

## **GCSE (9–1)**

### **History A (Explaining the Modern World)**

**J410/07:** International Relations: the changing international order 1918-2001 with The USA 1945-1974: The People and the State

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for November 2020**

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 2020

## 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

## 1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

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

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

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

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

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

### Awarding Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar to scripts with a scribe coversheet

- a. If a script has a **scribe cover sheet** it is vital to check which boxes are ticked and award as per the instructions and grid below:
- i. Assess the work for SPaG in accordance with the normal marking criteria. The initial assessment must be made as if the candidate had not used a scribe (or word processor) and was eligible for all the SPaG marks.
  - ii. Check the cover sheet to see what has been dictated (or what facilities were disabled on the word processor) and therefore what proportion of marks is available to the candidate.
  - iii. Convert the SPaG mark to reflect the correct proportion using the conversion table given below.

SPaG mark awarded	Mark if candidate eligible for one third (e.g. grammar only)	Mark if candidate eligible for two thirds (e.g. grammar and punctuation only)
0	0	0
1	0	1
2	1	1
3	1	2
4	1	3
5	2	3

- b. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet** attached to it the candidate **can** still access SPaG marks (see point a. above) unless the cover sheet states that the checking functionality is enabled, in which case no SPaG marks are available.
- c. If a script has a **word processor cover sheet AND a scribe cover sheet** attached to it, see point a. above.
- d. If you come across a typewritten script **without** a cover sheet please check with the OCR Special Requirements Team at [specialrequirements@ocr.org.uk](mailto:specialrequirements@ocr.org.uk) who can check what access arrangements were agreed.
- e. If the script has a **transcript, Oral Language Modifier, Sign Language Interpreter or a Practical Assistant cover sheet**, award SPaG as normal.

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

1. Outline the actions of Al-Qaeda in the period 1995–2001.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [5]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples should also be credited.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>outline the reason for the actions</b> of Al-Qaeda in the period 1995–2001 <b>supported by at least one example</b>, OR <b>describe two examples of their actions</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>The actions of Al-Qaeda were inspired by hatred of Western democracies and the belief that they should wage war against their enemies. They tried to cause as many American deaths as possible, for example the 1998 attacks on American embassies in Africa, which made Americans abroad feel less secure.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Al-Qaeda attacked the Twin Towers in New York. There were over 3000 casualties when they flew two planes into the World Trade Centre. They also attacked the Pentagon and another plane crashed because the passengers fought back. They also launched a suicide attack on a US warship, the USS Cole [2]. 17 sailors were killed when a boat packed with explosives was driven straight into them by an Al Qaeda cell.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Higher mark for development of both examples or reason and one developed example.</b></p>	<b>4–5</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically outline one <b>example of their actions</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>In 2000 an Al-Qaeda terrorist cell launched a suicide attack on a US warship, the USS Cole [2]. 17 sailors were killed when a boat packed with explosives was driven straight into them.[3]</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Al-Qaeda's development aimed to attack Western democracies who they believed were a threat and enemy to Islam.[3]</i></p>	<b>2–3</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>Response includes some knowledge that is relevant to the question.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically outline one or more events with little or <b>no reference to the actions of Al-Qaeda</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There was a war on terror</i>  <i>There was tension in the Middle East</i>  <i>President Bush blamed Iraq</i>  <i>The Taliban were powerful in Afghanistan</i></p>	<b>1</b>

<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>
--	--	----------

2. Explain why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	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]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question. This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.	Level 5 answers will typically <b>identify at least two reasons</b> why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s <b>and explain</b> them fully e.g. <i>Countries lost confidence in the League in the 1930s for several reasons. One reason was the Manchurian Crisis. In 1931 Japan, who was a leading member of the League, invaded Manchuria in China. The League lacked an army, and instead of intervening sent Lord Lytton to carry out an investigation. This took almost a year, by which time Japan had taken control of Manchuria and then left the League when asked to return it to China. This made countries lose confidence in the League as they had failed to stop the invasion or control one of their own members. Another reason was the Abyssinian Crisis. In 1935 Italy – another member of the League – invaded Abyssinia in Africa. Again the League did very little, and in fact Britain and France tried to make a secret deal with Mussolini to give him part of Abyssinia which caused great embarrassment when it became public. Mussolini conquered Abyssinia and left the League. The main members of the League of Nations had failed to protect smaller countries and acted in their own self-interest, which again caused countries to lose confidence in it.</i> <b>THRESHOLD ANSWERS</b> <i>Countries lost confidence in the League because of Japan's invasion of Manchuria. Japan was a leading member of the League but it still acted aggressively and did not use the League to solve its dispute. This went against everything the League stood for and when it left, the League had been weakened. When the League failed to get Italy out of Abyssinia countries also lost confidence in it. It tried to use economic sanctions but did too little too late, and some of its own members refused to stop trading in coal so sanctions weren't very successful. The sanctions didn't stop Italy and in the end it continued its conquest and nothing more was done.</i>	<b>9–10</b>
<b>Level 4</b> Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.	Level 4 answers will typically <b>identify at least one reason</b> why countries lost confidence in the League of Nations in the 1930s <b>and explain</b> it fully e.g. <i>Countries lost confidence in the League in the 1930s because important countries left it. Japan was a founding member of the League but left in 1932, and in 1934 Hitler's Germany walked out of the League too. The League was supposed to work on the basis of collective security but this wasn't possible if countries weren't members. The more countries that left the League, the less confidence countries had in it.</i>	<b>7–8</b>

<p>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</p>		
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>identify and/or describe one or more</b> reasons why countries lost confidence in the League but <b>will not</b> explain e.g.</p> <p><i>Countries lost confidence in the League because the Disarmament Conference it held in the early 1930s failed.</i></p> <p><i>Countries like Germany and Italy left the League, making countries lose confidence in it.</i></p> <p><i>The Hoare-Laval Pact between Britain, France and Italy made countries lose confidence in the League.</i></p>	<p><b>5–6</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain <b>description of events linked</b> to the weakness of the League of Nations in the 1930s.</p> <p><i>In 1935 Mussolini invaded Abyssinia, to gain land and raw materials. The Abyssinian emperor Haile Selassie made a speech at the League demanding action be taken against Mussolini, and eventually the League agreed to impose sanctions on Italy but this took time to introduce and did not include coal and oil.</i></p>	<p><b>3–4</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically assert general reasons not specific to the weakness of the League of Nations e.g.</p> <p><i>Hitler got stronger.</i></p> <p><i>There was a greater chance of war in the 1930s.</i></p>	<p><b>1–2</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>



3. Do you think this interpretation is a fair comment on Chamberlain and the policy of Appeasement between 1937 and 1939? Use your knowledge and other interpretations of Appeasement between these dates to support your answer.


<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	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]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically address the question through fully developed analysis and <b>evaluation of specific elements of Interpretation A</b>, supported by relevant references to other interpretations or the context of Interpretation A</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is arguing that British policy towards Germany was a mistake and Chamberlain was foolish to trust Hitler, because Hitler had a track record of not keeping his promises.</i></p> <p><i>In some ways this is a fair comment because historians writing immediately after the Second World War believed that Chamberlain misjudged Hitler and so appeasement was a mistake. They argued that whilst it was morally right to try and avoid war, giving in to Hitler was not going to work and so appeasement was a miscalculation. These historians would have agreed with Cato that Hitler could not have been trusted and that appeasement was not the right policy to use.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to Churchill's 'The Gathering Storm' or to the orthodox school of thought; this is not a requirement but should be credited]</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand, people in 1938 would not have thought Interpretation A to be a fair comment on British policy towards Germany at the time. They thought that appeasement was the right policy, that war should be avoided at all costs and that Chamberlain was right to trust Hitler. Chamberlain received thousands of letters of support in 1938 and these people would have felt Cato's comments to be unfair.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to the 'popular majority view'; this is not a requirement but should be given credit]</i></p> <p>NB: Answers at this level can be one-sided or balanced provided they are sufficiently developed and supported.</p>	<b>21–25</b>
<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>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 <b>will not specify the aspect(s) of Interpretation A which they consider fair or unfair.</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation A is saying appeasement was a bad policy.</i></p>	<b>16–20</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Historians writing in the 1960s to the 1980s would disagree with this, so the interpretation isn't fair. They would argue that because of Britain's economic and military position appeasement was the best policy in the circumstances and held off war for as long as possible.</i></p> <p><i>[Answers might refer to the revisionist school of thought or to specific historians such as Taylor or Watt. This is not required but should be credited]</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically be based on a valid argument about fairness and support this with relevant <b>factual knowledge OR undeveloped references to other interpretations</b> to judge fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>This comment is fair because Hitler went on to prove he could not be trusted. The Munich Agreement involved Britain and France agreeing that Hitler would be allowed to occupy the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia as Germans lived there, but that he would make no more claims for land. Several months later Hitler went on to invade the rest of Czechoslovakia which proves that he could not be trusted and makes the opinion expressed in Interpretation A a fair one.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>Counter-revisionists writing in the 1990s would agree with Cato that appeasement was not the right policy.</i></p>	<b>11–15</b>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically describe relevant interpretations without addressing the question of fairness e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation A is being critical of appeasement. Another view was that of the revisionist historians who thought appeasement was a good policy. Winston Churchill said that appeasement was a mistake.</i></p> <p><i>NB: Cannot be based on a misunderstanding of interpretation.</i></p>	<b>6–10</b>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>The response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate understanding of Interpretation A and/OR offer undeveloped/unsupported assertions about fairness</p> <p><i>Cato thinks that Hitler shouldn't be trusted. This shows was people thought in 1940. I agree that Mr Chamberlain was wrong to have trusted Hitler when he had lied in the past.</i></p> <p>NB: Place in this level answers which seem to show some knowledge of context or other interpretations but have misunderstood interpretation A</p>	<b>1–5</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

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

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	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]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically explain <b>how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from two or more periods have disagreed with Interpretation B and <b>explain the reason(s) for differences for at least one of them</b></p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Europe and the wider world caused the tension. Many of these writers were influenced by the Red Scare in America in the early 1950s when it was widely believed that Soviet agents were trying to infiltrate American society and destroy it, so this would affect their views of history. Some American historians had connections with the US government at the time so they would be unlikely to criticise their own government and this influenced their view that the USSR was responsible for the Cold War.</i> [Either example given here of the reason for difference would be sufficient for credit in Level 5]</p> <p><i>Many historians writing in the 1970s and 1980s would also have disagreed with Williams, as they believed that the Cold War arose because neither the USA nor the USSR were able to understand each other's motives, and these misunderstandings led to the Cold War. After the shock of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 there had been a gradual improvement in relations between the USA and USSR symbolised by the process of détente. This influenced historians to think less of blame and more of misunderstandings. They argued that the USA exaggerated the threat Russia posed and the USSR mistakenly believed American actions were aggressive. As they attributed some of the responsibility to Russia they would have disagreed with Williams.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to schools of thought such as orthodoxy or post-revisionism, or to specific historians such as Feis or Gaddis. These could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level]</i></p> <p><b>NOTE 1: Marks can be awarded within level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.</b></p> <p><b>NOTE 2: If a candidate explains how and why only one view differs mark at bottom of L5</b></p>	<b>17–20</b> 

<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically explain <b>how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>two or more periods</b> have disagreed with Interpretation B</p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Europe and the wider world caused the tension.</i></p> <p><i>Many historians writing in the 1970s and 1980s would also have disagreed with Williams, as they believed that the Cold War arose because neither the USA nor the USSR were able to understand each other's motives, and these misunderstandings led to the Cold War. They argued that the USA exaggerated the threat Russia posed and the USSR mistakenly believed American actions were aggressive. As they attributed some of the responsibility to Russia they would have disagreed with Williams.</i></p> <p><i>[Candidates might refer to schools of thought such as orthodoxy or post-revisionism, or to specific historians such as Feis or Gaddis. These could be given additional credit but are not required to reach the level]</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: Marks can be awarded within the level for quality of support or addressing specific aspects of Interpretation B rather than the general premise.</b></p>	<p><b>13–16</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically <b>explain how</b> historian(s) or commentator(s) from <b>one period</b> have disagreed (or agreed) with Interpretation B</p> <p><i>Williams is arguing that the United States was to blame for the Cold War because aggressive American policies left the USSR with no choice but to confront America. Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams as they argued that the Soviet Union was responsible for the Cold War and that their attempts to spread Communism in Eastern Europe and the wider world caused the tension.</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternatively</u></b></p> <p>Level 3 answers may explain valid reasons <b>why</b> historians from one or more periods disagree (or agree) but fail to explain how</p> <p><i>Most Western historians writing during the early Cold War would disagree with Williams. Many of these writers were influenced by the Red Scare in America in the early 1950s when it was widely believed that Soviet agents were trying to infiltrate American society and destroy it, so this would affect their views of history. American popular culture produced films like 'Invasion of the Body Snatchers' which also influenced historians.</i></p>	<p><b>9–12</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response analyses the given interpretation, and compares and contrasts a few aspects of the given interpretation with aspects of at least one</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically <b>identify historian(s) or commentator(s) who have agreed OR disagreed</b> with Interpretation B but fail to explain how or why e.g.</p> <p><i>Historians writing in the 1980s would not have agreed with Interpretation B that the United States was responsible for the Cold War.</i></p> <p><b><u>Alternatively</u></b></p>	<p><b>5-8</b></p>

<p>other interpretation studied, to show how the interpretations differ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will give a basic but correct account of the historiography e.g</p> <p><i>Orthodox historians argued that the USSR caused the Cold War, but revisionist historians said it was the USA's fault. Post-revisionist historians then said it was down to both sides.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is no consideration or no relevant consideration of any other interpretations.</li> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general assertions about Interpretation B or give their own critique of it e.g.</p> <p><i>Some historians would argue that both sides were responsible for causing the Cold War.</i></p> <p><i>Interpretation B is biased against the USA.</i></p> <p><b>NB: Award at this level if candidates give their own critique of B (i.e. 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.</b></p>	<b>1-4</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

## Section B

## The USA 1945–1974: The People and the State

5. Describe one example of opposition to the civil rights movement between 1954 and 1964.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [2]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of opposition to the civil rights movement between 1954 and 1964 should also be credited. 2 egs or one eg explained= 2 marks

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
N/A  Points marking	<p>One example of opposition to the civil rights movement was police using violence against civil rights protesters [1]. For example, in Birmingham in 1963, 'Bull' Connor ordered police officers to turn dogs and fire hoses on the peaceful protesters [2].</p> <p>OR</p> <p>One example of opposition to the civil rights movement was state authorities refusing to abide by federal laws [1]. For example, even though the Supreme Court had ordered that 9 black students be allowed to attend a white school in Little Rock, Arkansas, the state governor ordered reserve soldiers to prevent to students from entering [2].</p>	<b>2</b>

6. Explain why groups other than African Americans protested in the 1960s and 1970s.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	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]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<p><b>Level 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and thorough, convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify <b>two or more reasons</b> why groups other than African Americans protested in the 1960s and 1970s and <b>explain them fully</b>.</p> <p><i>Firstly, gay rights campaigns sprang up because of the treatment of gay people by the police. It was illegal to take part in any homosexual activity in almost all of USA's states. In New York, where there was a large gay community, the city authorities were aggressively anti-gay. The police used surveillance, informers and even undercover police to trap gay men and women. By 1966, the police were arresting over 100 gay men a week. This led to fear and resentment from New York's gay community. In 1969, there were violent protests following a police raid on the Stonewall gay bar in New York, which sparked off a wider Gay Pride movement.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, women were protesting due to the increase in the number of women working since the Second World War. Even though women made up almost half of the workforce in 1960, many earned only 50 per cent of the wages of men doing the same job. This led to Eleanor Roosevelt putting pressure on President Kennedy and the US government to take action. Despite the Equal Pay Act, discrimination against female employment continued which led to various organisations emerging in the 1960s to try and challenge this.</i></p> <p><i>[Alternatively, candidates may explain reasons that Hispanic Americans, Native Americans or students/anti-war campaigners protested during this period. Candidates may also explain two different reasons for one group, which is acceptable.]</i></p> <p><b>THRESHOLD ANSWERS</b></p> <p><i>Firstly, gay rights campaigns sprang up. Homosexual acts were illegal in most US states, and authorities in places like New York were very anti-gay and arrested many gay people. There was a huge amount of resentment to their methods and it led to violent protests, for example the Stonewall riots.</i></p> <p><i>Women's groups like NOW and Women's Lib also protested. This was because there was a lot of discrimination against women in employment and in society in general. NOW and Women's Lib were campaigning for equal rights for women and an end to discrimination in all areas of life.</i></p>	<p><b>9–10</b></p>

<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to develop a full explanation and analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify <b>one reason</b> why groups other than African Americans protested in the 1960s and 1970s and <b>explain it fully</b>.</p> <p><i>Gay rights campaigns sprung up because of the treatment of gay people by the police. It was illegal to take part in any homosexual activity was illegal in almost all of USA's states. In New York, where there was a large gay community, the city authorities were aggressively anti-gay. The police used surveillance, informers and even undercover police to trap gay men and women. By 1966, the police were arresting over 100 gay men a week. This led to fear and resentment from New York's gay community. In 1969, there were violent protests following a police raid on the Stonewall gay bar in New York, which sparked off a wider Gay Pride movement.</i></p>	7–8
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify or describe reason(s) without explaining them e.g.</p> <p><i>Gay people were protesting because of the raid on the Stonewall bar.</i></p> <p><i>Women were protesting because there was not equal pay.</i></p>	5–6
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain <b>description of events</b> linked to protests of groups other than African Americans in the 1960s and 1970s.</p> <p><i>In 1969, there were violent protests and demonstrations by gay New Yorkers for almost a week. There were Gay Pride marches in New York and Los Angeles.</i></p> <p><i>American women went on marches and became more radicalised. One group was the National Organization for Women.</i></p>	3–4
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain <b>general points or assertions</b> about the protests in this period.</p> <p><i>Gay people weren't treated equally.</i></p> <p><i>The women's movement emerged after the Second World War.</i></p>	1–2
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		0



## 7. Study Sources A and B. How similar are these two sources?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO3 (a): Analyse sources contemporary to the period. [10]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>Analysis of a single source, no matter how thorough, cannot achieve more than the top mark in Level 2.</p> <p>For Level 3, a reasonable coverage of both sources and a balance between the treatment of sources is expected.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.</p>

Levels	Indicative content	Marks
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically compare the sources' attitudes or purposes, e.g.</p> <p><i>Sources A and B are actually very different even though they are both evidence of discrimination against African Americans in the South. In Source A, we can see the photograph clearly focusing on the poster at the top of the wall which is advertising that Imperial Laundry washes only white people's clothes, and sees that as a selling point. However, this photograph was published in the magazine to highlight the inequality between black and white Americans in order to get people to support change for African Americans. We can see from the article's title that some people felt that the way that black Americans were treated was little better than slavery.</i></p> <p><i>In Source B we also see evidence of these racist attitudes. This group wants to keep segregation in order to maintain 'racial integrity'. However, unlike Source A, this source is trying to defend segregation and fight against civil rights – its purpose is to stop the election of Truman because he is taking away the South's 'rights' to continue segregation.</i></p> <p><i>So both sources are evidence of segregation but A is trying to end it and B is trying to defend it.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Compare attitudes or purposes.</b> NB: If candidates do not explicitly refer to similarity in content, mark at 7-8 marks.</p>	<b>7–10</b>
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response analyses both the sources by using relevant detail from the source content and provenance or historical context</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically compare the content of the two sources e.g.</p> <p><i>These sources are similar in some ways as they are evidence of discrimination against African Americans. In Source A the laundry company advertises they only wash white people's clothes, and in B the politician is saying that segregation helps to maintain 'racial integrity'</i></p>	<b>3–6</b>

to construct an argument to answer the question about the sources.	<b>Nutshell: Different content</b>	
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically assert similarity or difference in general terms with limited or no support from sources, or focus on provenance simplistically e.g.</p> <p><i>Both sources are about Jim Crow.</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><i>One source is a photograph and the other source is a statement from a political party.</i></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Both are about discrimination (2 marks)</p> <p>In this level, answers may focus almost entirely on one of the two sources.</p> <p><b>Nutshell: Source types or points of detail compared</b></p>	<b>1–2</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

- 8.\* 'The Red Scare was an over-reaction to a Communist threat which did not exist.' How far do you agree with this view of the USA between 1945 and 1954?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	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]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	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.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically construct a <b>balanced and well-supported argument</b> which uses a range of supporting evidence to support the argument being made, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence to agree with the statement. The Red Scare created an atmosphere of fear and paranoia that was definitely an over-reaction. For example, the House Un-American Activities Committee jailed the 'Hollywood Ten' for a year for refusing to answer questions about whether or not they were members of the Communist Party. This was clearly an over-reaction because it was not illegal to be a member of the Communist Party in a democracy. Secondly, thousands of people found their lives and careers ruined by McCarthy's witch hunt, such as over 100 university lecturers and over 300 Hollywood producers, writers and directors. False accusations led to them being blacklisted, which meant that they could not work. This demonstrates an anti-Communist hysteria clearly existed.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also evidence that a Communist threat did actually exist. Firstly, the international situation at the time suggests there was every reason for the US to be concerned about Communism. In 1949 the USSR had developed its own atomic weapon and China had also fallen to Communism. This meant that the USA saw Communism as a growing rival and threat. In addition to this, there were Communist spies. For example, in 1951, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted of passing atomic secrets to the USSR. They were executed. Even though the evidence against them appeared to be flimsy, more recent coded telegrams between them and Soviet show that they were probably guilty, so in their case the Red Scare eliminated a potential threat to the US.</i></p> <p><i>On balance I would challenge the statement because I think it's a false split. There was indeed a very real Communist threat, as shown by the plots that were caught out. However, this does not mean that the Red Scare was not an over-reaction because hundreds of innocent people were caught in the cross-fire of anti-Communist hysteria. In fact McCarthy's incompetent methods probably made it more difficult to catch the real spies.</i></p> <p><b>NB: 18 marks: At least 3 explained examples plus a clinching argument</b> <b>15-17 marks: 3 explained examples</b></p>	<b>15–18</b>

<p><b>Level 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a <b>balanced or one-sided argument</b> with support from at least <b>two explained examples</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to agree with the statement. Thousands of people found their lives and careers ruined by McCarthy's witch hunt, such as over 100 university lecturers and over 300 Hollywood producers, writers and directors. False accusations led to them being blacklisted, which meant that they could not work. This demonstrates an anti-Communist hysteria clearly existed.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also evidence that a Communist threat did actually exist. For example, in 1951, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted of passing atomic secrets to the USSR. They were executed. Even though the evidence against them appeared to be flimsy, more recent coded telegrams between them and Soviet show that they were probably guilty, so in their case the Red Scare eliminated a potential threat to the US.</i></p> <p><b>Reserve 14 marks for clinching argument; 12 marks is standard and one mark for additional development of either point.</b></p>	<p><b>11–14</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a <b>one-sided argument with support from one valid explained example</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to agree with the statement. Thousands of people found their lives and careers ruined by McCarthy's witch hunt, such as over 100 university lecturers and over 300 Hollywood producers, writers and directors. False accusations led to them being blacklisted, which meant that they could not work. This demonstrates an anti-Communist hysteria clearly existed.</i></p>	<p><b>7–10</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation about the historical events/period, which uses relevant second order historical</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will <b>typically identify evidence without explanation and/or describe</b> events related to the Red Scare without relating this to whether or not it was an over-reaction / whether a Communist threat did exist e.g.</p> <p><i>Johnson did a lot to advance civil rights because he passed the Civil Rights Act in 1964.</i> <i>OR</i></p>	<p><b>4–6</b></p>

<p>concepts, and gives an answer to the question set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>In 1950 Senator Joe McCarthy said that he had a list of over 200 Communists in the US government.</p>	
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• There is basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make <b>general</b> assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>There were many people accused of being Communists and a lot of panic about this.</i></p>	<b>1–3</b>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<b>0</b>

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

<p><b>High performance</b> <i>4–5 marks</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>
<p><b>Intermediate performance</b> <i>2–3 marks</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>
<p><b>Threshold performance</b> <i>1 mark</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>
<p><b>No marks awarded</b> <i>0 marks</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learner writes nothing</li> <li>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</li> <li>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li> </ul>

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored