

GCE

History A

Unit **Y253/01**: The Cold War in Europe 1941–1995

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.















All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
	Assertion
	Analysis
	Evaluation
	Explanation
	Factor
	Illustrates/Describes
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Judgement
	Knowledge and understanding
	Simple comment
	Unclear
	View

Use the following indicative content mark scheme in conjunction with the generic levels of response in the Appendix

MARK SCHEME Section A

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p>Assess the impact on Eastern Europe of Soviet control in the years 1946-1955.</p> <p>In arguing that the political impact was most significant,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the imposition of communist rule immediately after the Second World War. • Answers might consider the implications of membership of Cominform. • Answers might consider the lack of democratic rights and the limitations placed on political parties and opposition groups. • Answers might consider the examples of Soviet intervention against potential political threats. <p>In arguing that other impacts were more significant,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the economic impact: importance of Comecon and economic union, the impact of collectivisation, nationalisation and Soviet approaches to economic planning, shortages of food and raw materials, the lack of a consumer economy and economic freedom and the economic burden placed on Eastern European states to send money, goods and materials to the USSR. • Answers might consider the socio-cultural impact: the lack of political and religious freedom, the lack of observation of human rights, restrictions on movement, separation of families, refugees, the rise of nationalism, the impact of Soviet-style education and youth, workers' and women's organisations and of the Party apparatus. • Answers might consider the military impact: the 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the extent, nature and/or severity of impact. • At higher levels answers might establish criteria against which to judge the various impacts. • To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

		<p>military occupation post-World War Two, the military burden placed on states to provide their own defence, and the implications of Warsaw Pact membership.</p> <p>Answers are likely to assess the political, economic, military and socio-cultural effects of Soviet control, and to look at both short term and long term impacts.</p> <p>Answers might make reference to a range of Eastern European countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, the Baltic States (which had been absorbed into the USSR) and Romania. Yugoslavia was expelled from Cominform in 1948 and was an independent communist state thereafter.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

2*	<p>“President Reagan was mainly responsible for the development of the ‘new cold war’ in the years 1979-1984.” How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing that President Reagan was responsible,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider Reagan’s intransigent attitude towards communism, viewing it as an ‘evil empire’ and his determination to win the cold war, rather than accept the status quo. • Answers might consider Reagan’s decision to massively escalate arms spending and develop new weapons technology, such as the ‘Star Wars’ programme, Cruise and Pershing missiles and the neutron bomb. • Answers might consider Reagan’s success in gaining support from other world leaders for his approach, such as Thatcher. <p>In arguing that other factors were responsible,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the failures and limitations of détente, which had led to disillusionment with this process on both sides. • Answers might consider the decision of the USSR to invade Afghanistan in 1979, which brought a rapid end to détente (prior to Reagan’s election). • Answers might consider the actions of other US politicians in escalating the Cold War – Republican criticism of Carter, the Senate’s refusal to ratify SALT II, and Carter’s boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics and escalation of arms spending. • Answers might consider developments in Eastern Europe, such as the USSR’s decision to impose martial law in Poland to crush the Solidarity union. • Answers might consider the leadership crisis in the USSR with a succession of aging, ill and backward-looking leaders (Brezhnev, Andropov and Chernenko), who had been conditioned by the Cold 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the relative importance of the reasons. • At higher levels answers might establish criteria against which to judge the relative importance of the reasons. • To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation, it should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.
----	---	----	--

			<p>War and were frequently paranoid and suspicious due to their isolation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider tensions resulting from international developments in Asia, the 'third world' (e.g. Angola, Mozambique, Somalia) and Europe (Greece and Portugal) and the intervention of the superpowers in these.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

3		<p>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</p> <p>‘Why [by 1946] had Stalin become so difficult to deal with? The answer was simple: the atomic bomb. The Americans had it and he did not... The American bomb appears to be the fundamental reason why Stalin was determined to hold onto everything he had and to prevent the expansion of American influence in Eastern and Southern Europe.’</p> <p><i>From: M. McCauley, Origins of The Cold War 1941-49, (2008).</i></p> <p>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</p> <p>The historical debate centres on the motivations for Stalin’s actions in Europe at the end of the Second World War and the reasons why his relations with the west were worsening.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation, answers might note that it sees America’s development of an atomic weapon as the major reason for Stalin becoming ‘difficult to deal with’, and motivating his actions in Eastern and Southern Europe. Answers might also note the phrase ‘difficult to deal with’ implies blame largely lies with Stalin for the decline in relations. Answers might note this interpretation characterises Stalin as being in a vulnerable position, motivated by fear rather than aggression.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation. • Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. • The quality of analysis and the evaluation of the interpretation should be considered when assigning answers to a Level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer. • Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis of the given interpretation do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate’s own viewpoint. • Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in the evaluation, however, for Level 5 there should be well-supported evaluation of both, in line with Levels descriptors. • Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation. •
---	--	--	----	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • America's race to develop a nuclear weapon and its testing of one in May 1945, following by its deployment in Japan in August 1945. • Stalin's reaction to the development and use of the bombs. • The USSR's failure to develop a weapon until 1949, leaving them vulnerable, particularly if the USA were able to place bases in Eastern or Southern Europe. <p>In analysing and evaluating the weaknesses of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ideological reasons behind Stalin's actions – his deep seated hatred and suspicion of capitalism and his desire to see communism spread to Eastern and Southern Europe. • The geopolitical benefits to Stalin of occupying Eastern and Southern Europe, particularly in providing a buffer against a potentially revived Germany in the future. • Stalin's paranoid personality as the main reason why he had become 'difficult to deal with'. • Stalin's economic concerns and priorities, particularly to prevent significant economic US influence growing in Europe by financing reconstruction, which would undermine communism and threaten its economic basis. • The actions of the USA and Great Britain during and after the end of the War as alienating Stalin (i.e. they, rather than he' were to blame for being 'difficult to deal with'), for example their approach to negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam, Truman's intransigent position, influenced by Kennan, Churchill's view expressed in the Iron Curtain Speech, and the closer Anglo-American links being formed at the expense of the USSR. 		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interpretations which see other factors as more important in motivating Stalin's actions, for example ideological, economic and geopolitical reasons.• Interpretations which agree that Stalin's actions were largely motivated by fear/vulnerability rather than aggression, but which do not see the atomic bomb as the only reason for this.• Interpretations which see Stalin as an aggressor, acting from a position of strength rather than weakness.		
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains the generic mark scheme grids

	<i>AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]
Level 5 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
Level 4 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
Level 3 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
Level 2 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
Level 1 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

	<i>A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]
Level 5 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 4 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 3 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
Level 2 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
Level 1 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

