

GCE

History A

Unit : Y223/01 The Cold War in Europe 1941 - 1995

Advanced GCE

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

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Which of the following had the greater impact on the development of the Cold War in the years 1956-1984? (i) The Arms Race (ii) The Space Race Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</p> <p>In dealing with the Arms Race answers might consider its importance in precipitating the crisis over Cuba in 1962 and the second cold war of 1979 onwards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the importance of America's development of long-distance missile technology such as Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), nuclear submarine technology and Cruise and Pershing Missiles, in shifting the balance of the Cold War. • Answers might also consider the de-escalation of the Arms Race in the late 1960s and 1970s due to détente, and that Mutually Assured Destruction to some extent protected the status quo. <p>In dealing with the Space Race answers might consider the propaganda implications of developments in space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the implications that the Space Race had for the arms race, in terms of potentially allowing the weaponising of space. • Answers might also consider the relatively slow pace of change in space technology and the limited practical impact as compared to the Arms Race. 	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. • Only credit material relevant to question. • Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable. • 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.
1	(b)*	Assess the reasons for the absence of a reconciliation	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected.

		<p>between the USSR and the West in Europe in the years 1946-1955.</p> <p>In assessing the reasons, answers may argue that political divisions were to blame,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the imposition of communist rule on Eastern Europe and the ‘iron curtain’ this created between East and West. • Answers might consider the role of Cominform in creating an Eastern European ‘bloc’. • Answers might consider American commitment to Containment. • Answers might consider the fundamental incompatibility of each side’s political ambitions and ideologies. <p>In assessing other reasons,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the lack of will on both sides to reconcile due to long-running ideological differences, disagreements in the years leading up to 1946, and the conviction on both sides that the other was an aggressor. • Answers might consider the personalities of the leaders of the main powers, particularly the role of Truman and Stalin, who was growing increasingly suspicious and paranoid. • Answers might consider the economic divisions which occurred as a result of the US Marshall Plan, Stalin’s refusal to allow Eastern European satellite states to accept this, and the formation of Comecon. • Answers might consider the military divisions which occurred, with the USSR and its satellite states and the West forming two rival blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At higher levels candidates will focus on ‘assess’, but at Level 4 may simply list the reasons. • At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the relative importance of the reasons. • At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge the reasons • To be valid judgements, claims 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.
--	--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the escalation of the arms race left both sides vulnerable and therefore committed to continue developing both conventional and atomic weapons. • Answers might consider the impact of crises, particularly the crisis over Berlin in 1948-9, which made reconciliation increasingly unlikely. • Answers might consider a range of political, economic, military and ideological factors, and consider both long and short term reasons. 		
2	(a)		Which of the following had a greater impact on the	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected

		<p>division of Europe in the years 1946-1955? (i) Economic policies: The Marshall Plan and Comecon (ii) Military policies: NATO and the Warsaw Pact Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).</p> <p>In dealing with economic policies, answers might consider the suspicion created by America’s introduction of the Marshall Plan, which prompted Stalin to escalate Soviet control of the East.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the very different models of economic development which ensued from the Marshall Plan and Comecon, which created very real differences between East and West Europe. • Answers might also consider that the Marshall Plan was offered to Eastern European countries, and that some economic and trading links still remained. <p>In dealing with military policies, answers might consider the significance of defensive alliances in creating to rival blocs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the impact of NATO and the Warsaw Pact on militarising allies of the USA and USSR due to the presence of military bases. • Answers might consider that the formation of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact were arguably responses to existing divisions, rather than a cause of them. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement must be supported by relevant and accurate material. • Only credit material relevant to question. • Answers may deal with each factor in turn, then compare them to reach a judgement, or take a continually comparative approach. Either approach is acceptable. • 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.
2.	(b)*	‘The main reason why Eastern Europe failed to mount	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected.

		<p>any effective opposition to Soviet rule in the years 1956-1984 was because resistance movements were divided and weak.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing that the main reason for a lack of effective opposition was division and weakness amongst resistance movements,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider the uncoordinated nature of protests in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968), which made them easy to crush. • Answers might consider the difficulties of most opposition movements and groups in mounting effective armed resistance (for example there was no armed resistance in Czechoslovakia in 1968). • Answers might consider the lack of economic resources available to opposition movements. • Answers might consider the relatively small scale and informal nature of most opposition groups and parties. • Answers might consider the lack of coordination between opposition movements and parties in different countries. <p>In arguing that other reasons were more important,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might consider examples of strong and coordinated opposition movements, for example Solidarity in Poland. • Answers might consider the strength of the Soviet Army, which was used effectively to crush opposition in Poland (1956), Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968). • Answers might consider the apparatus of state security, such as secret police, suspension of human rights and the imposition of martial law at times of opposition activity. • t Answers might consider the nature of the 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At higher levels candidates will focus on ‘how far’, but at Level 4 may simply list the reasons. • At Level 5 and above there will be judgement as to the relative importance of the reasons. • At higher levels candidates might establish criteria against which to judge the reasons. • To be valid judgements, claims 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>communist political systems set up in Eastern Europe, which made opposition illegal, and the weaknesses and miscalculations of Eastern European political leaders who sought change, such as Imre Nagy in Hungary and Alexander Dubcek of Czechoslovakia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers might consider the commitment to communism among large numbers of the population in most Eastern European countries.• Answers might consider the lack of support from the West for opposition movements and activity.		
--	--	--	---	--	--

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 Question 1(a) and Question 2(a): Which of the following? [10]
Level 6 9–10 marks	Both factors are thoroughly analysed and evaluated using accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a developed and substantiated judgement in relation to the question.
Level 5 7–8 marks	Both factors are analysed and evaluated using generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, in order to reach a substantiated judgement in relation to the question.
Level 4 5–6 marks	Both factors are analysed and evaluated using relevant knowledge and understanding of key features of the period, however treatment of factors may be un-even with analysis and evaluation of one of the two being only partial. Analysis and evaluation is used to support a reasonable judgement in relation to the question.
Level 3 3–4 marks	Both factors are analysed and evaluated in a partial way, using some relevant knowledge of key features of the period, in order to make a basic judgement in relation to the question.
Level 2 2 marks	Limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a limited analysis or evaluation of both factors, and this is linked to a very simplistic judgement.
Level 1 1 mark	Very limited and generalised knowledge of the period is used to attempt a very limited analysis or evaluation of one of the factors. The other factor is either not considered or there is very limited information or description of the factor with no attempt to use this knowledge. If there is a judgement, this takes the form of assertion.
0 marks	Nothing of any relevance to the factors.

	<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 Question 1(b) and Question 2(b): Essay [20]
Level 6 17–20 marks	There is a consistent focus on the question throughout the answer. Accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated throughout the answer and is consistently evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated, developed and sustained judgements. There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent and logically structured. The information presented is entirely relevant and substantiated.
Level 5 13–16 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 10–12 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 7–9 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 4–6 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 1–3 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.

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

