

**GCE**

**History A**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

**Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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 2018

## Section A

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1*	<p><b>“Developments in Germany were the main reason for rising tension between the USSR and the West in the years 1946-55.” How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that developments in Germany were the main reason for rising tensions</b>, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The long-term history of disagreement between Stalin and the West over the future of Germany, and which were not resolved and arguably escalated after the end of the war.</li> <li>• The decision of Britain, France and the USA to merge their zones and begin moving towards a unified constitution, without consultation with Stalin, and the creation of the independent Federal Republic of Germany in 1949, which further worried Stalin.</li> <li>• Disagreements over the economic future of Germany, with Stalin angered by Marshall Aid and the introduction of a new currency for the West and the West suspicious of Stalin’s own currency plans which would economically divide Germany between East and West.</li> <li>• The Berlin Blockade and Airlift, the first direct conflict between East and West.</li> <li>• The role of events in Berlin in stimulating the creation of NATO and subsequently the Warsaw Pact, which militarily divided the two sides.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that other developments were the main reason for rising tensions</b>, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deep suspicion of Stalin’s actions on the part of the Western powers, who saw his occupation of, and imposition of communism on, Eastern Europe as an act of aggressive expansionism (rigged elections, Comecon, Cominform and the Warsaw Pact).</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the relative importance of the reasons.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge the relative importance of the reasons.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personality clashes between the leaders of the USA and USSR, particularly Truman’s deep suspicion of Stalin and Stalin’s paranoid nature.</li> <li>• The arms race, particularly America’s further development of atomic weapons and a hydrogen bomb, and the USSR’s own acquisition of the atomic bomb.</li> <li>• US intervention in Europe - The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan</li> <li>• Answers may note developments outside Europe which exacerbated tensions – for example the Chinese Revolution and communist insurgency in Asia – which would be valid, but it would be expected that the focus of answers would be on developments in Europe.</li> </ul>		
2.*	<p><b>How much progress had been made in the process of détente by 1979?</b></p> <p><b>How much progress had been made in the process of détente by 1979?</b></p> <p><b>In arguing that progress had been made, answers might consider:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved relations between the leaders of the major powers, for example Nixon’s visit to the USSR.</li> <li>• Moves towards arms limitation, with a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty being signed in 1969, the SALT 1 Treaty being signed in 1972 and SALT 2 in 1979.</li> <li>• The Helsinki Agreement of 1975 which reached agreement on geopolitical issues (Soviet control of Eastern Europe), developed trade links and gained Soviet agreement to respect human rights.</li> <li>• Brandt’s Ostpolitik in West Germany, which improved relations between East and West Germany, leading to the Basic Treaty of 1972, and also improved relations with Eastern Europe and the USSR, for example the Moscow Treaty of 1970 with the USSR and Poland.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement as to extent of progress.</li> <li>• At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge progress.</li> <li>• To be valid, judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The establishment of cultural and sporting connections between the USSR and the West and some co-operation in the space race.</li> <li>• The lack of a major crisis or flashpoint between 1963 and 1979.</li> </ul> <p><b>In arguing that progress was limited,</b> answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The broad failure of the SALT Treaties, with neither the US nor USSR observing their terms, and their failure to limit arms proliferation amongst other powers.</li> <li>• The limitations of the Helsinki agreement, with the USSR largely continuing to fail to observe human rights; the West being forced to recognise Soviet control of Eastern Europe could also be argued to represent a lack of progress in relations.</li> <li>• Many of the advancements, particularly in the cultural and sporting arena, were largely propaganda exercises rather than representing real change.</li> <li>• Ongoing geopolitical divisions between the two powers, for example in the Arab-Israeli War of 1973.</li> <li>• The lack of buy-in for détente amongst both ordinary people and the political elite on both sides.</li> <li>• The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the reaction to it arguably shows the fragility of Détente.</li> </ul>		
3.	<p><b>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</b>  <b>“The [Second World] War had been won by a coalition whose members were already at war – ideologically and geopolitically, if not militarily – with one another.”</b></p> <p><b>From: J.L. Gaddis, The Cold War, 2005</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</b></p>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. The quality of analysis and evaluation of the interpretations should be considered when assigning answers to a level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>The interpretation centres on the status of the Grand Alliance in 1945 and the extent to which relations had already declined to a war-like state, or whether this occurred due to developments after the end of the war.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation, answers might note that it characterises the USA, US and Great Britain as already 'at war' by 1945 and sees this as an ideological and geopolitical conflict.</p> <p><b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the interpretation, answers might note:</li> <li>• The deep ideological differences that had existed between the USSR and the USA/GB since the Russian Revolution of 1917, and the suspicion and hostility this had created.</li> <li>• The tensions that had developed during the war due to differences of opinion over tactics and strategies, for example Stalin's early pact with the Nazis, and the Allied delay over opening up a second front against Hitler which left the USSR to bear the brunt of the conflict.</li> <li>• The geopolitical debates that had opened up from 1943 onwards once discussions began about the future of post-war Europe, with disagreements over spheres of influence, the future of Germany and how to guarantee future security, particularly for the USSR.</li> <li>• Fears towards the end of the war that a military conflict could develop between the West and Russia once Nazi Germany had been defeated.</li> <li>• America and the USSR's race to develop an atomic weapon during the course of the war.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate's own viewpoint.</li> <li>• 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 and for level 4 supported evaluation of both, in line with levels descriptors.</li> <li>• Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p><b>In analysing and evaluating the weaknesses of the given interpretation</b>, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relatively positive relations between the leaders of the Grand Alliance, Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, which only started to seriously decline after the death of Roosevelt and election of Atlee in 1945 after the end of war.</li> <li>• The productive military alliance which had developed through the war, which by 1945 had seen a decisive defeat of Nazi Germany and its allies, indicating cooperation between the powers.</li> <li>• Events after the end of the war which generated greatly increased tension, for example, the use of the atomic bomb, Stalin's occupation of Eastern Europe and the imposition of communist rule there, the 'war of words' between post-war leaders and America's decision to offer the Marshall Plan to Europe.</li> <li>• The first direct confrontation of the Cold War, the Berlin Blockade, occurred in 1948-9, over 3 years after the end of the war and only after a series of developments which raised tensions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretations that do see relations as weak between the Grand Alliance prior to and during the war, but which do not characterise this as a 'war'.</li> <li>• Interpretations which accept the deep ideological divisions between the East and West, but which do not see any geopolitical 'war' prior to 1945.</li> <li>• Interpretations which see relations as generally good during the war, and/or believe that the war-like state emerged only after 1945.</li> </ul>		

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>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 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.
<b>Level 4</b> 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.
<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 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.
<b>Level 1</b> 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>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 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.
<b>Level 4</b> 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.
<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 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.
<b>Level 1</b> 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)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2018

