close reference to the sources and may begin to use some of their own knowledge (AO2). Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level will show a clear understanding of the different views about the reasons for the USSR’s decision to blockade the city of Berlin in 1948–1949 as outlined in Source A, Source B and Source C (AO3) and of the reasons for these (AO2). At the top of this level they will use their contextual knowledge to explain clearly the reasons for these interpretations (AO2) and will make reference to the sources to support their explanation. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Candidates may make **some** of the following points:

- **Source A** is an account given by a modern historian. He explains that Stalin was keen to stamp his authority on West Berlin because it was deep within the Soviet zone of Germany. His intention was to force the western allies out and make Berlin and its people completely dependent on the USSR. That is why he ordered the Blockade of the city of Berlin. The historian gives a factual account of Stalin’s attitude. Candidates may use their own knowledge to show that the details given are accurate and may make some reference to Stalin’s determination to protect the USSR. They should refer to the nature of the source, i.e. that it is the job of the historian to provide an accurate, well-researched account with no bias
- **Source B** is the view of the US President Truman. In this primary source he is speaking to the American people in 1948 and is giving his interpretation of events in Berlin. He believes that the Blockade is an example of the USSR trying to extend its control. He states that Stalin is testing the West by his actions, and that he wants to drive the Allies out of West Berlin and bring the city and its people completely under communist control. Candidates may use their own knowledge to point out that Truman had this interpretation as he was very suspicious of Stalin’s actions throughout this period. He had committed the USA to a policy of containment of communism in the Truman Doctrine of 1947. He was not sympathetic to the USSR’s need for security and saw Stalin’s actions as attempts to spread communism further
- **Source C** is the view of a Major in the army of the USSR who was stationed in Berlin from 1945 to 1949. This interview was given almost fifty years after the events but seems to be fairly accurate. Major Semiriaga gives the USSR perspective here and focuses on the problems which the Allied presence in West Berlin was causing for the USSR. He tells us the Allies were a “thorn in our side” and that their economic reforms in West Berlin were making East Germans discontented. So the USSR decided to take action. He is very honest about their intention – “we decided to force them out”.

Other relevant points

Candidates may use their own knowledge to develop the interpretations of the reasons for the Berlin Blockade as outlined in the sources. They might also give some detail on Stalin’s worries about the security of the USSR; they may refer to the impact of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid to explain the differing interpretations given in the sources. Candidates may reach the conclusion that there is some truth in all the sources here as it is the experience and stance of the author which determine their interpretation/perspective.

Any other valid point [10]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

28

SPaG

5

Section A

33

Section B

Answer **one** question from this section.

In **all** questions a maximum of **5 additional marks** is available for the use of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

2 This question is about relations between the USSR and Eastern Europe, 1953–1968.

Explain why and how the USSR faced challenges to its control over Eastern Europe between 1953 and 1968.

Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information.

- Khrushchev and the attitude of the USSR to Eastern Europe, 1953–June 1956
- Hungary, 1956
- Berlin, 1961
- Czechoslovakia, 1968.

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history and demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts and key features and characteristics of the period studied.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Simple descriptive answer rather than explanation and analysis, which may be episodic and lack historical accuracy. To reach the top of Level 1, answers must attempt to provide detail of some of the reasons why and how the USSR faced challenges to its control over Eastern Europe between 1953 and 1968. In Level 1, answers may use only two of the guidelines. Answers may be limited in range. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Developed but limited explanation which goes beyond Level 1 by providing a more informed, if limited, analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give more specific detail on why and how the USSR faced challenges to its control over Eastern Europe between 1953 and 1968. In Level 2, answers may use three of the guidelines or may contain omissions in coverage of some episodes and developments. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Well-informed, accurate explanation and a clear and coherent analysis of events. Answers must display sound understanding of why and how the USSR faced challenges to its control over Eastern Europe between 1953

and 1968. In Level 3, answers must use all four guidelines with accurate illustrative detail. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers may include some of the following:

Khrushchev and the attitude of the USSR to Eastern Europe, 1953–June 1956

- when Stalin died in 1953, people in Eastern Europe hoped that the repressive aspects of USSR rule might be relaxed. After a power struggle, Khrushchev emerged as the new leader of the USSR in 1955. He was determined to carry out political and economic reform.
- he denounced Stalin in the “secret speech” to the Congress of the Communist Party in 1956 and released thousands of political prisoners. This was welcomed in Eastern Europe and the West as a sign of a thaw in the Cold War
- however, Khrushchev was determined to retain control of Eastern Europe, believing that this was essential to maintain the security of the USSR
- in Poland in 1956, protests against strict USSR control and demands for political reform were defused with a programme of reforms and liberalisation under Gomulka. He reassured Khrushchev that Poland would remain in the Warsaw Pact. Khrushchev believed that the USSR’s security was safeguarded. However, his more relaxed reaction encouraged unrest in Hungary.

Hungary, 1956

- from 1948, Hungary was ruled by a pro-Stalin dictator called Rakosi. In 1956 popular unrest in Hungary resulted in his removal. This gave hope to Hungarians looking for freedom from Russian control. In October 1956, a more popular communist leader, Imre Nagy was appointed. Nagy believed that Khrushchev was not as strict as Stalin and would compromise as he had in Poland. Khrushchev withdrew Russian troops from Budapest. However, when demonstrations spread to the countryside, Khrushchev moved Russian troops to the border
- on 1 November Nagy announced free elections and declared that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and become a neutral country. Radio Free Europe promised Western support for the rebels
- Khrushchev, however, was determined to keep Russian control over Hungary. He would not allow it to leave the Soviet bloc. Five divisions of the Russian army and six thousand tanks were sent into Hungary. Fierce fighting in Budapest from 4 to the 14 November 1956 resulted in the deaths of thousands. 200 000 Hungarians fled and the rebels were defeated. Nagy was executed in 1958 and a pro-Russian government, led by Kadar, was imposed.

Berlin, 1961

- the city of Berlin was the only place where people from east and west had open contact during the Cold War in the 1950s. People from East Berlin were permitted to visit and work in the other three sectors of Berlin. Differences in living standards between East and West were most visible in Berlin. During the 1950s over two million East Germans, mainly young skilled workers, used Berlin as an escape route to the “Golden West”
- in the late 1950s, Khrushchev tried to negotiate a peace treaty that would give the USSR complete control of Berlin. He feared that the loss of so many young, skilled workers through West Berlin would destabilise East Germany and weaken Russian control. However, his efforts failed
- on 13 August 1961 the East German government acted, encouraged by the USSR. Police sealed off all crossing points between East Berlin and West Berlin. Barbed wire fences were soon replaced by a concrete wall. The East Germans called it “The Anti-Fascist Protectionist Wall”
- the Wall was patrolled by armed guards and many East Germans were killed while attempting to escape. The Berlin Wall remained a clear symbol of communist oppression and the Cold War until its collapse in 1989.

Czechoslovakia, 1968

- Khrushchev’s successor, Brezhnev was also determined to retain Russian control over Eastern Europe. So when economic problems and dissatisfaction with censorship in Czechoslovakia led to political protest in early 1968, Brezhnev was worried
- the unpopular Czech leader, Novotny, was replaced by a new leader, Alexander Dubcek, who wanted to introduce modest political and economic reforms. These reforms were known as “the Prague Spring”. He called his reforms “Socialism with a human face”. Dubcek wanted to hold free elections and reduce censorship. However, a committed communist, he wanted Czechoslovakia to remain in the Russian sphere of influence and in the Warsaw Pact
- Brezhnev expressed concern about these reforms. He feared that other countries in Eastern Europe would demand greater freedom and the USSR’s sphere of influence in Eastern Europe would be undermined. On 20 August 1968, 400 000 troops from the USSR and four other Warsaw Pact countries invaded Czechoslovakia “to restore order”
- Dubcek encouraged the Czechs to adopt a policy of passive resistance to avoid open conflict and bloodshed. Russian control was reasserted and Dubcek was removed from power.

Any other valid point

[22]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

22

SPaG

5

3 This question is about the involvement of the USA in the Vietnam War, 1954–1968.

Explain how the USA became involved in Vietnam and why the US Army experienced problems in Vietnam by 1968.

Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information.

- Reasons for USA interest in Vietnam
- Increased USA involvement in Vietnam, 1954–1965
- Problems faced by the US Army in Vietnam, 1965–1968
- The tactics of the Viet Cong, 1965–1968.

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history and demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts, and key features and characteristics of the period studied.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Simple descriptive answer rather than explanation and analysis, which may be episodic and lack historical accuracy. To reach the top of Level 1, answers must attempt to provide detail on how the USA became involved in Vietnam and why the US Army faced problems in Vietnam by 1968. In Level 1, answers may use only two of the bullet points. Answers may be limited in range. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Developed but limited explanation which goes beyond Level 1 by providing a more informed, if limited, analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give more specific detail on how the USA became involved in Vietnam and why the US Army faced problems in Vietnam by 1968. In Level 2, answers may use three of the bullet points or may contain omissions in coverage of some episodes and developments. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Well-informed, accurate explanation and a clear and coherent analysis of events. Answers must display sound understanding of how the USA became involved in Vietnam and why the US Army faced problems in Vietnam by 1968. In Level 3, answers must use all four bullet points with accurate illustrative detail. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers may include some of the following:

Reasons for USA interest in Vietnam

- after 1947 the foreign policy of the USA was based on the Truman Doctrine. The USA was committed to preventing the spread of communism. The loss of China to communism in 1949 and China's Treaty of Friendship with the USSR in 1950 worried the USA. The focus of the Cold War moved to Asia
- the Domino Theory was widely believed in the USA. All countries in Asia were in danger of falling to communism. General McArthur warned that "Asia is where the communists are making their play for world domination"
- Vietnam had been a key part of French Indo-China before the outbreak of World War Two. Ho Chi Minh led the Viet Minh against France's attempts to regain control after 1945. Ho Chi Minh was a nationalist who wanted to free Vietnam from foreign control. He was also a communist and this turned his struggle into part of the Cold War
- the USA gave France \$1.4 billion to help defeat the Viet Minh. France was defeated at the battle of Dien Bien Phu in 1954 and in a peace settlement Vietnam was divided on Cold War lines along the 17th Parallel. North Vietnam became communist, led by Ho Chi Minh, and South Vietnam was non-communist.

Increased USA involvement in Vietnam, 1954–1965

- the government of South Vietnam faced a guerrilla war against the Viet Cong led by Ho Chi Minh. The USA was determined to save South Vietnam and from 1954 to 1964 it sent increasing amounts of indirect help – money, military equipment and advisers – to the government of South Vietnam
- by 1960 there were 16 000 American advisers in South Vietnam. The South Vietnamese government was unpopular. President Diem, a Catholic, sided with the landlords against the mainly Buddhist peasants. In November 1963, President Diem was assassinated and the Viet Cong controlled over 60% of South Vietnam
- the Gulf of Tonkin incident of August 1964 was the immediate cause of direct USA involvement. A North Vietnamese gun boat fired at a USA warship. There was anger in the USA and President Johnson stated his determination not to lose South Vietnam. He called it the "cornerstone of democracy in South East Asia"
- the Tonkin Resolution gave President Johnson the right to use "all necessary measures" to help the government of South Vietnam. It became known as "Grandma's nightshirt" because it covered everything! President Johnson ordered direct air strikes against North Vietnam in Operation Rolling Thunder and in March 1965 sent USA troops to South Vietnam to defeat the Viet Cong.

Problems faced by the US Army, 1965–1968

- the US Army faced many problems. They were better equipped but were frustrated by the guerrilla tactics of the Viet Cong
- the attempt by the USA to win "the hearts and the minds" of the people of South Vietnam also failed. The strategy to bring peasants to

“strategic hamlets” was very unpopular. The Americans provided medical and educational facilities but the peasants resented the loss of their land

- the USA used “Search and Destroy” missions in a desperate attempt to capture Viet Cong suspects. This involved the burning of homes and atrocities such as the My Lai Massacre in 1968 when over 300 civilians were killed. This turned the South Vietnamese people against the USA troops
- the Americans tried to destroy the Viet Cong supply lines, especially the Ho Chi Minh trail. They used intensive bombing in South and North Vietnam and chemical defoliants, e.g. Agent Orange but these failed to defeat the Viet Cong. The Viet Cong were very committed and kept the supply routes open in spite of intensive USA bombing
- the USA soldiers were sent on a one year tour of duty and most were young and lacking in military experience. By 1968 USA morale had declined and drug abuse was a major problem among the American soldiers.

The tactics of the Viet Cong, 1965–1968

- the Viet Cong were experienced guerrilla fighters, familiar with the jungle terrain and very committed to uniting Vietnam under communist control. They ambushed the Americans and disappeared into the jungle. Their Punji traps and land mines caused rising casualties and wore down the Americans. 58 000 American soldiers were killed in the Vietnam War
- the Viet Cong won the support of most South Vietnamese peasants. This allowed them to move around freely and take shelter in the villages. They spoke the same language and wore the same clothes. One Viet Cong leader stated that “the people are the water and our armies are the fish”
- the Viet Cong received vital help from North Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail along the western border with Cambodia and Laos. This was used to smuggle weapons and supplies from North Vietnam. The Viet Cong also received indirect help, e.g. raw materials and vehicles from the USSR and China.

Any other valid point

[22]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

22

SPaG

5

4 This question is about the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1959–1962.

Explain why relations between the USA and Cuba changed after 1959 and how the actions of the USA and the USSR led to the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962.

Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information.

- Castro and changes in Cuba's relations with the USA, 1959–1961
- The actions of the USA towards Cuba, 1959–1961
- Involvement of the USSR in Cuba, 1960–1962
- Actions of the USA and the USSR in the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962.

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate their knowledge and understanding of history and demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts, and key features and characteristics of the period studied.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 ([1]–[3]) AO1 ([1]–[3]) AO2

Simple descriptive answer rather than explanation and analysis, which may be episodic and lack historical accuracy. To reach the top of Level 1, answers must attempt to provide detail of some of the reasons why relations between the USA and the USSR changed after 1959 and how the actions of the USA and the USSR led to the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962. In Level 1, answers may use only two of the bullet points. Answers may be limited in range. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([4]–[7]) AO1 ([4]–[7]) AO2

Developed but limited explanation which goes beyond Level 1 by providing a more informed, if limited, analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give more specific detail on the reasons why relations between the USA and the USSR changed after 1959 and how the actions of the USA and the USSR led to the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962. In Level 2, answers may use three of the bullet points or may contain omissions in coverage of some episodes and developments. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([8]–[11]) AO1 ([8]–[11]) AO2

Well-informed, accurate explanation and a clear and coherent analysis of events. Answers must display sound understanding of the reasons why relations between the USA and the USSR changed over Cuba after 1959 and how the actions of the USA and the USSR led to the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962. In Level 3, answers must use all four bullet points with accurate illustrative detail. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers may include some of the following:

Castro and changes in Cuba's relations with the USA, 1959–1961

- Cuba was situated only 90 miles from Florida in southern USA. Americans owned most of the businesses, banks, sugar and tobacco plantations, as well as a large naval base. The USA maintained good relations with the pro-American dictator Batista
- Batista was overthrown in 1959. 95% of Cuba's trade was with the USA so the Cuban economy was heavily dependent on the USA. The new leader, Fidel Castro wished to reduce USA influence. He nationalised industries and banks and introduced land reforms
- this damaged USA banking and business interests and led to deterioration in relations.

The actions of the USA towards Cuba, 1959–1961

- Eisenhower refused to meet Castro when he visited the USA in 1959 and he refused loans and economic aid to Cuba. All trade with Cuba was banned when Castro turned to the USSR for support
- in January 1961 the USA broke off all diplomatic relations with Cuba. Castro then announced that Cuba was a communist country. This alarmed the government of the USA. It was not prepared to tolerate a communist country in its sphere of influence
- in April 1961 USA President Kennedy approved a CIA plan to invade Cuba and overthrow Castro. 1400 Cuban exiles were to carry out the invasion, equipped and advised by the USA. The Bay of Pigs invasion was a fiasco. Most of the rebels were captured or killed
- this failure embarrassed President Kennedy and the USA and made Castro a national hero. However, the CIA continued to try to overthrow and assassinate Castro.

Involvement of the USSR in Cuba, 1960–1962

- in 1960 Castro and the USSR agreed to trade oil and sugar for machinery. In December 1961, Castro announced that he had become a Communist
- after the US cut diplomatic relations with Cuba, Castro needed a new trade partner and turned to the USSR. Trade agreements were made with the USSR and with most countries in the Soviet bloc. By 1962 over 80% of Cuba's trade was with the USSR. They exported sugar, fruit and tobacco in return for imports of oil and machinery
- as relations became closer, Castro turned to the USSR for military protection from the USA. In May 1962 Khrushchev agreed to supply Castro with weapons to protect Cuba. He sent thousands of guns, patrol boats, tanks and jet fighters and 42 000 Russian soldiers. This made the Cuban army the best equipped in Latin America
- Khrushchev was eager to help Castro because he saw an opportunity to strengthen the USSR in the Cold War. By 1962 the USSR was worried at the "missile gap" resulting from the USA's superiority in long-range nuclear missiles. Khrushchev was also concerned about NATO missiles in Turkey on the border of the USSR
- the situation in Cuba offered Khrushchev a chance to counter this threat. The USSR sent technicians to secretly build silos and missile erectors. By September 1962, they had installed 43 short and

medium-range nuclear weapons. These were brought to Cuba hidden in ships carrying machinery

- the USA was unaware of these developments. These missiles in Cuba threatened most of the main cities in the US and the 80 million Americans who lived there. The USSR believed that this would restore balance in the nuclear arms race.

Actions of the USA and the USSR in the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962

- the Cuban Missile Crisis, the “Thirteen Days”, lasted from 14 to 27 October 1962. On 14 October photographs taken by a US U2 spy plane confirmed that Russian missiles were in Cuba and that missile sites were being developed. President Kennedy set up EXCOMM, a small group of military and political advisers to deal with the crisis
- in October 1962, 18 Russian ships, many carrying parts for nuclear missiles, were sailing towards Cuba. Kennedy rejected advice from members of EXCOMM to invade Cuba and decided to set up a naval blockade of the island to stop these ships landing. The Russians sailed close to the blockade but turned back on 24 October
- the world was on the brink of a nuclear war during the Crisis. The shooting down of a USA U2 spy plane on 26 October could have triggered a nuclear war
- however, an exchange of telegrams between Kennedy and Khrushchev on 26 and 27 October eased tensions. The USSR promised to withdraw its ships and remove its nuclear weapons from Cuba if the USA removed its Jupiter missiles from Turkey and promised not to invade Cuba. Kennedy agreed and made an unofficial promise to remove American missiles from Turkey. Khrushchev accepted this and on 28 October the crisis was over.

Any other valid point

[22]

Assessment of spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar.

If the response does not address the question then no SPaG marks are available. However, if the candidate has attempted to answer the question but produced nothing of credit, SPaG marks may still be awarded.

Award [0] for responses not worthy of credit

Level 1 Threshold performance ([1])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, candidates use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

Level 2 Intermediate performance ([2]–[3])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

Level 3 High performance ([4]–[5])

Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, candidates use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

	22
SPaG	5
Section B	27
Total Paper Marks	60