



GCE

History A

Y253/01: The Cold War in Europe 1941-1995

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2019

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 2019

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

| Annotation | Meaning of annotation |
|---|--|
| BP | Blank Page |
| | Highlight |
| Off-page comment | |
| A | Assertion |
| AN | Analysis |
| EVAL | Evaluation |
| EXP | Explanation |
| F | Factor |
| ILL | Illustrates/Describes |
| IRRL | Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question |
| J | Judgement |
| KU | Knowledge and understanding |
| P | Provenance |
| SC | Simple comment |
|  | Unclear |
| V | View |

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

MARK SCHEME Section A

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| 1* | <p>Assess the causes of the Berlin blockade of 1948-1949.</p> <p>In arguing that Soviet fears of the creation of an independent West German State were the main reason for the blockade, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stalin’s frustrations about the creation of Bizonia and Trizonia and the likelihood that these could form the basis of a West German state. • The break-down of the London Conference of 1947, which put an end to any hope of four-power control in Germany. • The second London Conference of 1948, to which Stalin was not invited, which set the ball in motion towards a new West German state. <p>The new constitution of 1948, on which Stalin was not consulted.</p> <p>In arguing that economic factors were a significant reason for the blockade answers might consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The currency reform of 1948, with the new <i>Deutschmark</i> being introduced without consultation with Stalin. The need to protect East Germany from a flood of the old currency was Stalin’s justification for launching the blockade. • The economic policies pursued in the western zones, such as ceasing reparations and re-industrialisation which Stalin believed violated the terms of the Potsdam agreement and threatened the security of the USSR. • | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement on the importance of causes. • At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge causes. • 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>In arguing that other reasons were more significant, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The long term tensions over the future of Germany that dated back to the Second World War and pre-dated any allied plans to create an independent West German state. • The symbolic importance of West Berlin as well as its strategic significance, making it a natural flashpoint for conflict between the USSR and the West. • Stalin’s wider concerns about the policies of the USA and the West, particularly his anger about the introduction of Marshall Aid 1947-8. • The attitude of the Allies towards Stalin, which had arguably become more hostile and provocative, for example Churchill’s ‘iron curtain’ speech, the doctrine of containment and their increasing refusal to negotiate with the USSR. | | |
| 2.* | | <p>‘The USSR’s aims in the Cold War in Europe remained the same throughout the period 1956-1984.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>In arguing that the USSR’s aims stayed the same, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commitment of the USSR to preserving the Warsaw Pact, evidenced in events in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia and epitomised in the Brezhnev Doctrine. • Continued commitment to the economic, political and socio-cultural policies of the USSR being pursued in its satellite states. • The commitment of the USSR to preserving post-war territorial boundaries in Europe. • The desire to limit the power of West Germany as far as | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected. • At Level 5 there will be judgement as to the extent of change. • At level 5 answers might establish criteria against which to judge change. • 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>possible and preserve the integrity and strength of East Germany.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of Soviet policy as primarily defensive rather than expansionist through this period. • Continued participation in the arms race and space race through the period. <p>In arguing that the USSR's aims changed, answers might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The period of détente in relations with the West that occurred after the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, coming to an end with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. • The attempt to de-escalate the arms race in the 1960s and 1970s, which then re-escalated in response the actions of the USA. • An increased focus on attaining security through diplomacy and treaties through the middle of the period in question, bookended by more isolationist aims in the earlier and later parts of the period in question. • Fluctuations in policy over Germany, for example, in the early part of the period, pursuing potential reunification before confirming division through the construction of the Berlin Wall, and from 1969 onwards engaging in <i>Ostpolitik</i>. • The decision to intervene in Afghanistan in 1979. • Differences of aims and priorities of the different Soviet leaders during this period. | | |
| <p>3.</p> | | <p>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</p> <p>'Nothing that happened during the end of the Cold</p> | <p>20</p> | <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. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>War [1984-1995] was planned.”</p> <p>From: A. Brown, ‘Gorbachev, Reagan and the End of the Cold War’, <i>History Today Volume 64, Issue 9</i> (September 2014)</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 extent to which the end of the Cold War and the series of events associated with the collapse of communism and the USSR were planned or ‘masterminded’ by particular leaders of groups, or whether they were unplanned and/or unexpected.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the interpretation, answers might consider that Brown characterises the events which collectively signalled the end of the Cold War as entirely unexpected and accidental. Answers might consider the use of the word ‘nothing’, implying that all the major players may have been taken by surprise by the course of events, and none had an efficacious role in planning the demise of the Cold War.</p> <p>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The very rapid collapse of communist control in Eastern Europe, which took many political leaders and segments of the wider population by surprise. • The importance of popular protest, which was often very spontaneous, in the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. • The atomised nature of the collapse of communism, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • 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. • Candidates are not required to construct their own interpretation. |
|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>which while forming something of a ‘domino effect’, occurred differently in all the countries with communist regimes and all the member states of the USSR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gap between Gorbachev’s reformist intentions and the ultimate consequence of his policies. • The fact the Reagan’s desire to ‘win’ the Cold War was also accompanied by an expectation that the USSR itself would survive. • The rapidity of the collapse of the USSR and its transition away from a communist political and economic system. • The seemingly unpredictable and possibly impulsive actions of Yeltsin during the crises that led to the demise of the USSR. <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 military policies of Reagan, which sought to escalate the arms race to a point where the USSR could not keep up. • The planned and intentional process of increasing pressure on the USSR from a variety of angles after the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. • The new détente of 1985-88. • Gorbachev’s far-reaching economic and political reforms and his decision to abandon the Brezhnev Doctrine. • The long-term pressure on Soviet control in Eastern Europe that was planned and executed by Lech Walesa and <i>Solidarity</i> in Poland. • The decisions taken by Yeltsin to resist hardline communists and accept the dismantling of the USSR. • Kohl’s importance in leading the reunification of Germany. | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interpretations which do not see the end of the Cold War as unplanned, and give credit to one or more major players for intentionally causing the events which brought it to an end (for example, particularly, Reagan or Gorbachev, but also in some cases Yeltsin, Kohl (in Germany), Lech Walesa/Solidarity).• Interpretations which may not see the end of the Cold War as masterminded by a particular individual, but nonetheless do not see it as entirely unexpected nor its individual component parts as entirely unplanned/unintentional.• Interpretations which see protest movements in Eastern Europe as central to the collapse of communism, and whilst not necessarily centrally planned and coordinated, see the actions of individuals and smaller groups involved as entirely intentional in terms of the outcome they hoped to achieve. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

APPENDIX 1 – this contains a generic mark scheme grid

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <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)
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

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 2019

