OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE

History A (Explaining the modern world)

Unit **J410/02**: International Relations: the changing international order 1918–c.2001 with Germany 1925–55: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

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

Annotations

Stamp	*Description*
✓ 1	Level 1
✓ 2	Level 2
✓ 3	Level 3
✓ 4	Level 4
✓ 5	Level 5
SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	Not answered question
~~	Extendable horizontal wavy line
	Blank Page

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.

USING THE MARK SCHEME

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

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.

Candidates’ answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of 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.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

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

1. Outline the impact of the worldwide economic depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s.

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 should also be credited.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 • The 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.	Please see following page	**4–5**
Level 2 • The 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.		**2–3**
Level 1 • The response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.		**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

1. Outline the impact of the worldwide economic depression on international relations in Europe in the 1930s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically outline how the depression led to worsening international relations supported by at least one example e.g. *The Great Depression led to worsening international relations as countries followed more aggressive foreign policies. This was because countries were struggling economically. Important powers like Italy tried to expand and looked for new sources of raw materials by invading other nations. They believed this would help their economies revive, and give the public something to feel happy about. In Italy's case this led to the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935.* **Nutshell: Valid framing statement (see highlight) supported by one or more examples (higher mark for development or more examples)**	**4–5**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically outline one or more examples of the impact OR provide a framing statement without development e.g. *In 1935 Italy invaded Abyssinia. Mussolini believed that this would help the Italian economy recover from the depression as Abyssinia contained raw materials such as oil and tin.* *OR* *The Great Depression led to worsening international relations as countries followed more aggressive foreign policies.* **Nutshell: Describes example(s) of international impact** [Alternatively, candidates might refer to aggressive economic policies such as tariffs and duties or the calling in of loans, especially US loans to Germany, or the US even greater reluctance to involve itself in world affairs or support European sanctions. Do not credit Manchuria unless linked to League of Nations' response.] NOTE: Students may refer to worsening economic relations. For L3 this needs to link to political events.	**2–3**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more event with little or no reference to the impact of the depression on international relations e.g. *Germany suffered from high unemployment and debt* *Britain experienced high unemployment* *The Wall Street Crash meant the USA went bust*	**1**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Hitler came to power in Germany **Nutshell: Identifies impact of depression but national not international**	
Level 0		**0**

2. Explain why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s.

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 • The 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.	**Please see following page**	**9–10**
Level 4 • The 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.		**7–8**
Level 3 • The 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.		**5–6**
Level 2 • The 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.		**3–4**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 1 • The 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.		**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

2. Explain why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s and explain how these led to deeper involvement e.g. *The USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s for many reasons.* *One reason was the policy of containment. Many Americans believed that communism was evil and that China and Russia were trying to spread communism through Asia. They thought that if one county fell to communism, other countries would also fall like a row of dominoes. By 1965 the Vietcong were getting so much aid and military equipment from Russia and China, the USA believed that it had to send its own troops, or they feared the rebels would overthrow the government and the country would become communist. Sending aid and advisers was no longer enough.* *Another reason they got more involved was because they were worried about losing face. They got dragged in slowly from the 1950s until they got to a point in the 1960s where they couldn't pull back. Under Eisenhower in the 1950s they sent advisers and spent $2 billion helping the South Vietnam Government. However, because it was unpopular and corrupt they needed to help more to keep it in power, otherwise the communists would take over. Kennedy sent special forces and spent even more in the early 1960s, and then under Johnson it was as if they had reached the point of no return. When the South Vietnam government got too weak they felt they had to send troops or all they had spent would be for nothing which would be humiliating.* **Nutshell: Two reasons for involvement identified and explained.**	**9–10**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically identify at least one reason why the USA got more involved in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s and explain why/how it led to deeper involvement e.g. *One reason the USA got more involved was the policy of containment. Many Americans believed that communism was evil and that China and Russia were trying to spread communism through Asia. They thought that if one county fell to communism, other countries would also fall like a row of dominoes. By 1965 the Vietcong were getting so much aid and military equipment from Russia and China, the USA had to send their own troops or America feared they would overthrow the government and the country would become communist.* **Nutshell: Identifies reason(s) with one reason explained (explanation needs to be linked to Vietnam/South East Asia)** **NOTE: Answers at L4 may identify and attempt to explain several reasons but only be successful with one.**	**7–8**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify and describe one or more valid reasons but will not explain how the reason(s) led to deeper involvement.	**5–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	The USA got more involved for many reasons. The policy of containment was one reason. So was the "Military-Industrial complex". And then there was the weakness of the Diem government. This was the leadership of South Vietnam which was unpopular and corrupt at times. [Alternatively, candidates may focus on US support of military coup that murdered Ngo Dinh Diem; weakness of the AVRN; electioneering by Kennedy; Gulf of Tonkin incident; Kennedy wanted to look strong after Cuba; USA didn't want Communism to spread to protect its economy and trade]. **Nutshell: Identifies and describes reason(s) but fails to explain how it/they led to deeper involvement**	
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to US involvement in the war in Vietnam. *The US got involved first by sending aid and advisers to help Diem. The communists were attacking the government. Then they sent soldiers to attack the Vietcong after Diem was assassinated. America was trying to protect its interests.* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to Vietnam war e.g. *The Americans felt threatened* *America wanted to support their allies* **Nutshell: Unspecific points**	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the policy of appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement 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. **Candidates are not required to refer to specific historians or schools of thought but should be given credit within the level if they do so correctly.**

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.	**Please see following pages**	**21–25**
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.		**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 understanding that is relevant to the question.		**11–15**
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		**6–10**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.		
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		**1-5**
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 policy of appeasement? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement to support your answer.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically address the question through fully developed analysis and evaluation of specific elements of Interpretation A, supported by relevant references to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A *In Interpretation A Parker is criticising Chamberlain for the policy of appeasement. He calls him stubborn and he also says he was half hearted in opposing Hitler and should have done more to deter Hitler by standing up to him.* *This is not really a fair comment. Revisionist historians from the 1960s would not accept the idea that Chamberlain failed to stop Hitler because he was half hearted about opposing him. Revisionists argued that Chamberlain failed to oppose Hitler because he was constrained by Britain's poor financial situation and limited armed forces.* [Answers may refer to historians such as Dilks and Cameron Watt or use the term revisionist– this is not a requirement but should be credited] *OR* *In some ways, this is a fair comment as historians from the 1940s and 1950s would definitely agree. Parker says that Britain's attempts to block Hitler's expansion were half hearted and too late. The authors who wrote Guilty Men during the war thought that appeasement was a foolish and cowardly policy and in their own words 'The British Government did not exert itself to any great extent in the arming of our country, didn't do enough to prepare Britain for war'.* [Answers may refer to modern historians as post-revisionists, and those in the 1940s and 1950s as orthodox – this is not a requirement but should be credited] **Nutshell: Valid use of other interpretations or context (of A) to support OR challenge specific point(s) from Interpretation A** NOTE: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.	**21-25**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically address the question of fairness through valid use of other interpretation(s) or the context of Interpretation A. Answers at this level will not specify the aspect(s) of Interpretation A which they consider fair or unfair. *In Interpretation A Parker is criticising appeasement.* *Churchill and the Orthodox historians would say this is fair. Although Churchill did admit that Chamberlain was a good man he believed that Chamberlain showed poor judgement and failed to see what Hitler was really like. As a result appeasement encouraged Hitler.* **Nutshell: Valid use of other interpretation(s) or context (of A) to support / challenge the general premise of Interpretation A**	**16-20**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant factual knowledge OR undeveloped references to other interpretations to judge fairness e.g. *The comment is fair because it's true that Chamberlain and his government didn't want to build a barrier to Hitler's expansion. When Chamberlain chose not to help the Czechs defend the Sudetenland, and instead, agreed Hitler could have the territory, they were giving Hitler important industrial and military land: after it was gone the Czechs lost heart and were less able to defend against Hitler taking over the rest of their nation. He also refused to negotiate seriously with the Russians which is why in the end Stalin formed the Nazi-Soviet pact. If he had done this war might have been avoided as Hitler didn't want a war on two fronts in 1939.* *OR* *Parker is writing in 1993 and he is critical. I think this is fair because Cato would agree with this and be critical as well.* **Nutshell: Valid argument based on knowledge OR valid but undeveloped references to other interpretations to support / challenge the general premise of Interpretation A**	**11-15**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant interpretations without addressing the question of fairness e.g. *Parker's view is from the 1990s and he criticises appeasement. One interpretation about appeasement is from 'The Guilty Men' which says that Chamberlain was cowardly. The revisionists said that he was…* **Nutshell: Demonstrates knowledge of interpretations without explicitly addressing fairness of A** *NOTE: Cannot be based on a misunderstanding of interpretation.*	**6-10**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness *Parker thinks that appeasement was a bad idea.* *Parker thinks Chamberlain was stubborn* *The Interpretation is right. He says Chamberlain is stubborn and could have done more against Hitler. I agree.* *This is harsh. Lots of other historians disagree and think he had no choice.* **Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness** NOTE: Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A	**1-5**
Level 0		**0**

4. Study Interpretation B. Explain why **not** all historians and commentators agree with this interpretation. 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. [10] 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. Candidates are not required to refer to specific historians or schools of thought but should be given credit within the level if they do so correctly. Credit could be awarded within any level for candidates who explain (with valid support such as the new sources under the Public Records Act) that some historians **have** agreed with the interpretation.

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. • The 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.	Please see following page(s)	**17–20**
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.		**13–16**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
• The 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 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. • The 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.		**9–12**
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. • The 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.		**5–8**
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. • The 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.		**1–4**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

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

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from two or more periods have disagreed with Interpretation B and **explain the reason(s) for differences for at least one of them** *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B.* *Paterson is saying that the responsibility for the Cold War should be shared as both the USA and the USSR were to blame. But in the 1940s through to the early 1960s most US historians blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA, and criticised it for trying to spread communist ideas across the world. However, most of these commentators were heavily influenced by feelings of Red Scare which were so strong in the 1950s, and so were unwilling to consider any explanations for the Cold War unless it blamed Russia. Some of these people had also been involved in the events they wrote about, as senior US officials or advisers, so they were less likely to criticise their own government or their own actions.* [References to Kennan and Feis could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level. Equally labelling Paterson's view as post-revisionist is worthy of credit.] *In the same way, some historians writing since the end of the Cold War would disagree. Since the Soviet archives were opened and lots more sources became available a number of historians have again criticised Russia, and Stalin in particular, for causing the Cold War. When Reagan was President in the 1980s he was aggressive in his actions and speech against the USSR, calling it an evil empire, and some historians in the early 1990s seem to have been influenced by this attitude. Not surprisingly, as historians often find what they are looking for, they found evidence in the Soviet archives to blame Russia again.* **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two or more periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one is different (probably based on context or the evidence used by the historian).** **NOTE 1: Marks can be awarded within level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.** **NOTE 2: If a candidate explains how and why only one view differs mark at bottom of L5**	**17–20**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **two or more periods** have disagreed with Interpretation B *Paterson is saying that the responsibility for the Cold War should be shared as both the USA and the USSR were to*	**13–16**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	blame. But in the 1940s through to the early 1960s most US historians blamed the Soviet Union, not the USA, and criticised it for trying to spread communist ideas across the world. [References to Kennan and Feis could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level.] *Other historians writing in the 1960s blamed the USA more. These historians said that the USA's 'get-tough' attitude with the Truman Doctrine made the Soviets feel threatened. They argue that the US was trying to create economic dominance with things like the Marshall Plan and that this threatened Stalin and provoked him to react. [References to Kolko or other revisionists* could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level.] **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two or more periods disagree** **NOTE: Marks can be awarded within the level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.**	
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically **explain how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **one period** have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B *It is true that not all historians would agree with Interpretation B. Paterson is saying that both Russia and the USA were responsible for the start of the Cold War. But during the 1950s many writers argued that the Cold War was caused by Russian aggression and expansion. They wanted to spread their influence across Europe and then Asia.* **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how view from one period would disagree** **Alternatively**, Level 3 answers may give valid reasons why historians from one or more periods disagree (or agree) but fail to explain how Soviet historians would not accept this view. Soviet historians would have faced pressures of censorship and control. If they were to criticise the USSR they might have lost their job or worse. **Nutshell: Valid reason(s) why view from one period(s) is different/similar but not how.**	**9–12**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify historian(s) or commentator(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why eg *Not all historians would agree with Interpretation B about America being equally to blame. The historians of the late 1940s would have disagreed.* *OR* *Historians in the 1940s in the USA blamed the Soviets. In the 1960s revisionist historians blamed the USA. Post revisionists*	**5–8**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	blamed both sides. **Nutshell: Lists historians / schools of thought but no valid development**	
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g. *Some people would disagree with Interpretation B because Russia was more to blame than the USA.* *Not all historians would agree because lots were really critical of the Russians. Others said it was mainly America's fault.* **Nutshell: General assertions** NOTE: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (ie not the views of other historians). This may well be phrased as 'other historians' but is in fact the candidate's own view using contextual knowledge.	**1–4**
Level 0 credit.		**0**

5. Describe denazification in Germany after the end of the Second World War.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
Additional Guidance	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of denazification should also be credited.

Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
N/A Points marking	*Denazification involved investigating Germans who had been members of the Party or had worked for them.(1) In the Western zones, all adults over the age of 18 had to complete a questionnaire detailing their past political activities and beliefs(+1)* *OR* *Many were tried and imprisoned (1).* OR *Denazification involved trying to root out Nazi ideas and thinking in Germany (1). The Soviet army tore down all symbols, flags and banners in their zone and it was illegal to display them (+1).* **<u>Possible alternative points</u>** Nuremberg Trials Control of the media – censorship and the destruction of books – textbooks, novels and poetry. Showing of film of concentration camps to enforce idea of collective responsibility	**2**

6. Explain why the Nazis persecuted some groups in Germany after 1933.

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 • The 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.	*Please see following pages*	**9–10**
Level 4 • The 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.		**7–8**
Level 3 • The 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.		**5–6**
Level 2 • The 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.		**3–4**
Level 1 • The 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.		**1–2**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

6. Explain why the Nazis persecuted some groups in Germany after 1933.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically identify two or more reasons for the Nazis' persecution of some groups after 1933 and explain them fully e.g. *The Nazis persecuted some groups because they believed they were inferior. The Nazis believed in the superiority of Aryan people over others and thought that groups like the Jews, gypsies and black people would pollute this 'master race' if they continued to exist within Germany and Germans associated with them. As a result, the Nazis passed laws limiting the rights of these groups to take part in society and even tried to annihilate the Jews and gypsies with a massive programme of extermination. The Nazis were anti-Semitic and racists and saw these groups as a threat so tried to drive them out and remove them through persecution.* *The Nazis also persecuted some groups because they saw them as a threat to their National Community. Homosexuals were a threat to family life: the Nazis believed that families should be heterosexual and have lots of children to rebuild Germany and make her great again. They also targeted people with mental and physical disabilities as they saw them as a burden on society because they needed help with everyday living. They even sterilised many of these people so that their genes would not weaken the master race in the future.* **Nutshell: Two reasons identified and explained.**	**9–10**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason for the Nazis' persecution of some groups after 1933 and explain it fully e.g. *The Nazis persecuted some groups because they believed they were inferior. The Nazis believed in the superiority of Aryan people over others and thought that groups like the Jews, gypsies and black people would pollute this 'master race' if they continued to exist within Germany and Germans associated with them. The Nazis were anti-Semitic and racists and saw these groups as a threat so tried to drive them out and remove them through persecution.* **Nutshell: One reason identified and explained** **At this level many candidates will try to explain more than one reason but only explain one to the required standard.**	**7–8**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify reason(s) for persecution without explaining them e.g. *The Nazis persecuted the Jews because they were racists.* The Nazis wanted to achieve a Volksgemeinschaft [Alternatively, candidates may focus on national unity – scapegoats such as the Jews help bind Germany together*;* political opponents – communists, members of the army with monarchist views; people who opposed Nazi ideology –	**5–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Swing Movement, Edelweiss Pirates or religious opponents – moral critics such as Niemoller/ Bonhoffer.] **Nutshell: One or more reasons identified but no explanation of why they are reasons.**	
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to persecution of some groups, or identifies groups persecuted e.g. *The Nazis built concentration camps and extermination camps. Some had gas chambers and the concentration camps forced people to work as slave labour very often* *OR The Nazis persecuted Jews and gypsies* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified.**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points or assertions e.g. *The Nazis passed new laws. They built camps.* **Nutshell: General points or unrelated events**	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

6. Study Sources A and B. Is one source more useful than the other about the lives of women in Nazi Germany?

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [10]
Additional Guidance	Analysis of a single source, no matter how thorough, cannot achieve more than the top mark in Level 2. For Level 3, a reasonable coverage of both sources and a balance between the treatment of sources is expected. No marks must be awarded for demonstration of knowledge and/or understanding in isolation, knowledge and understanding can only be credited where it is clearly and intrinsically linked to analysis of the source. 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 3 • The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the question about the sources.	*Please see following pages*	**7–10**
Level 2 • The response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources.		**3–6**
Level 1 • The response analyses the sources in a basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance and using this to give a simple answer to the question about the source(s).		**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7. Study Sources A and B. Is one source more useful than the other about the lives of women in Nazi Germany?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically make valid supported inferences about the usefulness of the source(s) as evidence about relevant aspects of the period. *Both of the sources are useful, but for different reasons.* *Source A is useful because it is a Nazi produced magazine and so shows historians how the Nazis saw women and how the Nazis wanted women to see themselves. The woman is clearly happy to stay at home and look after her child, while the man does the hard work in the field and protects his family from danger. According to the Nazis that was the 'natural' order, and women should embrace it and play their part in the Volksgemeinschaft. That the Nazis produced a magazine for women tells us they thought women were important in achieving a new society and needed them onside.* [Alternatively, candidates might argue that the source is useful as an example of how the Nazis used propaganda to appeal to women or reinforce their views about women] *Source B is useful because it shows that not everyone was happy with the Nazi view of women, or at least, the success of their propaganda about marriage. These letter-writers were complaining that women have 'aimless' lives, and they seem critical of 'vague hopes' of marriage, at a time when men didn't value women or want to get married. They are either criticising the Nazis for not doing enough to encourage men to get married, or they are criticising the Nazis for making women feel hopeless and aimless, possibly because they are told that marriage should be their aim. Either way, it is useful for seeing how some women felt, and to note that they were prepared to voice criticisms publicly which is a bit surprising in a police state!* [Alternatively candidates may argue that the source is useful as evidence about the impact of Nazi policies on women.] **Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on valid supported inferences** NOTE: Inferences can be based on the content of the source(s) or from the fact of its publication Note: one valid supported inference is maximum of 8 marks	**7–10**
Level 2	<u>Level 2 answers will typically make valid unsupported inferences about the usefulness of the source(s) as evidence about relevant aspects of the period eg</u> *Source A is useful because it shows what the Nazis thought the role of women was. Source B is useful because it tells us not all women were happy with the situation in Germany under the Nazis.* **Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on unsupported inferences** NOTE: Unsupported inference(s) from one source = 5 marks <u>Alternatively Level 2 answers will make valid comments on the usefulness of the source(s) by evaluating reliability e.g.</u>	**3–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	Source B is more useful because A is simply propaganda. A was produced by the Nazi party and is naturally trying to persuade women to accept the role in life they think they should have. Source B doesn't seem biased as they are writing in a letter to a newspaper and taking a risk by criticising the Nazis so it is clearly their genuine opinion. **Nutshell: Usefulness of source(s) based on reliability** NOTE: Answers which criticise or dismiss the usefulness of the sources capped at 4 marks	
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically assert the usefulness of the content or provenance or make a simple comparison *Source A is more useful because it is the Nazis themselves producing it.* *Source B is more useful because it is a criticism.* *OR* *A is a magazine that was made at the time and B is useful because it tells us women are lonely* *Both are useful but for different things. Source A shows the Nazis produced magazines for women focusing on the home and children. Source B is useful as its shows that women were complaining that men weren't getting married enough* NOTE: In this level, answers may focus almost entirely on one of the two sources.] Nutshell: Valid comparison of selected extracts	**1–2**
Level 0	Level 0 answers will typically fail to make any comparison of the sources e.g. summarising each one.	**0**

8.* 'The Nazis were only able to take power because of the impact on Germany of the worldwide economic depression'. How far do you agree with this statement?

Assessment Objectives	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
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. Answers at Level 4 require one point on each side of the argument and one element of support. Answers with more valid support than this should be awarded L5. 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 • The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question. • This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • *There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.*	*Please see following pages*	**15–18**
Level 4 • The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question. • This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • *There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.*		**11–14**
Level 3 • The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question. • This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • *There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.*		**7–10**
Level 2 • The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set. • This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.		**4–6**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
• *There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.*		
Level 1 • The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially or the answer may be in the form of assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer. • There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • *The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.*		**1–3**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

8.* 'The Nazis were only able to take power because of the impact on Germany of the worldwide economic depression'. How far do you agree with this statement?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument which uses a range of supporting evidence to support the argument being made, e.g. *The statement is true. The worldwide depression had a devastating effect on Germany. Businesses collapsed as trade shrank and the US recalled loans: by the end of 1932 there were six million unemployed. The Nazis' Twenty-Five Points had a special appeal to those most vulnerable to the depression, offering them work and bread. Not surprisingly the unemployed were attracted to them and in the elections of 1930 and 1932 the Nazis increased their seats in the Reichstag dramatically. Weimar's politicians were also unable to work together to help the people through the problems of the depression and to deal with the lawlessness and disorder on the streets. The Nazis appeared capable of bringing order to this chaos, with ranks of uniformed SA and SS giving the impression of discipline and organisation which increased support at the ballot box.* *On the other hand, not everyone was taken in by the Nazis promises in the depression and you could argue that a more important factor was negative cohesion, in other words, people supported the Nazis as they hated the same things as them. As Nazi support increased in the depression so did that of the communists, who also offered extreme solutions to the nation's problems. Many in the middle class were really worried about this so supported the Nazis, as they feared a communist revolution would rob them of their wealth, farms and businesses. Newspaper owners and Germany's elites were particularly supportive because of this, and gave the Nazis money, publicity and in 1933, encouraged Hindenburg to appoint him as Chancellor, crucial for the Nazi takeover.* *However, had it not been for the depression and people's desperation, it is less likely the communists would have been so successful, so because this factor was energised by the depression, it really comes back to the fact that it was this which was the main reason the Nazis took power, inceasing their support and forcing Hindenburg's hand.* **Nutshell: Balanced argument with two explained points on each side OR two explained points on one side and one point on other side** **NOTE:** **18 marks = As below plus a clinching argument** **16-17 marks = 4 explained points (3-1 or 2-2)** **15 marks = 3 explained points (2-1)**	**15–18**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided argument with support from at least two valid examples e.g. *The statement is true. The worldwide depression had a devastating effect on Germany. Businesses collapsed as trade shrank and the US recalled loans: by the end of 1932 there were six million unemployed. The Nazis' Twenty-Five Points had a special appeal to those most vulnerable to the depression, offering them work and bread: the work was in the army, rearming and in public work schemes. Not surprisingly the unemployed were attracted to them and in the elections of 1930 and 1932 the Nazis increased their seats in the Reichstag dramatically. This led to Hindenburg and von Papen inviting Hitler to become Chancellor. Weimar's politicians were also unable to work together to help the people through the problems of the depression and to deal with the lawlessness and disorder on the streets. The Nazis appeared capable of bringing order to this chaos, with ranks of uniformed SA and SS giving the impression of discipline and organisation which increased support at the ballot box and increased their chances of being offered power.* OR *The statement is true. The worldwide depression had a devastating effect on Germany as businesses collapsed: by the end of 1932 there were six million unemployed. Weimar's politicians were unable to work together to help the people through the problems and by 1932 democracy had broken down and there was chaos on the streets. The Nazis' Twenty-Five Points had a special appeal to those most vulnerable to the depression and in the elections of 1930 and 1932 they increased their number of seats in the Reichstag as support grew. This led to Hindenburg and von Papen inviting Hitler to become Chancellor.* *On the other hand, not everyone was taken in by the Nazis promises and you could argue that a more important factor was fear of communism. As Nazi support increased in the depression so did that of the communists, who also offered extreme solutions to the nation's problems. Many in the middle class were really worried about this, as they feared a communist revolution would rob them of their wealth, so they supported the Nazis, increasing their chances of being offered power.* **Nutshell: One sided (two explained points of support); or balanced argument (one explained point of support on each side)** **14 marks- reserve for clinching argument**	**11–14**
Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument with support from one valid example e.g. *The statement is true. The worldwide depression had a devastating effect on Germany. Businesses collapsed as trade shrank and the US recalled loans: by the end of 1932 there were six million unemployed. The Nazis' Twenty-Five Points had* a special appeal to those most vulnerable to the depression, *offering them work and bread: the work was in the army, rearming*	**7–10**

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
	and in public work schemes. Not surprisingly the unemployed were attracted to them and in the elections of 1930 and 1932 the Nazis increased their seats in the Reichstag dramatically. **Nutshell: One sided argument, one explained point of support** **NOTE: Many answers at L3 will attempt a balanced answer and a wider range of support but only achieve one valid explanation**	
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically describe the depression and/or identify other reasons why the Nazis came to power e.g. *A more important reason was Hitler's leadership of the Nazi Party (or the fear of communism, the desire to overturn the Treaty of Versailles, action of the elites, Nazi election campaign etc.).* OR *The depression hit Germany hard and over 6 million were unemployed by 1932.* **Nutshell: relevant events/developments but not explaining how it helped the Nazis take power**	**4–6**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions e.g. The depression was important. Nazi support went up. **Nutshell: General assertions**	**1–3**
Level 0		**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

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 2018