



Rewarding Learning

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
2014**

History

Unit 2: The Cold War 1945–1991

Higher Tier

[GHY22]

FRIDAY 23 MAY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

Mark schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

The Purpose of Mark Schemes

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of students in schools and colleges.

The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes, therefore, are regarded as part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

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 Cuban Missile Crisis.

(a) Study Source A.

What does Source A tell us about the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the reputations of Kennedy and Khrushchev?

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

No rewardable material [0]

Candidates should include some of the following points:

- Kennedy's reputation in the USA was improved by the way he stood up to Khrushchev
- Kennedy's reputation in other countries was enhanced
- Cuba remained Communist and an ally of the USSR with Castro in power
- Khrushchev claimed this as a victory
- In the USSR Khrushchev's role as a peacemaker and a statesman was highlighted
- Both gained something from the Cuban Missile Crisis.

[1] for each valid piece of information

[4]

(b) Study Sources A and B.

How far does **Source B** support the view in **Source A** that "Kennedy and Khrushchev both gained something from the Cuban Missile Crisis"?

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/or 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 each source to show similarity and/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 each source to show similarity and difference. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Point of agreement:

- In **Source A**, Khrushchev's 'role as a responsible peacemaker' was highlighted. In **Source B** President Kennedy 'respected Khrushchev for the actions he had taken to reach a peaceful solution'.

Points of disagreement/omission:

- In **Source A** we are told that Kennedy 'emerged from the Cuban Missile Crisis with a greatly improved reputation in his own country'. In **Source B** President Kennedy 'made no attempt to take credit for what had happened'.
- In **Source A** we are told that Khrushchev had been 'forced to back down' by Kennedy. However, in **Source B** Robert Kennedy stated that President Kennedy 'did not want to claim any kind of victory'.
- In **Source A** Khrushchev claimed a personal triumph, as Cuba remained 'a useful ally in the USA's 'backyard'. This is omitted by **Source B**.

Any other valid point

[6]

(c) Study Source C.

How **useful** and **reliable** is **Source C** to an historian studying the effects of the Cuban Missile Crisis on relations between the USA and the USSR?

Target AO3: Understand, analyse and evaluate a source as part of an historical enquiry.

Award **[0]** for responses not worthy of credit

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/or 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]–[6])

Answers at this level may discuss the reliability and/or utility of the source in explaining the effects of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the relations between the USA and the USSR. Candidates may point out that it is a primary source and discuss the value of this. They may begin to make observations on the authorship, the fact that this source is the view of Khrushchev, leader of the USSR. Candidates will begin to question the motivation of Khrushchev's letter to Castro at the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Candidates will begin

to question the reasons why this source was produced, and how these affect the reliability and/or utility of Source C. They may refer to the content of the source to support their analysis. They may use some outside knowledge to support their answers. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([7]–[8])

Answers at this level will discuss more fully the reliability and usefulness of Source C in explaining the effects of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the relations between the USA and the USSR. Candidates will refer to the content of the source to support their analysis. Candidates may use outside contextual 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:

Usefulness:

- The author was Khrushchev, leader of the USSR and one of the most important people in the Cuban Missile Crisis
- The letter was written to his ally Castro, leader of Cuba. This increases the usefulness of the source as Cuba was where the USA and USSR came into direct conflict in October 1962
- The date is very useful as a primary source as it was written at the end of the Cuban Missile Crisis when the telegrams had been exchanged and the USSR's ships were returning home
- The content of the letter provides a useful insight into Khrushchev's viewpoint at the end of the Crisis. He stresses 'the USA has been the loser here'. He focuses on how Cuba and Castro have been saved from takeover by the USA: 'they made plans to attack Cuba but we stopped them' and Khrushchev stressed in the letter how the USSR has safeguarded Castro's position: 'we forced them (USA) to promise to the world that they will never do this again'
- The source has limitations. It makes no reference to the concessions which Khrushchev had made, e.g. Khrushchev had backed down by ordering the USSR ships to return home; he had promised to remove USSR missiles and missile sites from Cuba
- Another limitation is the fact that it gives one perspective only—that of the USSR.

Reliability:

- The source is unreliable as it presents only one viewpoint about the Cuban Missile Crisis
- Its aim could have been to explain to his ally Castro why he had made a deal with the USA
- It gives a very biased interpretation of the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis: 'we see this as a great victory for Communism'
- It is not objective as it tries to convince Castro that Cuba has benefited from the crisis. The letter omits significant detail, e.g. that the USSR would be withdrawing its 43 000 soldiers and nuclear missiles and missile sites
- However, Khrushchev does realise that the USA will see the events that led to a resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis as a victory for them: 'our enemies will see the events of the last few weeks in their own way'.

Overall, this source gives us a valuable insight into the USSR view as expressed by Khrushchev, but it is a very limited source as there is no USA input.

Any other valid point

[8]

- (d) Using **Sources A, B and C** and **your own knowledge**, explain why there are different interpretations of the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the USA and the USSR.

Target AO2 and AO3: Demonstrate 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 which 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 impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis. (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 some of the different views about the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis (AO3) but may show limited knowledge or understanding of the reasons for these. (AO2) They may refer to the view given in Source A that ‘both Kennedy and Khrushchev both gained something from the Cuban Missile Crisis’ and develop this with reference to Source C. The view of Robert Kennedy in Source B of President Kennedy’s refusal to be triumphant could be developed. 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 different interpretations of the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the USA and the USSR. 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])

Candidates at Level 3 will show a clear understanding of the different views about the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on the USA and the USSR as outlined in Sources A, B and 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 and will make reference to Sources A, B and C and some outside knowledge to support their explanation. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Candidates may make some of the following points:

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Source A

- Source A provides the interpretation of a modern historian. This will be relatively objective and balanced as it was written more than thirty years after the Crisis. The historian will have access to a range of primary sources and secondary accounts of the Cuban Missile Crisis and its impact. The historian will provide his own viewpoint. Source A states *'Kennedy and Khrushchev both gained something from the Cuban Missile Crisis'*
- In Source A the historian provides detail on how Kennedy benefited. It states that he emerged with a *'greatly improved reputation in his own country and throughout the world'*
- Source A also shows a positive interpretation by Khrushchev of his role in the Cuban Missile Crisis. It was seen *'as a personal triumph'* and the fact that Khrushchev was forced to order the return of the USSR ships bound for Cuba *'was quickly forgotten'*
- Source A provides evidence to show that the USSR benefited as Cuba *'remained a useful ally in the USA's 'backyard'*
- Source A acknowledges that his actions in ending the Cuban Missile Crisis enhanced Khrushchev's reputation as *'a responsible peacemaker'*.

Source B

- Source B is the viewpoint of President Kennedy's brother, Robert Kennedy, who had played an important role in the Cuban Missile Crisis
- Source B downplayed any triumphant attitude by President Kennedy. He *'made no attempt to take the credit'*
- Source B presents Khrushchev in a sympathetic light. It states that President Kennedy *'respected Khrushchev for the actions he had taken'*. President Kennedy believed that avoiding nuclear war was the main achievement of the Cuban Missile Crisis
- This source is American but it takes a positive view of Khrushchev's actions
- This source may have been trying to present President Kennedy, who was killed in 1963, as a statesman. There was a thaw in the Cold War in the late 1960s with the beginning of détente. Robert Kennedy may have had this in mind. (own knowledge)

Source C

- Khrushchev, the USSR leader at the time of the Crisis, is the author of Source C and gives a more defiant view of his actions here. This may have been because of the date (in the immediate aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis) and the person to whom he was writing, (Castro)
- He takes the view that the USSR has emerged best from the Cuban Missile Crisis. *'We believe that the USA has been the loser here'*
- Khrushchev focuses on the benefits, especially in guaranteeing Castro's position: *'they (USA) made plans to attack Cuba but we stopped them'*
- Source C takes the view that Cuba being allowed to remain a communist country was *'a great victory for Communism'*
- Khrushchev is clearly trying to reassure Castro in this source. Castro was angry at the actions of Khrushchev. (own knowledge)

Candidates may bring in other contextual information from their own knowledge to develop their analysis of the interpretations in these sources, e.g.

- Some of the events from the Thirteen Days could be used to develop perspectives: the naval blockade ordered by President Kennedy; the presence of 43 000 USSR troops in Cuba in October 1963; Khrushchev’s decision to order the withdrawal of the USSR ships en route to Cuba
- The secret promise made by President Kennedy to remove the US Jupiter missiles from Turkey could be mentioned to explain President Kennedy’s respect for Khrushchev’s actions.

Candidates may conclude that the main reason for the difference in interpretation in these sources is the role and perspective of their authors.

Any other valid point [10]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

28

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] mark)

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] marks)

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] marks)

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. [5]

SPaG

5

Section A

33

Section B

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 the Cold War in Europe between 1945 and 1961.

Explain how and why the city of Berlin affected relations between the USA and the USSR between 1945 and 1961. Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information

- Tensions over Berlin, 1945–1948
- The Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 1948–1949
- Tensions over Berlin in the 1950s
- The Berlin Wall, 1961.

Targets 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, 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 attempt to provide some detail of how Berlin became a cause of tension between the USSR and the USA between 1945 and 1961. In Level 1, answers may use only one 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 accurate account of events and a more informed, if limited, analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give specific details on how and why Berlin became a cause of tension between the USSR and the USA between 1945 and 1961. In Level 2, answers may use three of the guidelines but contain omissions in coverage of some episodes and development. 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 and why Berlin was the cause of tension between the USSR and the USA between 1945 and 1961. In Level 3, answers will fully explain the reasons for tension over Berlin with accurate illustrative detail. All four guidelines will be addressed. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Tensions over Berlin, 1945–1948

- At Yalta in February 1945, the USA and the USSR could not agree on the future of Germany. As a compromise, Germany was divided into 4 zones of

occupation. The USA objected to Berlin, the capital, being in the Russian zone. Berlin was divided into 4 sectors: British, French, American and Russian. Berlin, the capital of Germany, was situated 100 miles inside the Russian zone and behind the Iron Curtain

- As the Cold War developed, tension increased between the USSR and the West over West Berlin. The USSR wanted Germany to pay reparations for damage and deaths in World War Two while the USA wanted to rebuild the German economy
- In 1948, a new currency was introduced in the Western zones and help was given to rebuild West Germany and the Western sectors of Berlin through the Marshall Plan. This worried the USSR as it feared a prosperous West Berlin might be a threat to the USSR control over East Berlin and East Germany in the future
- The USSR viewed this currency reform as the first step in setting up a separate West German state from the British, French and American zones. Stalin feared that the West would use West Berlin as a centre for spying on Eastern Europe and, by showcasing West Berlin as a triumph of capitalism, would weaken communist control over East Berlin.

The Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 1948–1949

- In June 1948 Stalin blocked off all roads and railway links between the British, American and French zones and West Berlin. The 2 million residents of West Berlin were cut off. The USA saw the Blockade as an attempt by the USSR to drive the Allies out of West Berlin and a test of the Truman Doctrine
- The Berlin Blockade was the first open conflict between the USA and the USSR in the Cold War and led to the Berlin Airlift, when the USA and Britain supplied the people of West Berlin for 10 months with food and fuel. The airlift lasted 324 days with up to 13 000 tons supplied each day
- Stalin did not shoot down the Allied planes as he did not want to be seen as the aggressor and risk a nuclear attack. The determination of the USA and the West surprised Stalin and the Blockade was lifted in May 1949. The Airlift made the USA realise its key role in the defence of West Europe and in 1949 it set up NATO to protect West Germany.

Tensions over Berlin in the 1950s

- The city of Berlin was the only place where people from east and west had open contact with each other during the Cold War in the 1950s. People from East Berlin were permitted to visit and work in the other three sectors. The difference in living standards between East and West was clearly seen in Berlin. During the 1950s over 2 million East Germans used Berlin as an escape route to the 'Golden West'
- In the late 1950s, Khrushchev tried to persuade the USA to sign an agreement that would give the USSR control of West Berlin. These attempts ended in failure. Khrushchev feared that the loss of so many young, skilled workers would destabilise East Germany and, in the longer term, Soviet control over Eastern Europe.

The Berlin Wall, 1961

- On 13 August 1961, East German police sealed off all crossing points, first with a barbed wire fence which was quickly replaced by a concrete wall over 110 km long that cut West Berlin off from East Berlin and East Germany. This stopped all movement between the Russian sector and the West

- The West protested in vain and President Kennedy visited West Berlin to give moral support. The Berlin Wall remained a stark symbol of communist oppression. Armed guards patrolled and lookout posts were set up, and over 100 East Germans were killed while attempting to escape. However, the Berlin Wall did succeed in removing a threat to communist control in East Berlin.

Some of this detail may be included in Level 2
Any other valid point

[22]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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] mark)

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] marks)

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] marks)

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.

[5]

SPaG

5

Question 2

33

3 This question is about the Korean War, 1950–1953

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Explain how and why the USA, USSR and China became involved in the Korean War between 1950 and 1953. Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information.

- Reasons for involvement of the USA in Korea in 1950
- Actions of the USA in the Korean War
- Reasons for involvement of the USSR and the USSR's actions in the Korean War
- China's fears and military actions.

Targets 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, 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 attempt to provide some detail of how and why the USA, the USSR and China became involved in a war in Korea between 1950 and 1953. In Level 1, answers may use only two of the guidelines. 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 accurate account of events and a more informed, if limited, analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give specific details on how and why the USA, the USSR and China became involved in a war in Korea between 1950 and 1953. In Level 2, answers may use three of the guidelines but contain omissions in coverage of key 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 and why the USA, USSR and China became involved in a war in Korea between 1950 and 1953. In Level 3, answers will fully explain the reasons for the involvement of the USA, the USSR and China in Korea in 1950 with accurate illustrative detail. All four guidelines will be addressed. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers will include some of the following:

Reasons for involvement of the USA in Korea in 1950

- After World War Two Korea was divided along Cold War lines along the 38th parallel. North Korea was ruled by Kim Il Sung, a communist, and South Korea by Syngman Rhee, who was supported by the USA. American and Russian troops left but both Korean leaders wanted to reunite all of Korea under their system of government

- The loss of China to communism in 1949 with the victory of Mao Ze Dong in the Chinese civil war was a blow for the USA, which had supported the nationalists. The Truman Doctrine of 1947 widened the USA's commitment to contain the spread of communism. The USA would help any country resisting 'armed minorities' or 'outside pressures'
- In 1949, the USSR developed an atom bomb. The USA was no longer the only superpower. Many in the USA believed in the Domino Theory, that the USSR wanted to make all of Asia communist. In October 1950, communist USSR and China signed a Treaty of Friendship which seemed to confirm the USA's worst fears
- There was pressure within the USA on Truman to take a tough stance against communist expansion. The McCarthy Witch hunts targeted anyone suspected of being sympathetic to communism. Truman was very sensitive to any expansion of communist influence
- Between 1948 and 1950, thousands were killed in clashes between North and South Korea. In June 1950 Communist North Korea invaded South Korea, and within three months, the South Korean army was pushed into a small area in the south called the Pusan Pocket. Many Americans believed that this marked the first stage of the Domino Theory and soon all countries in Asia would be in danger from communism
- Truman believed that Stalin had ordered Kim Il Sung to invade and he was determined to stop South Korea falling to communism and the USSR increasing its sphere of influence.

Actions of the USA in the Korean War

- The USA became involved using the United Nations which was boycotted by the USSR. Fifteen countries contributed soldiers to the United Nations Army, but over 90% of the 300 000 soldiers sent to Korea were American. Almost all the weapons used were provided by the USA. The UN army was led by General Douglas MacArthur who was responsible to President Truman
- In September 1950 the UN/USA army successfully landed at Inchon behind North Korean lines. By October 1950, the North Korean army was easily pushed back over the 38th Parallel. The UN/USA army went on the offensive and invaded North Korea. This was against its original orders. The USA was now pursuing a more ambitious policy of Rollback or reuniting Korea as a non-communist country. The UN/USA army captured Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, and reached close to the Yalu River, the border between North Korea and China
- General MacArthur and other American politicians wanted to continue the policy of Rollback and use the Korean War to invade Communist China and put the Chinese Nationalists in control. China did not want to risk war against the USA but was determined to resist a USA invasion. On 25 October 1950, over 250 000 Chinese troops called 'Volunteers' moved into North Korea, and pushed the UN/USA army back into South Korea. Chinese troops captured its capital Seoul. In April 1951, Truman sacked MacArthur who wanted an offensive war against China. He abandoned the risky strategy of Rollback for containment
- In 1951, a number of costly offensives and counter attacks resulted in stalemate. The USA launched heavy bombing raids on North Korea, destroying Pyongyang and causing high civilian casualties. The USA/UN air force fought a secret war in the skies against Russian planes and pilots disguised as Chinese

- The Korean War showed that the USA was committed to containment of communism anywhere in the world. Over 50 000 Americans were killed and American military spending tripled. The actions of the USA had saved South Korea. The war also showed the dangers of pursuing a policy of Rollback and the dangers of nuclear war with the USSR.

Reasons for involvement of the USSR and the USSR's actions in the Korean War

- Stalin and the USSR would have benefited from the spread of communism in Korea and Asia. This would increase the USSR's sphere of influence and prestige. Kim Il Sung was a nationalist who wanted to reunite Korea. He persuaded Stalin to allow him to invade South Korea. However, Stalin was reluctant to openly support him in case it led to direct conflict with the USA and the risk of nuclear war. Stalin did send Russian military advisors to help draw up Kim Il Sung's invasion plans
- The USSR was boycotting the United Nations and was unable to use its veto to prevent the USA from using the UN army to front its military help to South Korea
- The war after 1951 consisted mainly of aerial battles between the UN/ USA air force and USSR planes with Chinese markings and Russian pilots dressed in Chinese uniforms. Stalin was reluctant to openly get involved in direct war against the USA.

China's fears and military actions

- The USA had spent \$2 billion to help the Nationalists in the civil war. However by October 1949 Mao Ze Dong became leader of China. China, the most populated country in the world had become communist. The loss of China confirmed the USA's worst fears that communism was about to overrun Asia and was a major setback for the Truman Doctrine. In 1950 China and the USSR signed a Friendship Treaty. There was a belief that the loss of China was only the first stage in a communist takeover of Asia. Many Americans believed in the Domino Theory that all countries in Asia were in danger from communism
- Korea became a very sensitive country in the Cold War as it bordered communist China and the USSR. Mao Ze Dong and China feared that the USA would use the Korean War to roll back communism and put the Chinese Nationalists in control
- General MacArthur and leading American politicians supported Rollback. In October 1950 after the Inchon landings, the North Korean army was pushed back over the border. Truman was persuaded to pursue the more ambitious policy called Rollback to defeat communism in Korea. The UN/USA army went on the offensive and reached the Yalu River close to the border between North Korea and China
- China was alarmed but did not want to risk war against the USA. On 25 October 1950, over 250 000 Chinese troops called 'Volunteers', moved into North Korea and pushed the UN/USA army back into South Korea, even capturing its capital Seoul. By 1951 a number of costly offensives and counter attacks ended in stalemate. An armistice was signed in 1953 at Panmunjom.

Some of this detail may be included in Level 2.
Any other valid point.

[22]

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 mark)

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 marks)

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 marks)

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.

[5]

SPaG

5

Question 3

27

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

4 This question is about challenges to the USSR's control over Eastern Europe, 1956–1968.

Explain why the USSR faced challenges to its control in Hungary and Czechoslovakia between 1956 and 1968 and how it dealt with these challenges. Use the following guidelines to help you with your answer and any other relevant information.

- Reasons for the Hungarian Revolution, 1956
- Actions of the USSR in dealing with the Hungarian Revolution, 1956
- Reasons for unrest in Czechoslovakia, 1968
- Actions taken by the USSR to deal with unrest in Czechoslovakia, 1968.

Target AO1 and AO2: Recall, select and communicate knowledge and understanding of History and demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis of key concepts, key features and characteristics of the periods 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 attempt to provide some detail of why the USSR faced challenges to its control in Hungary and Czechoslovakia between 1956 and 1968 and of how it dealt with these challenges. In Level 1 answers may use only two of the guidelines. 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 accurate account of events and a more informed, if limited analysis. To reach the top of Level 2, answers must give specific details of why the USSR faced challenges to its control in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 and how the USSR dealt with these challenges. In Level 2, answers may use three of the guidelines or may display omissions in coverage of key 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 the USSR faced challenges to its control in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 and how it dealt with these challenges to its control. 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 will include some of the following:

Reasons for the Hungarian Revolution, 1956

- There were many grievances in Hungary in 1956 that threatened the USSR's control. In the 1946 election, the Communist Party gained only 17% of the vote. However, since 1948 Hungary had been ruled by a pro-Stalin dictator

called Rakosi. Social and economic grievances and the suppression of press and religious freedom by the secret police, the AVO, caused much resentment

- After the death of Stalin in 1953, the new Soviet leader Khrushchev, was determined to carry out political and economic reform. He criticised Stalin as a tyrant in a famous speech in 1956. In Poland in 1956, protests against strict USSR control were defused with a programme of liberal reforms under a popular Communist leader, Gomulka. This encouraged people in Hungary to protest against Soviet control
- In October 1956, popular unrest in Hungary forced the resignation of the unpopular Communist leader, Rakosi. The USSR withdrew its army from Hungary as a concession. This gave hope to Hungarians looking for freedom from Soviet control. Anti-Soviet demonstrations encouraged the new communist leader, Imre Nagy, to announce free elections and that Hungary would leave the Warsaw Pact and become a neutral country.

Actions of the USSR in dealing with the Hungarian Revolution, 1956

- Khrushchev however, was determined to keep Soviet control over Hungary and was determined not to allow Hungary to leave the USSR's sphere of influence. Khrushchev sent the Soviet army and 6000 tanks into Hungary. Fierce fighting from 4 to 14 November 1956 caused thousands of deaths
- The rebels were defeated and 180 000 fled to the West. Nagy was executed and a pro-Soviet government was installed, led by Kadar. Many in Hungary felt betrayed by the failure of the USA and the West to help the rebels
- The USSR's actions in Hungary showed that the USSR was determined to keep control of Eastern Europe as a buffer zone and to preserve the Iron Curtain and maintain strict political control.

Reasons for unrest in Czechoslovakia, 1968

- The ruthless actions of the USSR in crushing the Hungarian Rebellion in 1956 ended unrest among the USSR's satellites in Eastern Europe. By 1968, growing economic problems in Czechoslovakia, the most industrially-developed country in Eastern Europe, led to discontent about Soviet control of the economy. The unpopular Communist leader, Novotny, was replaced by Alexander Dubcek
- Dubcek, the new Communist party leader, announced a programme of economic and social reforms. He aimed to achieve 'Socialism with a human face', and reassured the USSR that Czechoslovakia wished to remain loyal to Communism and stay in the Warsaw Pact. The reforms of the 'Prague Spring' included ending censorship and the powers of the secret police and opening up travel and trade with the west
- These reforms worried Brezhnev, the new Soviet leader. He feared that other communist countries would copy these reforms and threaten the USSR's control over Eastern Europe. Though Dubcek gave guarantees of loyalty to the Warsaw Pact in the Bratislava Declaration, he continued with his programme of reform.

Actions taken by the USSR to deal with unrest in Czechoslovakia, 1968

- On 20 August 1968, Brezhnev ordered 400 000 Warsaw Pact soldiers to invade Czechoslovakia. The Czechs wished to avoid the bloodshed of the Hungarian Rebellion and offered only passive resistance. Only 73 Czechs were killed. Anti-Soviet slogans were painted on the Soviet tanks and sit-

downs in front of Soviet tanks showed the hostility of the Czech people. One student, Jan Palach, burned himself to death in protest

- After the invasion, Dubcek was summoned to Moscow and on 28 August, agreed to end the Prague Spring and return to pre-1968 rule. Later he was sacked and replaced by Husak, who was loyal to the USSR
- In November 1968, the Brezhnev Doctrine restated the determination of the USSR to maintain control over Eastern Europe. The security of the USSR and the Warsaw Pact remained a central part of Soviet foreign policy and deterred further unrest in Eastern Europe for the next decade.

Some of this detail may be included in Level 2. [22]

Any other valid point.

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] mark)

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] marks)

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] marks)

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. [5]

SPaG

5

Question 4

27

Section B

27

Total

60

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

22