GCSE (9–1)

History A (Explaining the Modern World)

J410/05: International Relations: the changing international order 1918-2001 with South Africa 1960-1994: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

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

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✔ 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

Subject–specific Marking Instructions

INTRODUCTION

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

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

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

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

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

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

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

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

Section A

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

1. Outline how international peace was encouraged in the 1920s.

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 how international peace was encouraged in the 1920s.

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	Level 3 answers will typically identify a way in which peace was encouraged and develop the answer e.g. *To encourage peace a League of Nations was created in the 1920s. Many countries joined to try and keep peace through talking about disputes rather than resorting to violence. Countries made agreements between themselves to avoid a repetition of the First World War which had killed millions.* *The League of Nations encouraged peace by resolving disputes. A good example of this working was the dispute between Sweden and Finland over the Aaland Islands in 1921, where the case was brought to the League who ruled that the islands belonged to Finland. Sweden accepted the decision and this encouraged peaceful solutions.* **Nutshell: Supported example of approach eg Agreement / League (4 marks) with how it encouraged peace (5 marks)** Development is most likely to involve the aims/reasons for or methods of the organization/action identified.	**4–5**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify one or more example(s) of international peace being encouraged in the 1920s e.g. A League of Nations was created (2) to sort out disputes (3) Countries made treaties (2) Countries started to disarm (2) They agreed the Locarno treaty (3) (to get L3 needs how it would promote peace - some support about Locarno and / or Locarno being part of wider pattern of co-operation). Trade was encouraged to foster better relations (2) **Nutshell: Identifies example(s) of how peace was encouraged**.	**2–3**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more event with little or no reference to encouraging international peace, or respond very generally e.g. *Countries agreed to keep the peace.*	**1**
Level 0		**0**

2. Explain why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949.

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**
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 and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949.
2. Explain why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two reasons why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany and explain them fully e.g. *One reason the USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949 was that they could not agree on how to deal with Germany after the Second World War. Stalin wanted to force Germany to pay massive reparations for all the damage done to the USSR during the war but President Truman believed this would make a repeat of war more likely, just like after the First World War. Stalin became concerned that the USA was trying to build up Germany as an ally against the USSR.* *Another reason that they clashed over Germany was due to the Berlin Blockade. In 1948 Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin, which was occupied by the Allies but deep inside Soviet-occupied East Germany. Stalin was trying to force the Allies out, but they responded by transporting huge amounts of supplies to West Berlin by plane in what became known as the Berlin Airlift.* **Nutshell: Two reasons for problems identified and explained.** **NB: 2 threshold answers – 9 marks**	**9–10**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically identify one reason why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany and explain it fully e.g. *The USA and USSR clashed over Germany between 1945 and 1949 because they could not agree on how to deal with Germany after the Second World War. Stalin wanted to force Germany to pay massive reparations for all the damage done to the USSR during the war but President Truman blocked this. Stalin became concerned that the USA was trying to build up Germany as an ally against the USSR.* *THRESHOLD ANSWERS* *One reason was they couldn't agree on how to deal with Germany after the war. Stalin wanted Germany to pay huge reparations, but Truman blocked this. This caused a clash.* *Another reason that they clashed was due to the Berlin Blockade. In 1948 Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin which was occupied by the Allies to try to force them out. They responded by transporting supplies to West Berlin by plane.* **Nutshell: One reason for problems identified and explained.** **NB: 1 threshold answer – 7 marks**	**7–8**

Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically identify or describe at least one reason why the USA and USSR clashed over Germany. e.g. *Berlin was a source of tension between 1945 and 1949 because it was deep inside the Soviet zone of occupation but the Allies controlled the West of the city. The Allies had pumped large amounts of money into West Berlin to rebuild it but the East of Berlin remained poor.* *Truman thought that Stalin's desire for reparations would make Germany want revenge.* *Stalin thought Truman wanted to build Germany up as an ally against Russia.* *Stalin wanted Germany weak, the USA wanted to help build it up.* *The USA, Britain and France united the currency in their zones and Stalin was furious.* *Berlin was deep in the Soviet zone and Stalin resented western influence there.* **Nutshell: Identifies and describes reason(s) but fails to explain how it/they led to a clash**	**5–6**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events linked to the USA and USSR clashing over Germany e.g. *In 1947 the British and Americans merged their zones of occupation in West Germany to become Bizonia. The following year Stalin blocked off access to West Berlin, which was in the Soviet zone.* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified**	**3–4**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g. *After the war Germany was split into four parts.* *They clashed over Berlin.* **Nutshell: Unspecific points**	**1–2**
Level 0		**0**

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is a fair comment on the reasons why the Cold War began? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the early stages of the Cold War to support your answer.

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

Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
Level 5 • The response has a full and thoroughly developed analysis and evaluation of the given interpretation and of other interpretations studied in order to make a convincing and substantiated judgement of the interpretations in the context of historical events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	**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 events studied to answer the question. • The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.		**6–10**
Level 1 • The response has a basic analysis of the given interpretation and evaluates it in terms of the question. Other interpretations may be mentioned but there is no analysis or evaluation of them. • The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question		**1-5**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.	.	**0**

3.

3. Study Interpretation A. Do you think this is this a fair comment on the reasons why the Cold War began? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of the early stages of the Cold War to support your answer.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by **developed use of two** other interpretations OR **developed use of one** other interpretation and evaluation of Interpretation A based on the context of A e.g *In Interpretation A Nettl is arguing that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War, however its actions were understandable and to an extent justifiable. He is claiming that by trying to take control of Eastern Europe and keep Germany weak Stalin was looking to protect the USSR rather than expand it.* *In many ways this is a fair comment. Recent post-revisionist historians would have shared Nettl's view as they see Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe as defensive. These historians see the origins of the Cold War as being the result of mistrust and misunderstanding between the two sides which resulted in a cycle of action and reaction. They agree that Stalin was to blame for some aspects, but argue that his actions were often misunderstood by the US, just as in this extract Nettl tries to explain Stalin's actions without criticising them.* *On the other hand other historians would disagree with Nettl, and place the blame for the Cold War mainly at the feet of the US. These revisionist historians argued that the USA caused the Cold War by trying to dominate Europe economically, with Marshall Aid and using its 'Open Door' policy. This was an attempt to give the US access to states it could dominate.* *[Candidates could argue that other historians would disagree with Nettl partly and blame the USSR for helping to cause the Cold War, but see its actions as premeditated and about wanting to spread revolution around the world.]* **Nutshell: Developed use of other interpretations or context (of A) to support/challenge Interpretation A** **NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.** **NOTE For L5 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair**	**21–25**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by **developed use of one** other interpretation or the context of Interpretation A eg *Interpretation A argues that Stalin caused the Cold War because he was trying to protect the USSR, not because he was acting aggressively. That is why he took control of Eastern Europe.* *In many ways this is a fair comment. Other historians in the 1980s and 90s agree he caused the Cold War because although he was acting defensively, his actions were misunderstood by the USA and they overreacted to him, thinking that he was looking for world revolution. This then led to a cycle of reaction and action which made the situation very tense.* *OR* *This is not a fair comment. Revisionist historians would not agree as they saw the USA's actions as to blame for the Cold War, not the USSR's. These historians believe the US was trying to spread its influence and power which is why it was willing to give Marshall Aid to Europe, as it would help its own economy to recover and strengthen ties with Europe. This aggravated Stalin who saw it as 'dollar imperialism'* **Nutshell: Developed use of ONE interpretation or context (of A) to support / challenge Interpretation A** **NOTE For L4 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair**	**16–20**

Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically argue that Interpretation A is fair/unfair supported by relevant factual knowledge OR undeveloped use of relevant interpretation(s) eg *The comment is fair that the USSR caused the Cold War because when it took steps to expand into Eastern Europe this was spreading Communism and was seen as aggressive by the United States. When Stalin used tactics like bringing Red Army soldiers into Eastern Europe, staging rigged elections and assassinating non-Communist politicians like in Czechoslovakia Stalin was being reckless and ignoring agreements made at Yalta. (use of relevant factual knowledge)* *OR* *This comment is fair that the USSR caused the Cold War because orthodox historians agree that it was the USSR who caused it by acting aggressively and expanding. (undeveloped use of relevant interpretation)* **Nutshell: Valid argument based on contextual knowledge OR valid but undeveloped use of interpretation(s)** **NOTE For L3 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation A they believe to be fair/unfair**	**11–15**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically describe interpretation(s) without explaining whether it/they support or contradict Interpretation A eg *Orthodox historians think that the Cold War was the result of aggressive expansion by the USSR. Revisionists blamed the USA more than the USSR because the USA provoked USSR with the Truman Doctrine.* **Nutshell: Describes interpretation(s) but fails to address question**	**6–10**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points about Interpretation A accompanied by basic knowledge or a general statement about other interpretations e.g. *Nettl is being fair. The USSR was at risk and wanted to protect itself.* OR *Interpretation A is not fair. Many historians would disagree with what Nettl has said.* **Nutshell: Shows understanding of A/unsupported assertions about fairness**	**1-5**
Level 0		**0**

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

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. • 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.		**13–16**
Level 3		**9–12**

• 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.		
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 have agreed with this interpretation. Use other interpretations and your knowledge to support your answer.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5	Level 5 answers will typically provide developed explanations of **how** historian(s) or commentator(s) from **two** periods have disagreed with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B and explain **why** at least <u>one of them</u> disagrees, eg *Taylor is arguing that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a mistake and that Chamberlain, through 'fear', simply encouraged Hitler to make more and more demands and so made war inevitable rather than preventing it.* *In the late 1930s, many commentators would have strongly disagreed with this view. Many people at the time saw Chamberlain's actions as keeping the peace. In a world that still remembered the horrors of the First World War and had seen the effects of modern warfare in the Spanish Civil War many commentators respected Chamberlain and viewed him as a hero. Most MPs approved of his actions and Chamberlain was cheered by the people when he returned from the Munich Conference. (How and Why)* *Writing in the late 1960s, many historians also shared the view that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a reasonable one and so they too would not have agreed with Interpretation B. By this time more documents had become available that demonstrated just how weak Britain was in the 1930s and Britain's failure in the Suez Crisis in the 1950s had shown standing up to dictators with military force could end in failure. (How and Why)* **Nutshell: Valid explanation of how views from two periods disagree, with explanation as to why at least one is different: HW H.** **NOTE For L5 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported**	**17–20**
Level 4	Level 4 answers will explain **how or why** historians from **two** different periods agree or disagree with particular aspect(s) of interpretation B. **OR** will explain **how and why** historians from **one** period agree or disagree. *Not all historians and commentators shared Taylor's view that Chamberlain's actions were a mistake and encouraged Hitler. Many at the time would have disagreed with Interpretation B. Tens of thousands of letters and telegrams were sent to Chamberlain praising him for his actions. In a world that still remembered the horrors of the First World War and had seen the effects of modern warfare in the Spanish Civil War many commentators respected Chamberlain and viewed him as a hero.* *OR* *Writing years after the events, many historians in the late 1960s shared the view that Chamberlain's policy of appeasement was a reasonable one and would not have agreed with Interpretation B. By this time more documents had become available that demonstrated how weak Britain was in the 1930s, and that the Great Depression and disarmament in the 1920s had left Britain too weak to use military force against Hitler. Because of this, Chamberlain was seen having no other real option but to try and appease Hitler's demands, and in fact bought Britain the time it needed to rearm and stand up to Germany.* *[Alternatively, candidates could balance their argument with reference to those who might agree with Interpretation B, such as the authors of 'Guilty Men', or Churchill].* **Nutshell: 2H different periods or 2W different periods or H+W same period or H+W different periods** **NOTE For L4 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported** NB: Agreements can reach this level.	**13–16**

Level 3	Level 3 answers will typically explain **how** historian(s) and commentator(s) **from one period** have **agreed OR disagreed** with particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B OR will explain valid reasons **why** historians from one period **disagrees or agrees** but fail to explain how e.g *Many revisionist historians would have disagreed with the view that the failure of appeasement was down to Chamberlain. They argued he was working under very difficult circumstances and had little choice but to appease Hitler when the British military was still unprepared for war in 1938. (12)* *OR* *Many historians and commentators would actually have agreed with Interpretation B that Chamberlain was afraid. Straight after the war broke out a book called 'Guilty Men' accused Chamberlain and his colleagues of cowardice and failing to stand up to Hitler. (12)* *OR* *Interpretation B is critical of Chamberlain. Counter-revisionis' historians writing in the 1990s would agree as they have criticised Chamberlain too, saying that he overestimated the power Germany possessed and that he continued to use Appeasement long after it was obviously not going to work. (10)* **OR** *Revisionist historians would not accept this view that Chamberlain was motivated by fear. Most of them were looking at evidence that was made available after the 50 Year Rule was changed to the 30 Year Rule in the late 1960. They saw that in reality Chamberlain did not have many options other than to appease Hitler because of the state of Britain's economy and military. (12)* **Nutshell: Explains how or why historian from one period agrees or disagrees (H or W)** **NOTE For L3 cands need to make clear which aspect(s) of Interpretation B are contradicted / supported**	**9–12**
Level 2	Level 2 answers will typically identify historian(s) who have agreed OR disagreed with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why OR will provide a chronological overview of the historiography but not examine interpretation B, or misunderstand it, eg: *Some historians in the 1960s (or Revisionists) were more sympathetic towards Chamberlain because they thought he was in a no win situation.* *OR* *Commentators in the late 1930s praised Chamberlain. The orthodox view criticised him. The revisionists understood his actions and justified them and then the post revisionists criticised him again for stubbornness.* **Nutshell: Identifies historians / schools of thought / periods but fails to address particular aspect(s) of Interpretation B** NOTE: The term 'many historians' or similar expressions is not sufficient for L2 as its too unspecific- time period, school of thought or a named historian needed.	**5–8**
Level 1	Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g. *Many commentators would have disagreed with Interpretation B because they were there at the time and would see things differently.* *Some historians would also have disagreed because they would have access to sources that would allow them to have different views.* **Nutshell: General assertions/own critique** 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**

Section B

South Africa 1960–1994: The People and the State

5. Describe one consequence of the Rivonia Trial of 1964.

Assessment Objectives	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
Additional Guidance	First mark for identification of policy + second mark for descriptive detail for each response. All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of the consequences of the Rivonia Trial should also be credited.

Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
N/A Points marking	*One consequence of the Rivonia Trial was that Nelson Mandela and the other MK/ANC activists were found guilty. This meant that they were sentenced to life imprisonment on Robben Island.* OR *One consequence of the Rivonia Trial was that opposition to Apartheid was crushed. This was because leaders like Mandela and Sisulu were sent to prison for life on Robben Island.*	**2**

6. Explain why President FW de Klerk decided to end Apartheid.

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

Levels	**Indicative content**	**Marks**
Level 5 • Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	*Please see next page*	**9–10**
Level 4 • Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. • This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.		**7–8**
Level 3 • Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.		**5–6**
Level 2 • Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question. • This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.		**3–4**
Level 1 • Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question. • There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.		**1–2**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

6. Explain why President FW de Klerk decided to end Apartheid.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 •	Level 5 answers will typically explain two or more reasons why de Klerk ended Apartheid e.g. *One of the most significant reasons why FW de Klerk decided to end Apartheid was because of his personal connection with Nelson Mandela. The two men had met during the secret negotiations between the ANC and the National Party to discuss the transition towards democracy in South Africa and had struck up a strong relationship. De Klerk's respect for Mandela's leadership of the ANC meant that he was confident that the two parties would be able to negotiate an agreement that would be acceptable to both sides so was prepared to introduce laws that effectively ended apartheid.* *Another important reason why de Klerk acted was because of the severe dangers facing South Africa at the end of the 1980s which, he felt, could only be ended by abandoning Apartheid. The level of violence in the country was becoming increasingly difficult for the government to control as the ANC had given orders to 'make the country ungovernable'. In addition, the South African economy was in very serious difficulties as a result of the financial crisis caused by the failure of President Botha's Total Strategy. As a result of these dangers de Klerk chose to end Apartheid as he hoped that the ANC would end their violent opposition to the government and the economy would benefit from a peaceful transition to democracy.* **Nutshell: Two reasons identified and explained.**	**9–10**
Level 4 •	Level 4 answers will typically explain one reason why de Klerk ended Apartheid and explain it fully e.g. *One of the most significant reasons why FW de Klerk decided to end Apartheid was because of his personal connection with Nelson Mandela. The two men had met during the secret negotiations between the ANC and the National Party to discuss the transition towards democracy in South Africa and had struck up a strong relationship. De Klerk's respect for Mandela's leadership of the ANC meant that he was confident that the two parties would be able to negotiate an agreement that would be acceptable to both sides so was prepared to introduce laws that effectively ended apartheid.* N**utshell: 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 and describe reasons for the end of Apartheid without explaining it/them e.g. *De Klerk was a very religious man and wanted to bring peace to South Africa. He also met Nelson Mandela and they got on very well with each other. The South African economy was doing very badly and there was also a lot of violence in the country.* **Nutshell: One or more reasons identified or described but no explanation**	**5–6**
Level 2 •	Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the end of Apartheid e.g. *FW de Klerk became President in 1989 and in his first speech to parliament he unbanned the ANC and agreed to release Nelson Mandela.* **Nutshell: Description of relevant events but no reasons identified.**	**3–4**
Level 1 •	Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g. *De Klerk had met Nelson Mandela.* OR *There were lots of problems with the South African economy.* **Nutshell: General points or unrelated events**	**1–2**
Level 0	No response or no response worthy of credit.	**0**

7a. Study Source A. How reliable is this source about Botha's strategies within South Africa?

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
Additional Guidance	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 • Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content, provenance and historical context to construct a thorough and convincing argument in answer to the specific question about the source.	Please see next page	**4–5**
Level 2 • Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct an argument in answer to the question about the source.		**2-3**
Level 1 • Response analyses the source 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.		**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7a. Study Source A. How reliable is this source about Botha's strategies within South Africa?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 •	Level 3 answers will produce a developed evaluation of the source (usually based on purpose or context) to explain whether it is or is not reliable about the issue specified in the question e.g. *It can be argued that the source is reliable evidence of Botha's strategies in South Africa to a certain extent. What he claims is true: the level of violence did discourage "participation in political processes". There was extremely low turnout in the elections for the Indian and Coloured chambers of the Tricameral Parliament which Botha had established in 1984. However that was the result of his strategy not the strategy itself. What he says about the strategy is not reliable. It is not true that the "vast majority of the black urban areas support the government's action" because there was very strong opposition to the government's attempts to maintain Apartheid including the UDF's boycott of the 1984 elections.* **Nutshell: reliable / not about Botha's strategies or their impact or attitudes of people towards them**	**4–5**
Level 2 •	Level 2 answers will typically argue the content of the source is/is not reliable in general terms (usually based on their own knowledge or provenance) e.g. *Source A is not reliable because Botha is the Prime Minister of South Africa arguing that his own policies are successful. He claims that the vast majority of the black urban areas support the government's action to maintain order but this seems difficult to believe as the government was opposed by most black Africans.* *OR* *Source A is not reliable because most Black South Africans did not "support the government's actions" and there was strong opposition to Apartheid at this time with the formation of the UDF.* **Nutshell: reliable / not reliable in general terms**	**2-3**
Level 1 •	Level 1 answers will typically argue the source is or is not reliable based on selections from it or provenance. *Source A is not reliable because it was written by President Botha and you would expect him to say good things.* **Nutshell: Generalised comments on reliability based on source type**	**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7b. Study Source B. Explain why this source was published in South Africa at this time.

Assessment Objectives	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [5]
Additional Guidance	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 • Response analyses the source 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 source.	*Please see next page*	**4–5**
Level 2 • Response analyses the source by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context to construct a supported argument in answer to the question about the source.		**2–3**
Level 1 • Response analyses the source in a very basic way by selecting detail from the source content or provenance that is linked to the question.		**1**
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

7b. Study Source B. Explain why this source was published in South Africa at this time.

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 3 •	Level 3 answers will typically make a clear statement of purpose based on intended outcome and/or audience and support this with reference to content of the source or context e.g. *The purpose of the poster was to encourage students to protest against the South African Defence Force who were aggressively dealing with opposition to Apartheid in the schools and townships during the 1985 State of Emergency. It does this by reminding South Africans of previous attempts to fight against Apartheid as June 16th was 'Youth Day' in South Africa, the anniversary of the Soweto Uprising of 1976, when young people had resisted against Apartheid. The poster also contains a quote from the ANC's Freedom Charter of 1955 which again reinforces the message that resistance against Apartheid has a long history, encouraging students to oppose the SADF.* **Nutshell: Purpose (+ ck + sce for 5 marks)**	**4–5**
Level 2 •	Level 2 answers will typically identify and explain the message of the source using relevant source content or context e.g. *The message of the source is that the SADF are damaging young people's education and the townships by using force as the source shows an armed vehicle being used by them.* *OR* *The poster was published during the 1985 State of Emergency which allowed the South African Defence Force to aggressively deal with any opposition to the government in the schools and townships of South Africa. The poster is telling people that the government is clearly not on the side of the people and is using force against school children.* **Nutshell: Message (+ ck or sce for 3 marks)**	**2–3**
Level 1 •	Level 1 answers will typically argue the source was meant to provide information OR cite context but with no message or purpose e.g. *The source was published to show that there were soldiers and armoured cars in the schools and townships.* *OR* *The poster was published during the 1985 State of Emergency which allowed the South African Defence Force to aggressively deal with any opposition to the government in the schools and townships of South Africa. The government is clearly not on the side of the people and is taking action against them.* **Nutshell: sce as information or CK**	**1**
Level 0	No response or no response worthy of credit.	**0**

8.* 'The South African government was very effective in crushing opposition to Apartheid.' How far do you agree with this view?

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 next page*	
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.*		
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.*		
Level 2 • The respose 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. • *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.*		
Level 0 No response or no response worthy of credit.		**0**

8.* 'The South African government was very effective in crushing opposition to Apartheid.' How far do you agree with this view?

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
Level 5 • .	Level 5 answers will typically construct a balanced and well-supported argument explaining how far e.g. *Initially the South African government was effective in crushing opposition to Apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly, opposition movements such as the ANC and the PAC were banned by the government in 1960 which made it more difficult to organise resistance. In the 1970s and 1980s the government spent huge amounts of money supplying the South African Defence Force and the police which meant that they had vast resources available to them to deal with any opposition. The 1985 State of Emergency also led to the imprisonment of thousands of UDF supporters and meant that South Africa was virtually under military rule.* *However, over the long-term it could also be argued that the South African government was ineffective in crushing opposition to Apartheid. Despite the banning of the ANC and PAC other opposition movements emerged such as the UDF which was formed in 1983. Also the ANC in exile was working with the International Anti-Apartheid Movement to support sanctions against South African goods. This was supported within South Africa by the ANC's call to 'make the country ungovernable' which meant that the level of violence grew and the State of Emergency in 1985 was ineffective in dealing with it.* **Nutshell: Balanced argument with at least two examples on one side and one on the other side** **NOTE: 18 marks = As below plus a clinching argument** **Award within mark range 15-17 for quality of each of the three points**	**15–18**
Level 4 •	Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced and supported argument, e.g. *The South African government was effective in crushing opposition to Apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly, opposition movements such as the ANC and the PAC were banned by the government in 1960 which made it more difficult to organise resistance. Also the government spent huge amounts of money supplying the South African Defence Force and the police which meant that they had vast resources available to them to deal with any opposition.* *However it could also be argued that the South African government was ineffective in crushing opposition to Apartheid. Despite the banning of the ANC and PAC other opposition movements emerged such as the UDF which was formed in 1983. Also the ANC in exile worked with the International Anti-Apartheid Movement to demand sanctions against South African goods.* **Nutshell: One sided (two explained examples of support); or balanced argument (one explained example 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, e.g. *The South African government was effective in crushing opposition to Apartheid in a number of ways. Firstly opposition movements such as the ANC and the PAC were banned by the government which made it more difficult to organise resistance. Also the government spent huge amounts of money supplying the South African Defence Force and the police which meant that they had vast resources available to them to deal with any opposition.* **Nutshell: One sided argument, one explained example to support** **NOTE:** Many answers at L3 will attempt a balanced answer and a wider range of support but only achieve one valid explanation	**7–10**
Level 2 •	Level 2 answers will typically identify and or describe reason(s) without explaining them fully e.g. . *The South African government was effective in crushing opposition as it was able to ban the ANC and put its leaders in prison.* *OR* *The South African government was not very effective in crushing opposition because there were many attempts to resist by a wide range of groups including students, Trade Unions and the church.* **Nutshell: identify and describe relevant events/developments but not explaining in relation to question.**	**4–6**
Level 1 •	Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate simple knowledge of the way that the government dealt with opposition to Apartheid e.g. *The government banned the ANC.* *OR* *Opposition to Apartheid continued even after the government tried to stop it.* **Nutshell: General assertions**	**1–3**
Level 0	No response or no response worthy of credit.	**0**

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

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

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