

GCSE HISTORY

(8145)

Marked Papers 1B/E - Conflict and tension
in the Gulf and Afghanistan, 1990-2009

Understand how to apply the mark scheme for our sample
assessment papers.

Version 1.0 April 2018

EXAMPLE RESPONSES



Example responses plus commentaries

The following student responses are intended to illustrate how the mark scheme can be interpreted and how it is likely that students will respond to the questions, allowing the student and teacher to explore and reflect upon the mark scheme and how answers can be improved.

Paper 1B/E

Conflict and tension in the Gulf and Afghanistan, 1990–2009

Question 01

Study **Source A** in the Sources Booklet.

Source A supports Saddam Hussein. How do you know?

Explain your answer using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)	
Level 2	Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance	3–4
	Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source. For example, students may refer to details of the image which project Saddam is a positive light, eg as a leader/powerful/courageous warrior, facing forward, defending children, protecting order and stability; a wall painting in Baghdad at this time would inevitably have been pro-Saddam due to power of Ba'ath Party.	
Level 1	Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance	1–2
	Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with basic factual knowledge and understanding For example, Saddam has been made to appear heroic; it was propaganda designed to flatter Saddam.	
	Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question	0

Responses

Student one

The source supports Saddam because it portrays as a hero. He's holding a machine gun and is surrounded by tanks, guns a helicopters, which shows how powerful the Iraqi army is and how he is leading the Iraqi army to defeat their enemies like the United States and other Western countries. Saddam was in power when this poster was shown, so it would have to support him because he was a brutal dictator who crushed anyone who criticised him in Iraq.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows developed analysis of the content and provenance (the timing) of the source, using relevant contextual knowledge and understanding to comment on the features of the source and explain how it supports Saddam Hussein.

Student two

This supports Saddam because makes him look good it shows Saddam Hussein looking tough with a gun. There are guns all around him, which make him powerful. This picture was produced in Iraq in the 1990s and could be seen by all sorts of people in Baghdad, so they would have to support him.

Commentary – Level 1

The response shows simple analysis of the source. It identifies relevant features of the content (how Saddam is portrayed) and the provenance (the type and time), with some simple knowledge shown. To progress, the response could use contextual knowledge to explain why the public nature of the source meant that the author had to be supportive of Saddam.

Question 02

Study **Sources B** and **C**.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to a historian studying opinions in the United States about the invasion of Iraq in 2003?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

[12 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance 10–12

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, taken together they reflect how polarised American views were about Iraq. Students may also recognise limitations arising from provenance and particular significance may be attached to (eg) the passage of time and purpose of the two sources. In assessing utility the small readership of the newspaper (Source O) may lead to this source being seen as unrepresentative, particularly in view of Bush's victory in the presidential elections in 2004.

Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance 7–9

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect opinions towards the invasion of Iraq.

For example, the cynicism and hostility of the cartoon (Source O) might reflect contemporary (liberal) American opinions following the war. The speech by President Bush (Source P) at the beginning of the war might be in step with popular attitudes/concerns/perceptions at the time as well as the government's stated line.

Level 2 Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the sources with simple reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, students may explain that the cartoon (Source O) is useful because it shows that some Americans did not believe that the government had good reasons for going to war with Iraq

The Bush speech (Source P) may be used by historians to shed light on the official grounds for the invasion of Iraq and may highlight the President's emphasis on idealism.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Bush is suggesting that this is a war for freedom; the cartoon suggests the reasons for going to war were made up.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

The content of source B is useful to the historian as it shows that not all people in America supported the invasion of Iraq and suggests that Bush had lied about why the USA invaded Iraq. It shows the concerns that lots of people had about the reasons which were used to justify the invasion, as no Weapons of Mass Destruction were ever found. The provenance is also useful. The source was produced in 2009, so it shows that the invasion stayed unpopular even after Saddam was defeated. For example, the artist would have known that an insurgency started in 2006, with which resulted in 2 million Sunni's leaving Iraq and hundreds of US soldiers dying. Therefore, the source shows that negative opinions lasted for a long time because the invasion led to more problems for Iraq and America.

The content of source C is useful as it shows the reasons that the President gave for going to war. It says that Iraq was a major threat to the US and 'freedom' because they have weapons of mass destruction, which explains why Bush included Iraq in the Axis of Evil. Bush also mentions terrorism, which was a huge fear in the USA after 9/11. The source is a radio message, so the purpose was to persuade the American people to support the war. This was because there was opposition to the war in America and in other countries like Germany and France, and Bush was worried that the war was not well supported.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex thinking. It addresses both sources and explains the content and provenance of both. A sustained judgment is shown in explaining how the provenance of source B (ie the time of creation and author's access to information) is useful for showing how negative opinions about the invasion were long lasting. This answer is an example of complex evaluation of each source individually. Complex thinking could also be shown by using the sources in combination to explain another point about utility.

Student two

Source B is really useful to a historian because it shows that some Americans were angry about the invasion of Iraq. The source suggests that the reasons given for going to war were 'fiction'. For example, the UN inspectors never found any weapons of mass destruction, and Saddam Hussein was not working with terrorists like Osama bin Laden and did not plan the 9/11 attacks. The source shows how angry people were with Bush and how much they opposed him.

Source C is useful because it shows that George Bush wanted to invade Iraq and wanted to stop terrorists. For example, he says that America and the other countries will 'defend our freedom', so he felt that Iraq was he was a threat to their freedom, which could be true because American and Iraq were enemies. The provenance of the source is useful, because it is a radio source where he is speaking to the American public, so he could be exaggerating.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed evaluation of source B. For example, it explains the content of the source using contextual knowledge and understanding about the issue. The evaluation of source C is simple, using some simple knowledge (America and Iraq were enemies) to comment on the content of the source, while the evaluation of the provenance of the source requires further substantiation. To progress, the response could explain how the sources are useful for the issue in the question when used together/in combination.

Question 03

Write an account of how Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait became an international crisis in 1991.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)	
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)	
Target	Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)	
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)	
Level 4	Complex analysis of causation/consequence	7–8
	Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Extends Level 3	
	Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.	
	For example, analysis of different consequences of the occupation of Kuwait... Bush and Thatcher refused to accept Saddam's blatant aggression and the tension escalated following initial sanctions. Neither side would back down; Saddam's bluff about the 'mother of all wars' was challenged by the next stage which was the creation of a sizeable international force. Operation Desert Storm was launched after deadlines for withdrawal were missed. While the military operation was a success, the international crisis within the coalition was complicated by missile attacks on Israel and Saudi Arabia as well as the critical issue of how to deal with Iraq's retreating forces. Bush's Arab allies were cautious about taking further offensive action to remove Saddam in case the coalition fractured. So a ceasefire was ordered with Kuwait liberated.	

Level 3 Developed analysis of causation/consequence 5–6

Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a **simple** narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related to, for example, to an analysis of how / why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, one consequence of how the occupation of Kuwait and the actions of Saddam Hussein gave rise to UN sanctions; neither side would back down. Saddam proved himself to be a provocative opponent and after deadlines for withdrawal were missed, the crisis led to US Operation Desert Shield, which saw the creation of a large and varied coalition force to launch a counter attack on Iraqi forces, thereby escalating the conflict.

Level 2 Simple analysis of causation/consequence 3–4

Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a **basic** narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, Iraq's aggression and occupation of Kuwait led to UN sanctions and direct military action.

Level 1 Basic analysis of causation/consequence 1–2

Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the event, such as Iraq invaded Kuwait so a multi-national force was formed to deal with this.

Responses

Student one

One way that the occupation of Kuwait causes an international crisis was by bringing together a coalition of countries against him. When Iraq invaded Kuwait, he assumed that America and its allies would not oppose him because the USA had armed Iraq during the Iran Iraq war. However, the USA was worried that Saddam's actions would cause further problems in the Middle East because a powerful Iraq would threaten the power and oil in places like Saudi Arabia and Egypt. As a result, the USA and UK were able to persuade a coalition of countries to force Iraq out of Kuwait including Arab nations and other UN countries, making it a big international crisis.

Another reason why the occupation of Kuwait became an international crisis was because it led to war between Iraq and the coalition. For example, Iraq's invasion made the UN give Saddam an ultimatum, saying that if he didn't stop the occupation of Kuwait then the Iraqi army would be removed by the international coalition, who supplied soldiers and military equipment. When Saddam Hussein ignored the ultimatum, the coalition launched operation Desert Storm. This was an international crisis because it resulted in war between Iraq and its neighbours like Saudi Arabia, which led to 90,000 Iraq soldiers dying, and Saddam ordered his army to set fire to Kuwait's oil before they were forced to leave the country.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex thinking by analysing more than one way the occupation of Kuwait led to an international crisis, supported with detailed knowledge and understanding that shows an understanding of sequencing. For example, the first paragraph explains why Saddam's actions led to the formation of the UN coalition, referencing the reasons why Arab and Western countries felt threatened. The response becomes complex in the second paragraph, when another reason why it was an international crisis is analysed and substantiated.

Student two

Saddam's invasion of Kuwait led to an international crisis because it worried Arab countries in the Middle East and brought them together against Iraq. For example, the King of Saudi Arabia worried that the invasion threatened Saudi Arabia and its oil, while Egypt and Syria also felt threatened. This meant that most Arab and Muslim countries joined the war against Iraq, including Saudi Arabia, Syria, Egypt and Morocco, which was a crisis because Middle Eastern countries that used to be allies were against each other.

After the war, the UN couldn't decide what to do with Saddam. Some countries wanted to invade Iraq and remove Saddam, and others thought that Iraqis would rise up against Saddam. In the end, the US decided not to invade Iraq. This was a crisis because Saddam was allowed to stay on as leader of Iraq.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed analysis of one reason why the occupation of Kuwait led to an international crisis. For example, the first paragraph addresses the focus of the question, (how these events became an international crisis) by analysing the sequence of events that led to the Middle Eastern countries joining the coalition and explaining why this was a crisis. The second point remains simple. It identifies a consequence of occupation and shows an understanding of sequencing. To develop, the response could go on to explain why Saddam staying as Iraqi President was an international crisis.

Question 04

'The main result of the Gulf War, 1990–1991, was that Iraqi forces were removed from Kuwait.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]

Mark scheme

Question 04 enables students to produce an extended response. Students have the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)	
	Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)	
Level 4	Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement	13–16
	Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.	
	Extends Level 3.	
	Students may progress from a developed evaluation of consequences by complex evaluation of the relationship between consequences supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a judgement.	
	For example, students will make a judgment about the short term result, ie success in liberating Kuwait with the long term results of leaving Saddam in power. There may be a suggestion that a judgement depends on the point of view – did the coalition consider oil supplies more important than dealing with a dictator who inflicted further brutality on his own people. Or students might consider that in the long term Saddam still had to be dealt with and it led to another Iraqi war, so this was a more important result.	

Level 1 Basic explanation of one or more factors **1–4**

Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students identify recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as the Coalition didn't take long to overcome Iraqi forces which were quickly defeated.

Students may offer basic explanations of other results eg Saddam's forces survived and so did his dictatorship.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question **0**

Responses

Student one

The removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait was an important short term result of the war, but there were more important long term results.

Removing the Iraqi army from Kuwait was important because it made the Middle East more stable and made it easier for Western powers to get oil. Saddam wanted to become the most powerful leader in the region and attacked other countries who got in his way. For example, he ordered the Iraqi army to destroy 90% of Kuwait's oil when leaving the country. By defeating Iraq in the Gulf War, the US and UK led coalition made sure that friendly countries like Kuwait and Saudi Arabia were kept safe, and would continue to supply oil to them.

Another result of the war was that Saddam Hussein was allowed to remain in power in Iraq. This is because the US and UK were afraid that the Arab members of the coalition would not support an invasion of Iraq, and assumed that opposition groups in Iraq would overthrow Saddam. However, Saddam crushed the opposition and continued to treat people like the Kurds and Shia Muslim's terribly, using chemical and biological weapons on them. This resulted in nearly 750,000 of them leaving Iraq. WMDs later led to the invasion of Iraq in 2003, as George Bush used Saddam's treatment of the opposition and his use of WMDs to persuade other countries like Britain to join the invasion.

A final consequence of the war was the damage done to Iraq. Iraq's oil production stopped during the war, which cut off an important source of money for the country. The UN also imposed sanctions, and the country was blockaded. This meant that it was impossible for Iraqis to buy everyday goods, and even if they were available wages fell and prices rose. The loss of the war therefore made life very difficult for ordinary people, who faced starvation and disease.

Overall, the statement is not true. The removal of Iraq forces was an important result of the Gulf War, but Saddam staying in power had longer term consequences. For example, because Saddam stayed in power, the UN imposed sanctions on Iraq

which damaged the country. Also, Saddam staying in power meant that Iraq continued to develop chemical weapons, which was a reason why the invasion of Iraq happened in 2003 because George Bush and Tony Blair used Saddam's actions as an excuse to invade.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows a complex explanation of the stated consequence and other consequences, using a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question to support the points made. Complex thinking is shown in the concluding paragraph, where the judgment is sustained by showing that the failure to remove Saddam the most important consequence as helped to cause later events in the region.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/8145

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3861