

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History (6HI03/E)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2015

Publications Code US041783

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
 - i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*
 - ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*
 - iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth</p>

		<p>and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in</p>

	<p>its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

Section B

Target: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

AO1a and AO1b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1 mark The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 4 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 5 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 6 marks</p>

		The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.
3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 7 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and – as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 11 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 12 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 13 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p>14-16</p>	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 14 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 15 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 16 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
-----------------	---------------------	---

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	10-14	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and</p>

		<p>debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Unit 3 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Section A Q	30	-	30
Section B Q	16	24	40
Total Marks	46	24	70
% weighting	20%	10%	30%

Section A

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of several pre-1914 crises (probably including the Moroccan crises of 1905-06 and 1911, Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1908, and the Balkan wars of 1912-13) as well as the July crisis of 1914 which led to the First World War. Reasons to explain why the pre-1914 crises did not result in a general European war might include: one side was effectively diplomatically isolated and thus prepared to settle the dispute, e.g. Germany at the Algeciras Conference (1906); one side was in no position to change the outcome of an event, e.g. Russia complied with a virtual German ultimatum to accept Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina (1908) because the Tsar was in no position to risk war over the issue; allies acted as a restraining influence e.g. during the First Balkan War (1912), Germany counselled Austria-Hungary not to attack Serbia. Reasons to explain why the July crisis of 1914 did lead to war might include: previous Balkan crises had sharpened Austro-Russian differences over the future of the area and made further compromise extremely difficult; growing German fears of encirclement and the 'blank cheque' to Austria-Hungary over Serbia removed some of the previous constraints; the role of military schedules (which included the planning of offensives and rapid mobilisations, e.g. the Schlieffen Plan) in precipitating war; the alliance system linked the 'peripheral' 1914 Balkan crisis directly to the rival European power blocs.</p> <p>At Level 5, the response will fully address both parts of the question with a sustained analysis of the reasons for resolution/non-resolution of the international crises from 1905 to 1914. The answer will also contain well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the reasons for resolution/non-resolution of the international crises from 1905 to 1914 although coverage may be unbalanced. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis of the reasons for resolution/non-resolution of the crises but the detail may be undeveloped in parts or the answer chronologically skewed. At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements about the international crises (1905-1914) will provide either only implicit argument or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the extent to which the victorious powers' desire for reconciliation shaped the peace treaties of 1919-23. Features of the peace treaties which support the statement in the question might include: the Versailles Treaty was not excessively harsh on Germany either territorially or economically; the treaties attempted to inject idealism and morality into international relations (e.g. national self-determination led to the establishment of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, plebiscites were used to foster self-determination in disputed areas e.g. Allenstein, the creation of the League of Nations and the International Labour Organisation); France initially demanded permanent German disarmament and a Rhineland Republic for security reasons but was forced to accept a demilitarised zone; similarly, French economic claims to the Saarland and other areas were modified under British and US pressure. Features of the peace treaties which do not support the statement in the question might include: Germany and her allies were saddled with 'war guilt'; the imposed nature of the treaties (e.g. Versailles, Trianon) leading to accusations of an Allied 'diktat' mentality; selective use of the 14 Points (e.g. national self-determination did not apply to Germany and Austria); the Allied powers followed their own narrow national interests, e.g. France's insistence on large-scale German reparations; the Habsburg Empire was replaced by a mosaic of small unstable states; the treaties helped to destabilise domestic politics in Weimar Germany and post-war Italy.</p> <p>At Level 5, there will be sustained analysis of the victors' desire for reconciliation in the peace treaties. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the victors' desire for reconciliation in the peace treaties with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis related to the extent to which the treaties reflected the victors' desire for reconciliation but the detail may be undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will offer simple or more developed statements about the peace settlements with either only implicit reference to the extent they were based on the victorious powers' desire for reconciliation, or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of the nuclear arms race in the period 1949-63. Developments which helped to increase US-Soviet tensions might include: Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) which precipitated a spiralling arms race (e.g. hydrogen bomb (1952-53), ICBM (1957), SLBM (1960)); fears about the nuclear superiority of the other side, e.g. the Gaither Report and the 'missile gap' (1957); nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. US doctrine of 'massive retaliation' (1950s), Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA's 'nuclear option' during the 1961 Berlin crisis. Developments which lowered US-Soviet tensions might include: the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons, e.g. US non-intervention over Hungary (1956); superpower cooperation to regulate the nuclear threat, e.g. removal of missiles from Cuba and Turkey, the Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow 'hotline'; US and Soviet leaders were aware of living in the nuclear age and acted responsibly, e.g. Khrushchev withdrew the offer of Soviet assistance for Communist China's nuclear weapons programme (1959).</p> <p>At Level 5, students should provide a sustained analysis related to the extent the nuclear arms race (1949-63) increased US-Soviet tensions. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the nuclear arms race with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis related to the extent it increased US-Soviet tensions, but the detail may be undeveloped in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2, candidates will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the nuclear arms race with either only implicit reference to the extent it increased US-Soviet tensions or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the reasons for the improvement in US-Soviet relations in the 1970s. These might include (1) the impact of improving Sino-US relations (2) the desire to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1 (3) wider US and Soviet economic considerations (for example, to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to western technology) (4) the impact of Vietnam on America (5) the pressure for détente generated by Ostpolitik in opening up channels between east and west Europe. This question also requires candidates to consider how significantly the US-Soviet relationship improved and the factors above might be developed to advance a positive case. Developments in the 1970s which challenge the view of significant improvement might include (1) Soviet refusal to link détente to further concessions (e.g. over Vietnam and USSR's anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev's adherence to the long-term victory of communism (2) the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (e.g. Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia) (3) the Helsinki Accords (1975) and Soviet human rights issues (4) the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) (5) the scrapping of SALT 2.</p> <p>At Level 5, there will be sustained analysis of the reasons for the improvement in US- Soviet relations in the 1970s with a reasoned judgement on 'how significantly'. The answer will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the reasons for improvement with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how significantly'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis regarding the reasons for the improvement in US-Soviet relations but the detail may be undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide only implicit reference to reasons for the improvement in US-Soviet relations, or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 provides support for the statement in the question by maintaining that Anglo-French divisions undermined the effectiveness of the League in the 1920s and the 1930s. It contends that the lack of a common Anglo-French approach could be seen over four issues – the Corfu crisis, the Geneva Protocol, Abyssinia and Hitler’s expansionist challenge – which ultimately destroyed the League’s credibility. This argument can be cross-referenced with Source 3’s observation that Britain and France viewed the function of the League very differently. In contrast, Source 2 offers the view that the USA’s lack of participation robbed the League of any realistic prospect of maintaining a stable international order. The extract is, however, careful to state that American involvement would have made League success more likely, not inevitable. Once again, this line of argument can be cross-referenced with Source 3. Finally, Source 3 notes how a variety of factors – constitutional requirements, US non-participation, Anglo-French indifference and state sovereignty – all weakened the League.</p> <p>Candidates own knowledge of the League’s weaknesses and failings should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the impact of Anglo-French differences on the functioning of the League (for example, the French regarded the League, much more than the British, as a means of preserving the European status quo); the ‘victors’ club’ image of the League and the prominent role played by Britain and France in its affairs in the 1920s and 1930s; the various defects and loopholes in the League’s constitution which made concerted action against aggression difficult to achieve; how US rejection of the League helped to facilitate the challenge of the revisionist powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) in the 1930s e.g. Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1935).</p> <p>Candidates’ own knowledge should be added to the source evidence and will be integrated into that evidence in support of an argument at Levels 4/5. It is acceptable to enter riders about the apparent League successes, especially in the 1920s, but the focus of good answers should be on reasons for failure. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of Anglo-French divisions in explaining League weaknesses and the answer will be informed by precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Anglo-French divisions in the failure of the League. Here, there will be confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 3 a clear conclusion about reasons for the League’s failure, linked to an understanding of the impact of Anglo-French divisions, will be offered, and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Levels 1 and 2</p>	40

	most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge.	
--	---	--

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>Source 4 gives candidates material to support the view that the outbreak of war between the USA and Japan in 1941 was due to a 'fundamental clash of systems'. The extract points out that major differences between the USA (liberal capitalist, free trade, democratic, respect for human rights) and Japan (protectionist, anti-democratic, militarist, disregard for human rights) made conflict likely. Source 5 rejects revisionist arguments that Roosevelt deliberately encouraged a Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor to shock US opinion into supporting war. Overy then goes on to argue that American miscalculation played a crucial role – the US government was convinced that Japan had neither the intention nor the military capability to launch a direct attack. Source 6 stresses the economic causes of the war by examining how the US trade embargo was undermining the Japanese economy and Japan's attempts to establish a 'Greater East Asian Co-Prosperty Sphere'. Viewed from this perspective, the Japanese attack was a desperate bid to break the US economic stranglehold. Candidates might cross reference Source 6 with Source 4 (to develop the economic argument) and Source 5 (to expand the miscalculation viewpoint).</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the reasons for the US-Japanese conflict in 1941 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: Japanese expansionist policies in the area, e.g. war against China (1937) and the creation of the Greater Asian Co-Prosperty Sphere (1940); US determination to uphold its Open Door Policy; American economic sanctions (e.g. oil, copper, zinc) 'forced' Japan into a pre-emptive strike; the impact of Hitler's victories in Europe (and growing influence in the Atlantic) on the decision-makers in Washington and Tokyo; the threat posed to US security by the Japanese challenge to British imperial interests in the region.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of fundamental differences between the US and Japanese systems on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. For Level 4, look for developed argument on the relative merits of the various arguments. Here, there will be confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. Level 3 answers will reach a conclusion probably recognising that the argument is not simply about a fundamental clash of systems and clearly recognising that the sources give different interpretations. Sources will be used with some confidence. At Levels 1 and 2 responses are likely to sift the evidence with some cross-referencing, and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements.</p>	40

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 argues that US expansionism was central to the development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1953. The US drive for markets and its universalist ideology not only prompted this policy but also led to American rejection of Stalin's attempts to consolidate the Soviet sphere. Stronger candidates will pick up on the reference to US misperception of Soviet motives and actions and will cross-reference relevantly to Sources 8 and 9. In contrast, Source 8 offers a more nuanced perspective. According to this extract, the USSR, guided by ideology and national interest, attempted to achieve security through expansion and control of its own sphere of influence. It portrays Stalin as an essentially cautious leader who provoked the USA only in peripheral areas such as Iran and Korea. Source 9 emphasises the role played by Stalin's actions in Europe and Asia and how Truman concluded that this was all part of an aggressive Soviet strategy to advance communism and undermine US security. Candidates might link this view with elements of the argument relating to the USSR in Source 8.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-53 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the US 'Open Door' policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism'; the 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the role of Stalin and other key personalities, particularly Truman and Roosevelt; the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the impact of the spread of the Cold War to Asia, notably China (1949) and Korea (1950-53).</p> <p>The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of US expansionism on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 3, a clear conclusion will be reached about the role played by US expansionism and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Levels 1 and 2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 supports the statement in the question by linking Reagan’s famous moral condemnation of the Soviet Union to the loss of popular legitimacy in the Eastern bloc by the late 1980s. In breaking with diplomatic convention, Reagan was highlighting the moral bankruptcy of the communist system. In contrast, Source 11 focuses on Reagan’s more moderate policies, particularly in his dealings with Gorbachev from 1985, which helped to end the Cold War. Candidates should note here that Reagan largely abandoned his earlier hard-line stance, and ignored neoconservative objections, to enter into constructive negotiations with the Soviet leader. Source 12 offers a different perspective by identifying the economic, technological and foreign policy challenges facing Gorbachev and how he attempted to resolve them. Here, candidates should note that several elements of the argument can be used to support the general moral bankruptcy view outlined in Source 10 (for example, low living standards and coercive control).</p> <p>Candidates’ relevant own knowledge of the Cold War should be added to the evidence of the sources and will be integrated into that evidence in support of a sustained argument at Levels 4/5. Candidates are likely to know about: key features pointing to the moral bankruptcy of the Soviet system (e.g. the corrupt nomenklatura, the alienated population, abuse of human rights, and the Eastern bloc being characterised as an ‘empire by rape’); the mounting economic problems and relative technological backwardness of the Soviet Union in the 1970s/1980s and the widening East-West gap in living standards; the policies pursued by Reagan (e.g. SDI, neutron bomb, MX missiles, hard-line ‘evil empire’ rhetoric, and, later, growing rapport with Gorbachev) and their impact; Gorbachev’s rejection of ‘old style’ Soviet diplomacy and the Brezhnev era (<i>perestroika</i>, <i>glasnost</i>); the impact of the INF Treaty (1987), the Moscow Summit (1988) and Gorbachev’s address to the UN (1988); the role of ‘people power’ in eastern Europe in the late 1980s e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall etc.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will offer a sustained discussion of the relative importance of key factors with some concentration on the moral bankruptcy of Soviet communism, using precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of the moral bankruptcy of Soviet communism and other factors (e.g. the role of Reagan) on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 3, a clear conclusion on why the Cold War came to an end will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge.</p>	40

