OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Accredited

June 2022 – Morning/Afternoon

GCSE (9–1) History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410/14 International Relations: the changing international order 1918–1975

Time allowed: 1 hour 15 minutes

Sample question paper for 2022 only. To see what adaptations have been made for 2022 please ensure you have referred to the Changes for 2022 qualification web page.

You must have:

- the OCR 12-page Answer Booklet

INSTRUCTIONS
- Use black ink.
- Write your answer to each question in the Answer Booklet. The question numbers must be clearly shown.
- Fill in the boxes on the front of the Answer Booklet.
- Answer Questions 1-4.

INFORMATION
- The total mark for this paper is **60**.
- The marks for each question are shown in brackets **[ ]**.
- Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) and the use of specialist terminology will be assessed in questions marked with a pencil (✎)
- Quality of extended response will be assessed in questions marked with an asterisk (*)
- This document has **4** pages.

ADVICE
- Read each question carefully before you start to answer.

© OCR 2020

International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001

Answer **all** the questions.

1. Outline the actions of the USSR in Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1948.

[5]

2. How successful were attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s?
Explain your answer.

[10]

3. Study **Interpretation A**.

Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on the policies of Neville Chamberlain in the period 1937–1939?
Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the events of 1937–1939 to support your answer.

[25]

(✎) Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology **[5]**

4. Study **Interpretation B.**

Explain why **not** all historians and commentators have agreed with this interpretation.
Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

[10]

(✎) Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology **[5]**

Interpretation A

There was widespread and sincere admiration for Mr. Chamberlain's efforts to maintain peace. However, in writing this account it is impossible for me not to refer to the long series of miscalculations, and misjudgements which he made. The motives which inspired him have never been questioned. The course he followed required the highest degree of moral courage. To this I paid tribute two years later in my speech after his death.

From 'The Gathering Storm', a history of the Second World War by Winston Churchill, published in 1948.

Interpretation B

Here, then, was the difficulty after the war. The Western democracies wanted a form of security that would reject violence. Security was to be for everyone, it was not to be a benefit denied to some in order to provide it to others. Stalin saw things very differently: security came only by intimidating or eliminating potential challengers. The contrast, or so it would seem, made conflict unavoidable.

From 'We Now Know: Rethinking the Cold War' by the American historian John Lewis Gaddis, published in 1997. Gaddis was writing about relations between the USA and the USSR immediately after the Second World War.

END OF QUESTION PAPER

© OCR 2015

Copyright Information:

Interpretation A: Adapted from Winston S. Churchill, The Second World War: The Gathering Storm: Volume I, Orion UK, 1948.

Interpretation B: Adapted from John Lewis Gaddis, We now know: Rethinking Cold War History, Clarendon Press UK, 1998.

OCR is committed to seeking permission to reproduce all third–party content that it uses in the assessment materials. OCR has attempted to identify and contact all copyright holders whose work is used in this paper. To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer–related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced in the OCR Copyright Acknowledgements booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download from our public website (www.ocr.org.uk) after the live examination series.

If OCR has unwittingly failed to correctly acknowledge or clear any third–party content in this assessment material, OCR will be happy to correct its mistake at the earliest possible opportunity.

For queries or further information please contact the Copyright Team, The Triangle, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group; Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

Accredited

…day June 20XX – Morning/Afternoon

GCSE (9–1) History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410 International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001

SAMPLE MARK SCHEME

Duration: 1 hour 15 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK 60

This document has 20 pages

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

PREPARATION FOR MARKING

RM ASSESSOR

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor assessor Online Training*; *OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal http://www.rm.com/support/ca
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses ("scripts") and the **required number of** standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.

2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.

3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.

4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.

5. **Crossed Out Responses**
   Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.)*

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.

7. Award No Response (NR) if:

- there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.

9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
b. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	**Award mark**
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. **Annotations**

Annotation	**Meaning**

1. **Subject–specific Marking Instructions**

INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.

2 The specific task–related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.

3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001

1. Outline the actions of the USSR in Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1948.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
Additional Guidance	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of the actions of the USSR in Eastern Europe in the period 1945–1948 should also be credited.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 • Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows a clear understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	*In the final stages of the Second World War Soviet forces drove German forces back across much of Eastern Europe. Once the war ended the Soviets kept their troops in countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia. Stalin wanted Eastern Europe to become a Soviet sphere of influence and he pushed for this at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences in 1945. At the same time the USSR helped Communist parties to take power in several Eastern European countries. To help keep this control Stalin established the Cominform in 1947, an organization based in the USSR which effectively controlled the Communist parties of the Eastern European states.*	**4–5**
Level 2 • Response demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. This is presented as a narrative that shows some understanding of the sequence or concurrence of events.	*In the final stages of the Second World War Soviet forces drove German forces back across much of Eastern Europe. Once the war ended the Soviets kept their troops in countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia because Stalin wanted Eastern Europe to become a Soviet sphere of influence.*	**2–3**
Level 1 • Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.	*The Soviet Union made a bloc of countries in Eastern Europe after the Second World War.*	**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

2. How successful were attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s? Explain your answer.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [5]
Additional Guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level. No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically cover different aspects of the argument, supported by a range of more detailed description and fuller explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g. *During the 1920s world leaders faced many problems still left over from the First World War. Because international rivalry had led to war they decided to try international co-operation.* *In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League held a vote which divided the area between Poland and Germany and both states accepted this. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. Greek troops invaded Bulgaria after some Greek soldiers were killed. The League ruled against Greece and ordered it to leave Bulgaria and Greece obeyed. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War. Its Finance Committee helped to repair a financial disaster in Austria and Hungary. The Health Committee helped to pay for research into vaccines against deadly diseases like malaria.* *The League was not the only type of international co-operation in the 1920s. For example in 1925 Germany reached an agreement with Belgium and France called the Locarno Treaties in which Germany accepted its borders as set out in the Treaty*	**9–10**

	of Versailles, reducing tension with France greatly. And in 1928 65 nations, including the USA which was not in the League, signed the Kellogg Briand Pact agreeing to reject war as a means of achieving political aims. *Of course there were also failures in the 1920s. In 1923 Italy attacked the Greek island of Corfu after a dispute involving some of its troops. At first the League of Nations ruled against Italy but the Italian leader Mussolini pressured Britain and France and they agreed to support Mussolini. The League was forced to change its mind and back down. The League also failed to achieve one of its main aims, international disarmament. There was one agreement about limiting naval forces in 1921 but apart from this no progress was made.* *So on balance the attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s and 1930s were mixed, with some successes and some failures.*	
Level 4 • Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will typically cover different aspects of the argument supported by description and explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g. *In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example, the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War.* *The League was not the only type of international co-operation in the 1920s. For example, in 1925 Germany reached an agreement with Belgium and France called the Locarno Treaties. And in 1928, 65 nations, including the USA which was not in the League, signed the Kellogg Briand Pact agreeing to reject war as a means of achieving political aims.* *Of course there were also failures in the 1920s. In 1923, Italy attacked the Greek island of Corfu after a dispute involving some of its troops. At first the League of Nations ruled against Italy but the Italian leader Mussolini forced the League back down. The League also failed to achieve one of its main aims, international*	**7–8**

	disarmament. *So on balance the attempts at international co-operation in the 1920s and 1930s were mixed, with some successes and some failures.*	
Level 3 • Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 3 answers will typically cover one aspect of the argument supported with description and explanation that is directly relevant to the issue in the question e.g. *In many ways international co-operation was very successful. The most obvious example was the League of Nations. During the 1920s the League was able to sort out several disputes. For example, in 1921 the League successfully resolved a dispute between Germany and Poland over Upper Silesia. The League also succeeded in stopping a dispute between Bulgaria and Greece in 1925. The League also did really important work in other fields. For example, the League's Refugee Committee succeeded in returning over 400,000 displaced persons to their homes after the First World War.*	**5–6**
Level 2 • Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the issue in the question e.g. *The League of Nations was the most important attempt at international co-operation in the 1920s.It had an assembly and a council and these were used to discuss international disputes.*	**3–4**
Level 1 • Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g. *The League of Nations was set up in 1919 and was based in Geneva.*	**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the policies of Neville Chamberlain in the period 1937–1939? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the events of 1937–1939 to support your answer.

Assessment Objectives	AO4 (a and d): Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. [20] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
Additional Guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	Level 5 answers will typically contain fully developed analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g. *The comment is fair about Chamberlain being sincere. He was trying to prevent another war. He was especially worried that a new war would involve civilians more than any previous war, through bombing. It is also fair to say that Chamberlain also made miscalculations. The most obvious one was that when he returned from his meeting with Hitler in 1938 he talked about the piece of paper in his hand which would bring peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia and then went on to invade Poland.* *Churchill's view is supported by many other historians. In the Second World War journalists and historians wrote accounts of Chamberlain and his supporters and accused them of being responsible for the war, calling them 'The Guilty Men'. In the 1960s, during the Cold War, American politicians often referred back to the policy of appeasement saying that England fell asleep and used it to justify aggressive actions towards the USSR.* *On the other hand it could be argued that the comment is not fair. Many historians argue that Chamberlain did not miscalculate, he was playing for time. In 1938 intelligence reports suggested that Germany's air force was much larger and more advanced than Britain's. Historians have shown that this information was incorrect but they also argue that Chamberlain did not know it was incorrect so his policy made sense.* *Historians in the 1990s were able to use official government papers which were kept secret before then. These papers show that Britain was struggling financially. When Chamberlain was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1936 he began planning for Britain's rearmament. So historians say Chamberlain did not miscalculate he just found himself in a difficult position and running out of time. Historians in the 1990s have also used*	**21–25**

	government records to show that the government was very worried that the British people simply did not support going to war in 1938. Neither did Britain's Empire. By contrast, the British people did support the decision for war in 1939. *Finally, we have to be careful about accepting an account of events in the 1930s written by Winston Churchill. He was well known for glorifying his own role in history. He was also a marginalised and rejected figure in the 1930s and we can see his discontent in what he says about Chamberlain.*	
Level 4 • The response has a developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a fully supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	Level 4 answers will typically contain developed analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g. *The comment is fair about Chamberlain being sincere. He was trying to prevent another war. He was especially worried that a new war would involve civilians more than any previous war, through bombing. It is also fair to say that Chamberlain also made miscalculations. The most obvious one was trusting Hitler's promise to leave Czechoslovakia and Poland in peace which he broke.* *Churchill's view is supported by other historians. In the Second World War journalists and historians described Chamberlain and his supporters as 'The Guilty Men'. In the 1960s, during the Cold War, American politicians often referred back to the policy of appeasement saying that England fell asleep.* *On the other hand not all historians are critical of Chamberlain. Historians in the 1990s used government records to show that the government was very worried that the British people simply did not support going to war in 1938. Neither did Britain's Empire. By contrast, the British people did support the decision for war in 1939.* *Finally, we have to be careful about accepting an account of events in the 1930s written by Winston Churchill. He was well known for glorifying his own role in history and even said history would be kind to him because he would write it.*	**16–20**
Level 3 • The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied, and uses this to make a partially supported judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and	Level 3 answers will typically contain some accurate analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and support this with consideration of other interpretations to address the question e.g. *The comment is fair because Chamberlain did make miscalculations. After Munich in 1938 he said he had gained peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia.*	**11–15**

understanding that is relevant to the question.	*Also Churchill's comments might not be completely fair. Churchill was well known for emphasising his own achievements. By criticising Chamberlain, Churchill was emphasising his own qualities in leading Britain to victory in the Second World War. It is said that Churchill actually told US President Roosevelt that history would be kind because he would write the history.*	
Level 2 • The response has some analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and limited evaluation of other interpretations studied, and links this to a judgement of the given interpretation in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.	Level 2 answers will typically contain some analysis and evaluation of Interpretation A and its context and link this to considerations of other interpretations to address the question e.g. *The comment is fair because Chamberlain did make miscalculations. After Munich in 1938 he said he had gained peace in our time. Less than six months later Hitler broke his word and invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia.* OR *Churchill's criticisms of Chamberlain are not fair. By criticising Chamberlain, Churchill was emphasising his own qualities in leading Britain to victory in the Second World War. It is said that Churchill actually told US President Roosevelt that history would be kind because he would write the history.*	**6–10**
Level 1 • The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them. • The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points about Interpretation A accompanied by basic knowledge or a general statement about other interpretations e.g. *The comment is fair because Chamberlain trusted Hitler in 1937–1939 and he should have stood up to him at Munich.* OR *We cannot really say this comment is fair because Churchill was writing after the war and during the war many people criticised appeasement because it led to war.*	**1–5**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why not all historians and commentators have agreed with this interpretations. Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

Assessment Objectives	AO4 (a, b and c): Analyse individual interpretations and how and why interpretations differ. [5] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [3]
Additional Guidance	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response. The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a range of aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a thorough, detailed analysis of how the interpretations differ. • There is a fully supported and convincing analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. • Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically provide a full analysis of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with an analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g. *Gaddis argues that conflict between the USA and USSR was unavoidable at the end of the Second World War because the two sides simply could not see each other's' point of view although he also seems to say that the Western powers were innocent and that Stalin was to blame.* *Not all historians would agree with this interpretation of events. In the 1940s and 1950s Soviet historians effectively argued the exact opposite of what Gaddis was saying. They claimed that it was the USA which was the aggressive power. Many Soviet historians were Communists, and even if they were not, the tight control of universities and publications in the USSR would have ensured Soviet historians criticism of the USA's actions. For example they argued that that the development of the atomic bomb, and Truman's attempts to intimidate Stalin with the bomb at the Potsdam Conference, prove that it was the USA not the USSR which was the aggressor.* *On the other hand historians in the USA in the late 1940s and 1950s would have taken a very different view. In the period after the Second World War, the USA was gripped by a Red Scare, a fear of Communism. In this climate US historians pointed to the way Stalin took control of Eastern Europe in the years 1945–1948 and claimed that he was planning to extend Soviet control into western Europe.* *However, by the 1960s some US historians were painting a slightly different picture of the Cold War which would have disagreed with what Gaddis says. By the later 1960s many American historians had become disillusioned about their own country as a*	**9-10**

	result of the Vietnam War. This made them look again at the actions of their own country in the early stages of the Cold War and argue that the USA was at least partly to blame, and even mainly to blame. According to this view, big business and military commanders joined together in aggressive policies because they gained from it through arms contracts and a well-supplied army. *By the 1990s and 2000s the situation in Russia and the USA had changed with the ending of the Cold War. Many historians gained access to archive sources, especially in the USSR, and these revealed that the Cold War was, to a great extent, the result of misunderstanding and mistrust. Each side was fearful of the other and so over-reacted to actions by the other side. So this view is similar to the view of Interpretation A, although not as critical of Stalin.*	
Level 4 • The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts some aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce an analysis of how the interpretations differ. • There is a supported analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. • Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 4 answers will typically provide an analysis of one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with an analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g. *Gaddis argues that conflict between the USA and USSR was unavoidable at the end of the Second World War and he also seems to say that the Western powers were innocent and that Stalin was to blame.* *Not all historians would agree with this interpretation of events. In the 1940s and 1950s Soviet historians effectively argued the exact opposite of what Gaddis was saying. They claimed that it was the USA which was the aggressive power. For example, they argued that the use of the atomic bomb on Japan was to intimidate the USSR. They also argued that the formation of NATO in 1949 was an aggressive act by the USA.* *On the other hand historians in the USA in the late 1940s and 1950s would have taken a very different view. In the period after the Second World War the USA was gripped by a Red Scare, a fear of Communism. In this climate US historians pointed to the way Stalin took control of Eastern Europe even though people there generally did not support Communist parties.* *However, by the 1960s some US historians were painting a slightly different picture of the Cold War which would have disagreed with what Gaddis says. By the later 1960s many American historians, like many American people, had become disillusioned about their own country as a result of the Vietnam War. This made them look again at the actions of their own country and argue that the USA was at least partly to blame. For example, American historians argued that the network of US military bases around*	**7-8**

	the world, supposedly to counter the threat of Communism, were actually a form of American imperialism.	
Level 3 • The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of other interpretations studied, to produce a partial analysis how the interpretations differ. • There is some analysis of why the given interpretation and other interpretations differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. • Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 3 answers will typically provide an analysis of more than one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, with a partial analysis of why these interpretations differ, e.g. *The Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would certainly not have agreed with Interpretation B. They said the USSR was not responsible and was defending itself by supporting Communist regimes in Poland, Czechoslovakia and other states. They also said the USA caused the Cold War by actions like the Marshall Plan which they said was designed to give the USA dominance over Europe.* *However, some historians would agree with Interpretation B. George Kennan had been a US diplomat in the years after the Second World War and had been involved in drawing up the Marshall Plan. He later became a historian and his experiences led him to write books which criticised Soviet actions but he also criticised US leaders.*	**5-6**
Level 2 • The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ. • There is a basic explanation of why the given interpretation and the other interpretation(s) differ, explained in terms of when the interpretations were created and their place within the wider historical debate. • Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 2 answers will typically provide an analysis of more than one aspect of Interpretation B and compare this with other interpretations of the same events in different ways, e.g. *Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would not have agreed with Interpretation B. Historians and all other writers were controlled by the state so they would have argued that the USA was to blame.* *However, some American historians at the same time would have agreed. In the late 1940s America was gripped by McCarthyism and saw the USA as a threat. They argued that the USSR was trying to take over Europe and the rest of the world.*	**3-4**

Level 1 • The response compares the candidate's own knowledge and understanding to the interpretation, or uses knowledge and understanding of the time in which it was created, to analyse the given interpretation. • There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations. • Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.	Level 1 answers will typically provide a comparison between contextual knowledge and Interpretation B and argue the source was meant to provide information, e.g. *Soviet historians who were writing in the late 1940s and early 1950s would not have agreed with Interpretation B because they were controlled by the state. But others would agree because of how the USSR took over most of Eastern Europe after the war.*	**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG) mark scheme

High performance ***4–5 marks***	• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate
Intermediate performance ***2–3 marks***	• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate
Threshold performance ***1 mark***	• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate
No marks awarded ***0 marks***	• The learner writes nothing • The learner's response does not relate to the question • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning

Assessment Objectives (AO) grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	SPaG	Marks
1	5					5
2	5	5				10
3	5			20	5	30
4	2	3		5	5	15
Total	17	8		25	10	60

BLANK PAGE