



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2017

**Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level in History (WHI04) Paper 1C**

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

June 2017

Publications Code

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Unit4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

WHI04 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943-90

Introduction

June 1706 was the first time that WHI04 was taken by candidates entered for the IAL History qualification, and was the first time that candidates encountered AO3-focused questions relating to Historical Interpretations. It was pleasing to see that most candidates were well prepared in terms of knowledge and that many responses were both well-informed and well-written. However, the approach of some responses to both Section A and Section B limited the ability of candidates to be rewarded at the higher Levels of the mark scheme.

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question relating to the historical issue outlined in Key Topic 1 – Historical Interpretations. The question requires candidates to make a judgement on a stated viewpoint, through the analysis of two extracts from historical works which address the historical issue and their own knowledge of the historical issues. The question assesses AO3 skills – candidate ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted – in combination with AO1 skills – candidate ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts.

Section B also targets AO1 skills. Section B provides a choice of essays relating to Key Topics 2-4. Questions set may address more than one topic or relate to a single topic. The essays assess knowledge and understanding of the period in depth – questions may relate to a single event or a longer period – by targeting five possible second order concepts – cause, consequence, change/continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Questions may combine second order concepts, for example, consequence and change. Candidates answer one question from a choice of three. The most common weakness in Section B essays was the lack of a sharp focus on the precise terms of the question and/or the second order concept that was being targeted.

Candidates are, in general, clearly aware of both the structure and the timing of the examination paper; there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

Candidate performance on each section and individual questions for Paper 2E is considered in the next section. Please note that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different routes of the paper to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

Centres may also wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website.

Section A

Unit 4 is the first time that candidates have encountered the AO3 skills requirement and most were aware of the need to address the viewpoint given in the question by analysing the interpretations presented in the extracts and drawing on their own knowledge. The viewpoint stated in the question will be represented clearly within one extract with counter-evidence being presented in the other. However, both extracts may include material which can be both compared as well as contrasted. Higher Level responses came to a judgement about how far they agreed with the viewpoint by analysing both extracts and integrating their own knowledge into the overall discussion. These responses often addressed the extracts from the beginning using them to discuss differing arguments in relation to the viewpoint and deploying own knowledge to expand the discussion and where appropriate indicate other areas of debate not covered. Higher Level responses also met the descriptor requirement to reach a judgement based on the views given in both extracts and did not just refer to the general lines of debate within the overall Key Topic area.

The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the three bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note their progression:

- interpretation and analysis of extracts
- deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate
- evaluation of and judgement about the interpretations

Some approaches by candidates matched the descriptors in the lower Levels of the mark scheme. Candidates who wrote a Section B AO1 style answer without any explicit reference to the sources found it difficult to achieve a mark beyond low-Level 2 as all the bullet point descriptors require some engagement with the extracts. Also candidates who wrote responses almost entirely based on comprehension and understanding of the extracts rather than discussing the views presented in the extracts were unlikely to achieve beyond Level 2. Some responses wrote very briefly about each extract and then wrote extensively on aspects not included in the extracts. Again these responses were not using the extracts to develop the debate and so could at best reach low Level 3. A few candidates seemed to have a prepared response to a generalised debate with regard to the Key Topic which ignored the viewpoint given in the question altogether and so were not able to focus on the question set.

Some candidates viewed this as an AO2 source analysis and evaluated the extracts with regard to aspects of provenance which is not an appropriate approach. There may be some occasions when the title of the book from which the extract is taken furthers the discussion of the viewpoint but it is not intended that the candidates use the information provided to help forward the debate and no instruction is given with regard to this (unlike the AO2 requirements). Candidates should be encouraged to refer to the extracts and to discuss the interpretations to be found within the extracts. Here it is worth noting the guidance given in the *Getting Started* document. *Students are not expected to be familiar with the writing of the selected historians but they should be familiar*

with the issues that make the question controversial. Reference to the works of name historians, other than the material in the extracts provided is not expected but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their arguments.

Also many candidates appeared to create their discussion by reference to only the first few lines of each extract and so lost an opportunity to develop key points made later in the extracts. Candidates have sufficient time to consider the extracts carefully and to draw out a variety of different key points in order to compare and contrast the interpretations presented.

Question 1

Candidates for this Option were almost universally well-prepared in relation to both their knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding the origins of the Cold War. Candidates were clearly aware of different views and the best responses were able to deploy this in discussing the extracts and using their understanding to reach a judgement on the view stated in the question. However, a significant number of candidates seemed to ignore the statement altogether and write a general response with regard to the general origins of the Cold War rather than the Cold War policies of the USA. Often these responses failed to acknowledge the wording of the statement at all, and so although knowledgeable did not focus on the question asked and so were mainly awarded Level 3 marks. There were some very good answers which were able to develop the view points in the extract and also expand on some of the events mentioned, particularly in Extract 1. Many were able to contrast the 'defensive' viewpoint in Extract 1 with the more 'expansionist' viewpoint in Extract 2. Some suggested that both were to some extent aspects of the same motivating belief in American values. This was an example of where the titles of the books used were deployed by some candidates to show the differing views. Most candidates were clearly aware of the historiography but only a few described the debate rather than used it to analyse; the main problem lay in the failure to address the specific question as outlined above. There were some very good and very interesting responses which were a pleasure to read.

This is a Level 5 response. It engages directly with the extracts in relation to the view stated in the question.

Please insert Doc ID QC429003925834

To a certain extent, I agree with the view that the Cold War policies of the USA were motivated by the ideological mission to defend liberty against communism in the years 1945-53. Extract 1 supports this view by highlighting the policies of the Truman Doctrine, which led to the USA's greater involvement in world affairs. On the other hand, Extract 2 emphasizes the importance of working to spread capitalism in order to increase the USA's power, something which can be seen further interpreted in the 1947 Marshall Plan. This is also seen in the Korean war ~~in Extract 1~~ mentioned and the leadership rivalry between Truman and Stalin.

On one hand, I agree with the view that USA's policies were mainly fuelled by the wish to defend 'liberty' against the forces of darkness. Extract 1 defends this view by stating the importance of the 1947 Truman Doctrine, which guided the 'spirit of American foreign policy'. The USSR is portrayed as an evil empire who's aim was 'slavery for all the world'. The USA, which had been threatened by communism since the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, felt responsible for saving freedom. Truman's resilience is conveyed by his separation between those who 'love freedom' and those who want 'slavery and darkness'. This idea had already ~~been seen in the~~ been seen in the 1946 Long Telegram from Moscow,

where George Kennan warned the US government of Russia's plan to spread communism. This view, which dominated American Cold War policies for much of the Cold War, evidently motivated the ideological nation to defend liberty against communism.

On the other hand, Extract 2 emphasises the importance of building an effective business market to spread world capitalism. The 'new strength' following the Second World War fuelled the USA's ambitions to increase their economic supremacy and 'reform world capitalism'. This interpretation by Kelk was shared by the USSR in the years 1945-53. The 1947 Marshall Aid was portrayed, by the USA, to be a generous act of benevolence, in order to prevent the economic crisis in Europe from declining even further. They gave \$17 billion in total to 16 countries in West Europe, excluding all satellite states of the Soviet Union. This reflects Extract 2's view that 'trade' and 'aid' were the true motivations behind the USA's policies, as they wanted to make sure that they upheld European trade partners. Poverty was also regarded to be the breeding grounds for communism by the US government, so the Marshall Aid was imposed to ensure the sustainability of capitalism. This interpretation is also supported by America's reluctance to force Germany to pay costly reparations during the 1945 Potsdam conference, something which the USSR condemned to be 'Dollar Imperialism'.

However, the aggression of Soviet expansionism in the years 1945-53 reflect Extract 1's portrayal of the USSR as 'slavery under the grim control of the Kremlin'. The speed at which Stalin managed to take control of the neighbouring states after the Second World War alarmed the West. By 1947,

every Eastern European state, except Czechoslovakia, were under communist control. Stalin also managed to stamp out all opposition by expelling, executing, or even executing those who tried to go against his regime, something which would have made the USA lean towards the view that the USSR were 'a force of darkness'. There was particular outrage after Stalin had promised to uphold free elections at the 1945 Yalta conference, along with his refusal to allow the original Polish government to replace the Red Army after the war. Extract 1 also mentions the Berlin blockade 1948-49, which portrayed Soviet aggression in preventing the introduction of Western capitalism. The USA were forced to fly up to 3000 tonnes of consumer goods every 24 hours to West Berlin, in order to prevent the people from starving. This illustrates the USSR as a 'force of darkness' which the USA had no choice but to fight against in order to maintain liberty.

On the other hand, the Berlin Blockade, although aggressive, had been triggered by the combined forces of West Germany. The Western allies had joined their territories together to create a 'Trizamia' state, something which Stalin saw as a threat. Their introduction of the new currency, Deutsche Mark, presents an example of the USA's aim to 'restructure' the world to gain power, as conveyed in Extract 2, suggesting that the USA had pushed the USSR into the blockade, undermining the view that the USA's Cold War policies were motivated by the wish to protect freedom. This can also be seen in the Korean War 1950, as America's war policies shifted from containing communism to 'rolling-back' communism. In October 1950, Truman ordered ~~MacArthur~~ General MacArthur and the 260,000 UN troops to capture Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea. The initial involvement of the USA in the war had been triggered by communist forces invading South Korea, suggesting the policy of 'defending liberty'. However, when

Truman decided to go further and invade North Korea, this portrays the policy of containing 'world capitalism' as stated in Extract 2. The Soviet expansion which America had condemned 'forces of darkness' were now being mirrored by the USA's 'extension and expansion of American capitalism'. Thus, ideological mission can not be identified to be the USA's motivation to defend those fighting communist forces.

In conclusion, the USA did regard the USSR as evil and it's Cold War policies were motivated by the defence of 'liberty against the forces of darkness'. Extract 1 shows how the Truman Doctrine portrays the defensive policies which dominated the USA in the years 1945-53, supported by aggressive Soviet expansionism following the Second World War. The Long Telegram further proves this interpretation to have been adopted by Truman's government along with their heroic act in facing Stalin's Berlin blockade. However, these portrayals could also be masking the true motivation behind the USA's Cold War policies as mentioned in Extract 2. Their interference in Europe with the Marshall Aid and the wish to uphold the sustainability of their trading partners, prove that the USA's policies may have been motivated by the world capitalism and gainning project. The triggering of the Berlin Blockade, along with the change of policies to 'rolling-back' communism in the Korean War, supports this interpretation of Extract 2. Thus, both Extract 1 and Extract 2, along with supporting evidence, implies that America's Cold War policies were motivated by defending liberty and economic gain in the years 1945-53.

This is a Level 4 response. Here the response is answering the question using the extracts in support of the discussion rather than to lead the discussion.

Please insert Doc ID QC429003925832

To a relatively small extent, the Cold War policies of the USA in the years 1945-53 were motivated by a genuinely ideological mission to defend 'liberty' against the forces of darkness! To the more pragmatic post-war superpower leaders Joseph Stalin of the USSR and Harry S. Truman (President 12 April 1945-20 January 1953), who saw the opportunity to fill the power vacuum that emerged from the fall of the French and UK empires and a war-torn Europe, the pursuit of hegemony and national security, as well as economic issues and interests likely were of relatively greater significance.

The foreign policy of the US 1945-53 was to some extent motivated by ideology. Extract 1 states that "the Truman Doctrine ... involved a vision of America's mission as defending 'liberty'. The battle for the hearts and minds, of which Europe was the first battle ground consisted, for the US, of stopping nations from 'falling' to communist authoritarian 'darkness'. The competing ideologies of capitalism and Marxism-Leninism (communism) were completely different and economically and politically opposed. Capitalist liberal freedom to consume and achieve the 'American Dream' in a freemarket economy with a small laissez-faire government approach contrasted sharply with what the Americans saw as communist tyranny: a planned economy and a one-party state. Extract 2, takes a more perhaps post-revisionist and broader angle to the rather orthodox school of historiography text of Extract 1. Extract 2 states

the "the US' ultimate objective at the end of WWII was to both sustain and reform world capitalism". Rather than the more ideologically ~~ideal~~ idealist approach adopted partly in Extract 1, Extract 2 comments that the ideological rivalry was also caused by the US' desire to expand its capitalist sphere of influence. This is challenged by for example Dean Acheson's (Secretary of State under Truman) statement that "I think that it is a mistake to think that you can sit down with the Russians and solve questions." The strong anti-communist stance of the Truman administration, also influenced by the strong anti-communist McCarthyism. In 1954 US "policies and programs" even involved adding "to God" in the Oath of Allegiance to take a stance against atheist communism. However, the desire to halt the spread of communism was also to maintain an American political and economic sphere of influence and markets for American goods in Europe especially.

Moreover, the Cold War policies of the USA were to a relatively large extent motivated by the pursuit of hegemony, as Molotov called it "dollar imperialism" and national security. Extract 1 states that "The Truman Doctrine established the guiding spirit of American foreign policy" and mentions the "influential document NSC 68". On April 12 1947, president Truman declared to Congress that "it must be the policy of the US to assist free peoples facing subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures". For this policy statement, it is perhaps sound to challenge the view that Truman changed US foreign policy

because of ~~the~~ Deputy Head of US Embassy to Moscow George Kennan's Long Telegram (22 February 1946) which first spoke of "a policy of containment" which Truman read and tried to enforce with his Doctrine. Other factors such as the "Berlin Blockade (June 1947 - May 1948) which resulted in an 11 month airlift, seemed to confirm US perception of Marxist expansionism. The same effect was produced by the Korean War (25 June 1950 - 27 July 1953), which the US saw a USSR aggression.

"NSC 68" ~~was~~ a 58 page document published especially to be read by Truman, 18 April 1950 emphasized the need for "containment" and a more aggressive, military stance against the USSR. Extract 2 similarly mentions that US policy was "not containment of communism... but the expansion of American capitalism" explaining it more with the desire for hegemony rather than national security as Extract 1 does.

The policy of containment under Truman (1945-53) involved the Marshall plan (April 8 1948 lasting 4 years)* which gave \$400 million to Greece and Turkey to reduce the fear of spread of communism. As Source 1 states "armed minorities" had to be fought against to free people he likely references the Greek civil war which began March 20 1946 and the desire for a Western-controlled Eastern Mediterranean was essential for US oil interests in the Middle East. The US gave today's equivalent of \$130 billion to re-built Europe and reduce the spread of communism by expanding capitalism.

Lastly, the Cold War policies of the US were to a relatively large extent motivated by its economic issues and interests. Extract 1 states that there was "an all-embracing struggle... between freedom... and slavery". The "slavery" here is the US perception of communist economies. As Extract 2 states, complementing Extract 1, "the US found itself immeasurably enriched" after WWII. Indeed, 1941-5 US GDP ~~rose~~ doubled and by 1945 half of the world's output was produced by US' powerful military-industrial complex, which was 3 times more than USSR manufacturing output. Concepts of "free trade" were vital to US growth and it needed capitalist markets especially in Europe to sell to and trade with. The setting of institutions such as Radio Liberty/Radio Free Europe was largely motivated by US desire for greater capitalist economic freedom domestically and abroad.

In conclusion, ^{only} to a relatively small extent small extent was the motivation of US Cold War policies in the years 1945-53 an ideological mission. To a larger extent, US desire for hegemony and national security was strong and involved the spread of capitalist ideology. Perhaps most importantly, US economic issues and interests made the US first an economic superpower so capitalist expansion was essential for US political supremacy in the Cold War against Communism.

Most candidates were clearly aware of the requirements for the essay skills assessed in Section B. Most candidates showed progression from the AS units and were well-prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical rather than a descriptive response. There was little evidence to suggest that the range and depth of essays were affected by the time taken to consider the two extracts in Section A. Many candidates were able to access Levels 3, 4 and 5 but weaker responses either did not provide enough factual support for a depth study essay or deal well with the conceptual focus of the question. Centres are reminded that any of the second order concepts listed in the introduction can be addressed in the essay section and candidates need to be aware that not all questions will refer to causation and that not all responses require a main factor/other factors response. Indeed, a persistent number of candidates attempt to respond to all questions by addressing the relative significance of generic causal factors whether appropriate or not.

The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note their progression:

- analysis and exploration of key features and characteristics of the period in relation to the second-order conceptual demands of the question
- selection and deployment of knowledge
- substantiated evaluation and judgement
- organisation and communication of argument

At Level 4 and above there is a requirement for the exploration of key issues by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period and many good responses remained in Level 3 because these relationships were stated rather than explained or because key features were addressed separately e.g. stating that each key feature in turn was the main reason rather than developing a logical argument. It is also important to note that the reference to valid criteria in the third bullet point is not a reference to the different factors/key issues/key features being discussed but to the measurement criteria being used to reach an overall judgement. This is the extent to which students are able to explain and justify their decision to ascribe greater significance to one cause than another, or to judge a development as significant or an action as ineffective etc.

Here are two Level 5 responses. They engage fully with the wording of the question and the responses, along with their overall conclusion, establish criteria for judgement.

Please insert Doc ID QC429003925837

During the years 1962 - 1979 there was a more permanent easing of tensions between the USSR and US. This resulted in improved relations due to increased agreements on arms limitations, as well as further agreements on human rights, and trade. Although there was an improvement in relations between the two superpowers, it could be argued that these did not greatly improve due to the USSR's economic inferiority, which made the USSR more dependent on agreements with the US. The relations also improved as a result of the Sino-Soviet split, thus demonstrating that the relations were eased because the USSR had to rather than wanted to. The relations also failed to greatly improve due to Soviet violations of the agreements and increasing pressure in the US concerning SALT II.

The superpower relations did initially improve due to the ~~total~~ easing of tension. The Cuban Missile Crisis 1962 illustrated the dangers of brinkmanship and nuclear weapons and thereby resulted in increased co-operation between the USSR and US concerning arms limitations. The hot-line telephone link in 1963, as well as the ~~Basic Principles Treaty 1963~~ ¹⁹⁶³ Test Ban Treaty, enabled a general improvement in superpower relations by

treaty outlining & providing a method of direct contact between the two superpowers in case of a future crisis, while the Test Ban Treaty reduced the ability of superpowers to test their new weaponry, although they were still able to if it was performed underground. ~~The~~ The Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty (SALT) in 1972 also improved ~~tension~~ relations because both superpowers agreed to limit ~~the~~ anti-ballistic missiles and signed the Basic Principles Treaty 1972. The Basic Principles Treaty was of "unlimited duration" and ~~suggested~~ suggested that in the case of a crisis both superpowers are to "engage in urgent consultations". Although this was a formal agreement, it was merely a statement of intent. Nonetheless these agreements on arms limitations improved the relations between the superpowers due to increased co-operation and limiting the threat of a nuclear war. ~~from~~

The superpower relations improved during this period because the arms limitations gave rise to increased co-operation in other fields. Initially, the violations of human rights in the Soviet bloc caused great concern in the West, specifically in regard to Jews, however the Helsinki Agreements in 1975 marked a significant improvement in American and Soviet relations due to the fact that the Soviets had agreed to improving human rights and Helsinki Agreement also included the

idea that borders should not be violated as well as encouraging increased trade between the two superpowers.

However, ~~the increase~~ although the increased trade could be argued to improve relations, the trade also worsened relations to an extent. The USSR relied on grain imports from the US, hence it could be argued that ~~too~~ there was increased co-operation in the years 1962-1979 but not necessarily an improvement in relations. This is ~~not~~ further supported by the fact that the USA's technology was far superior to the USSR; the USA had 30 million domestic computers in 1978, whereas the USSR only possessed 50 000. As a result the USSR's economy was much slower and relied on trade with the USA in order to benefit from the US's more advanced technology. ~~This~~ This suggests that the easing of tensions was also partly due to the USSR's economic dependence on the USA and the economic inferiority of the USSR could still have generated resentment towards the US's superiority.

Moreover, the superpower relations throughout this period did not necessarily improve greatly because the Sino-Soviet split established the need for the USSR to improve its relations with the USA. The Sino-Soviet split created a triangular diplomacy, in which the USSR would have to provide greater concessions to the USA in order to

maintain its relation and if not the US and China improved their relations, thus posing a greater threat to the USSR. This suggests that The USSR lost trade links with China as a result of the split, while China increased its trade with the US from \$~~5 billion~~ \$5 million to \$300 million. At the same time the USSR's growth rates gradually slowed from 3.7% in 1974 to 2.7% in 1978, yet at the same time world growth rates were ~~at~~ 8%. The slowing growth rates coupled with China's greater economic relations with the US required the USSR to co-operate with the US throughout this period, thus tensions eased and relations improved to an extent but the improved relations was not necessarily a result of increased Soviet willingness and the economic inferiority increased underlying tensions.

The relations between the USSR and USA can also be argued to not have greatly improved during the years 1962 - 1979 because there were underlying tensions and feelings of mutual distrust. The 1968 Czechoslovakian invasion demonstrated the ~~aggressive~~ continuous aggressive nature of the Soviets, while the Brezhnev Doctrine illustrated Soviets motivation to expand communism. Throughout the period both the US and USSR competed over influence in third world countries and the Soviet influence in Angola, Mozambique and

Ethiopia gave rise to tensions because the Soviets had agreed not to violate borders. However, Thus, the continuous expansion of the Soviets failed to improve relations between the US and USSR, while the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 ~~too~~^{marks} in a definitive end to co-operation between the Superpowers. Although the Soviet expansion in Africa gave rise to tensions but did not prompt confrontation or ~~stop~~ end co-operation, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan emphasised that the Soviets would continue to violate agreements and pursue hegemony. This is reinforced by the fact that the Soviets continued to violate human rights despite signing the Helsinki Agreement 1975, yet it could also be argued that the human rights were not specifically outlined and that the USSR had a different interpretation to the USA. The relations did not greatly impair as a result of Soviet actions but at the same time there was also growing pressure in the US that ~~thus~~ suggesting the USA no longer wanted to co-operate. The rise of neo-conservatism put increased pressure on SALT II 1979 because the belief was that it allowed the USSR to catch up to the US and thereby reduced the US's superiority. The failure to ratify SALT II in 1979 ~~is~~ was partly due to the invasion of Afghanistan but also indicates that the easing of tension between the Superpowers resulted due to the US's

increased economic and military superiority.

In conclusion, superpower relations did improve to an extent in the years 1962 - 1979 as seen through the increased arms limitation agreements and increased co-operation in the field of trade. However, relations did not greatly improve due to the fact that the USSR was partly dependent on the US for trade and technology, while the loss of China as an ally further increased this dependency - thus, the USSR's motivation for co-operation was not necessarily to improve relations but instead because it relied on the co-operation. Moreover, the continuous Soviet expansion in Africa and the aggressive nature of the Soviets in Prague did not improve tensions but increased underlying tensions that resulted in the end of Detente following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. It can also be argued that relations did not greatly improve because the US relied on maintaining their economic superiority thus the USSR's ~~weak~~ dependence simply eased tensions for a short period.

The period between 1962 and 1972, the Détente, has been viewed as a time when superpower relations between the USSR and the USA improved considerably. Indeed, this was an era of significant international treaties such as SALT I and the Helsinki Accords which demonstrated the willingness of USA and the USSR to co-operate with each other. However, many of these treaties had considerable weaknesses, their contribution was mainly symbolic. In addition, the deeper ideological and national causes of superpower tensions remained intact and would demonstrate the fragility of Détente when it shattered in 1972.

The Cuban Missiles Crisis of 1962 can be viewed as the highpoint of the Cold War tensions. The USA and the USSR narrowly avoided an all-out nuclear war. The Crisis greatly increased the fear of the destructive potential of nuclear weaponry and was a decisive factor in encouraging co-operation between the two superpowers. The establishment of the Hotline Telephone Link was an important result of the crisis that facilitated better communication between the leaders of USA and USSR in order to minimise future misunderstandings. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was to further stabilize relations and reduce fear of nuclear war by banning nuclear tests above ground and under water.

These gradual improvements in relations became more prominent in the 1970's and which is regarded as the Détente period with the signing of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I) ^{in 1972}. Under the ABM treaty of SALT I, each superpower was allowed only two anti-

anti-ballistic missile systems; one for the capital and one to protect their nuclear arsenal. The Interim treaty set limits on the number of submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and Inter-continental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) that USA and USSR could have. The General principles treaty set out some rules for the conduct of nuclear warfare like banning the placement of missiles on the seabed. ~~SALT II~~ was signed ~~in~~ SALT II built upon the agreements ~~in~~ of SALT I and imposed further limitations.

These agreements on arms were highly significant since the nuclear arms race was one of the key ways that the Cold War was fought. The simple fact that both sides were willing to compromise and reach an agreement with each other over nuclear weaponry shows that superpower relations had improved in the period.

The Helsinki Accords of 1975 was another important treaty agreement between the East and the West. Under this treaty the USA officially recognised Soviet influence in Eastern Europe by declaring the current borders 'inviolable'. Trade exchanges were another facet of the Helsinki Accords that showed how relations had improved. The human rights agreements made at Helsinki were extremely by the USSR was a very important concession. Lack of political freedoms like the freedom of press, speech and expression were one of the main factors fueling American hatred towards communism. The USSR's agreement to uphold these values, therefore signals improved relations.

However, there were inherent weaknesses in these agreements that show that even though relations had apparently improved, these improvements did not go very far.

One factor that shows how Cold War tensions had not improved is the

long time passed that was necessary to conclude agreements. Negotiations for SALT I had started as early as 1969 but only led to any results by 1972 and even then, the treaty itself was flawed.

Although limits were placed on nuclear weapons by the Interim Treaty, both the USSR and USA still had enough nuclear capability to repeatedly destroy the other. In addition the Interim treaty was only a temporary agreement that had to be renewed. In addition the arms agreements of this era tended to focus on existing weapons and ignore any future technological advancements. However these new weapons would be the decisive factor in winning the arms race. In this the US had a clear technological advantage. The General Principles Treaty however was nothing more than a statement of intent that had neither no guarantee to bind either power to it.

The earlier Nuclear Test Ban Treaty also had loopholes which made nuclear testing possible underground and in space. It is also notable that even though SALT I was signed it was never ratified.

Even during the détente the ideological conflict between capitalism and communism was still prominent. Indeed in US, détente policies were presented as being anti-communist. Arms agreements were seen as a way of restricting Soviet build-up of arms. Improved relations with China was portrayed as a way of splitting up the communist bloc. The USSR on the other side also showed no signs that it had stopped its belief in the inherent moral superiority of capitalism. It kept sending billions of dollars in aid to Third World countries and maintained a tight grip on the communist states of Eastern Europe. The Czechoslovakian crisis of 1968 showed this and was even a factor that hindered discussions for SALT I.

Improved relations were present in 1962 the period 1962 - 1972 were linked to domestic pressures of both superpowers. Military expenditure was diverting considerable sums away from improving living standards in both countries. In the US, the temporary demobilization & in the wake of the Vietnam war also played a part leading to better relations. For the USSR the desire to become more advanced technologically and the impact implications on the Sino-Soviet split nudged the Soviet leadership towards better relations. These factors show that USA and USSR only opted for improved relations because it was in their ^{best} national interests at the time. The Detente was not an effort to stop the Cold War but to continue it on different terms. As soon as the reasons encouraging co-operation disappeared the Detente came full apart in 1979.

In conclusion superpower relations did improve in the years 1962 and 1979, especially when considering the wider context ^{of} ongoing hostility between USA and the USSR. However the agreements of this era limitations of agreements in this era show that this apparent improvement did not go very deep, as did continuing ideological tensions. The improved relations of this period ~~can be~~ ^{can be} accurately described as superficial and only a temporary interlude that would only stay in place if it fulfilled the national interests of the USA and USSR. Therefore ^{though} superpower relations did improve somewhat, the word 'greatly' to say that they improved 'greatly' would be an overstatement.

Question 2

This was the more popular of the two questions. There were many high Level and interesting response to the question focusing on the extent to which relation between the USA and USSR improved. Those at the highest Level were able to differentiate between improved and improved 'greatly' and these tended to give a clear indication of the pattern of change over time. Some candidates appeared to produce a prepared answer on the causes of the improvement rather than the extent. At A level the emphasis should be on clearly addressing the specific focus of the

question. Some responses provided a narrative description of events and some unfortunately did not read the time period accurately and wrote about the period pre-1962. There were also a few unfortunate candidates who placed events in 1960/1961 as the starting point. Knowledge of the key dates and a clear understanding of the chronology are very important.

Question 3

There were some interesting responses to this question. Many candidates were able to discuss the relative significance of the Reagan presidency in relation to other contributory factors such as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the deployment of missiles in Europe, the rise of Solidarity in Poland, the role of Margaret Thatcher etc. At the higher Levels candidates were able to determine significance by consideration of the impact made by the different factors; the scale of the international response to each, the extent to which diplomacy was affected, the extent to which each led to the likelihood of war etc. Most suggested that there were a series of inter-related factors of which the Reagan presidency was only one. Some candidates were confused in their chronology, particularly those who were under the assumption that Gorbachev came to power at the same time as Reagan and Thatcher rather than in the mid-1980s.

This is a Level 3 response. It explains rather than explores the key features and issues.

Please insert Doc ID QC429004237774

Reagans presidency was the most significant contributary factor to the heightening of Cold War tensions in the early 1980s to a certain extent. Reagan had his own aggressive policies and his Doctrine to put pressure on the USSR, however other factors such as the US and Chinese relations, multiple uprisings and crack in Europe, as well as the Soviet economy and Afghanistan put some pressure on the Cold War. However Reagan had dominance over the USSR, as the US economy was stable and his high tech and the SDI programme increased the pressure.

Reagan and his policies increased tensions to a great extent as the USSR felt pressured by his policies. The Reagan Doctrine was similar to Truman Doctrine which put a hardline approach on the USSR and kept them in "Iron Gloves". Reagan would pressure the USSR economically, as USSR was incapable to keep up with the Cold War and with the technological advances.

Reagan put a lot of pressure on the Cold War when he introduced the SDI or the new Star Wars system, which could stop nuclear missiles by firing a laser at the rocket from space

which is created would have dominated the Cold War. However the SDI was used to scare the USSR, which have scared them, to a certain extent as they were worried about US invasion, US dominance of the Cold War. This put a lot of pressure on the USSR, and caused them to be more cautious and seen as weak to the rest of the world which annoyed them.

The US had very good relations with China due to Rapprochement which would put massive pressure on the USSR, as now both China and the US had nuclear weapons and were more less allied together. This put pressure on the Cold War as it would make the USSR look weak and unable to make the rest max, due to the pressure of Reagan policies.

Reagan put pressure on the USSR by the use of new technology and covert operations. Reagan had U2 spy planes which since the Cuban Missile Crisis put pressure on the USSR and the Cold War. The USSR was losing the war due to their outdated technology, as Reagan had the money and science to develop new technology and weapons for the USSR, this put a lot of pressure on the Cold War, as the USSR, was unable to do so, due to economic problems.

Reagan put pressure on the USSR by increasing heavy industry

production where the 12% of US GDP was spent on military weapons. Reagan also increased the production of nuclear weapons which scared the USSR, or in case of war between Communism and Capitalism, the USSR would be unable to defend themselves, which put pressure on the Cold War and increased its tensions.

Reagan would spread Capitalist propaganda around Europe and in other countries in the Far East, the project he used was called "American Dream" which argued and put pressure on the USSR as their propaganda did not seem to be working as well as Communist ~~propaganda~~ Reagan's propaganda.

The US put pressure on the USSR by putting pressure on some European countries such as Poland, where Solidarity would receive economic support from the US to spread "Freedom" in Poland. The USSR was humiliated by Reagan and Mao, as well as other European countries due to weakness and the inability to react. USSR was "bullied" by early 1980s, as it was starting falling apart.

US propaganda would be wide spread in Europe which would be the cause of some independent policies and uprisings in Romania and Hungary. Reagan improved relations with the UK which was involved in the "Ostpolitik", which allied West European and East European countries such as Italy and

Romania. The Cold War tensions increased.

However Reagan wasn't the only one to blame for Cold War tensions as it was mostly also the USSR. Following apart internally due to economical pressures from the Afghanistan war, which increased tensions in the Cold War, as the US did not want Afghanistan to become a communist state as well as USSR aggression upon Afghanistan pressured the USA.

$\frac{1}{3}$ of the USSR's money went on military resources and 30 out of 100 million people were involved in arms development sector. The expenditure on nuclear weapons and military was not lowered, which put some pressure on the US and caused Roosevelt to act aggressively as he thought that the other US presidents were too "soft" with the USSR, and called the USSR an "evil empire".

A lot of uprisings such as the Hungarian uprising, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, Solidarity in Poland caused tensions and reasons for argument between the US and the USSR, which enhanced Cold War tensions.

Soviet economy, poverty, unemployment put pressure on itself which made the USSR look weaker, technologically outdated and incapable to fight the Cold War with the US due

to economic problems which put pressure on Soviet Union, that also fuelled the Cold War.

In conclusion, Reagan's policies and his presidential years put a lot of pressure on the Cold War. However his actions were not the only reason Cold War tensions increased or China, European wars and the hate towards communism played a very important role in enhancing the Cold War tensions. However Reagan improved relations with China and the US which then would pressure the USSR with the European Ostpolitik, as well as his propaganda spread, military spending increase, technological advancements, his tactics and anti-communist views put a lot of pressure on the Cold War making it seem like the USSR was "bullied". The USSR was angry but couldn't do anything about it, as it was pressured by China and the US who both had nuclear weapons, which increased the Cold War tensions. Reagan's presidential years put pressure on the Cold War to a big extent, which later on in 1991, caused with other reasons (mostly internal reasons) caused the USSR to collapse on December 25th of 1991.

This is a Level 5 response. It explores rather than explains the key features showing the links between them.

Please insert Doc ID QC QC429003925848

The early 1980s marked the end of Detente and the relaxation of the superpower conflict, to begin a renewed confrontation between the USSR and the USA. There were several factors influencing the end of this period of increased stability and reduced hostility, but one of the most controversial of these was and remains the role of Ronald Reagan as President of the United States. Some of his critics have argued that his intervention heightened Cold War tensions and even prolonged the Cold War by provoking the USSR with renewed conflict. However, Triumphalists will argue Reagan was responsible for ending the Cold War and his role in heightening tensions would be integral in the ending of the conflict. Still, there are, undeniably, a number of factors that contributed to renewed hostility between the ~~treaty~~ USA and the USSR, such as the increasing ~~less~~ Soviet influence in the Third World and Soviet violations of human rights, Brezhnev's health problems, the USSR's

internal opposition to Détente, the rise of neo-conservatism in the USA and, finally, Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The Reagan presidency did not come about as an isolated incident in US history; it was a clear reflection of the change in attitudes in the USA towards Détente. Reagan's presidency was the result of the rise of neo-conservatism in the USA. This ~~new~~ ^{more} group rejected détente and believed it to be prolonging the Cold War. And so, pressured for a hard-line approach against the USSR and its government. Therefore, tensions in the late 1970s and early 1980s cannot solely be attributed to Reagan, since his opinions and decisions were popular and reflected the will of a large proportion of the American people.

Still, Reagan's role in Cold War tensions is undeniable. Upon assuming office he ordered an unprecedented rearmament programme. Many Triumphalists have seen this programme as a to promote national security and obtain concessions from the Soviets. But critics of Triumphalists emphasise his SDI programme appeared unrealistic to the Soviets, who did

not try to follow similar programmes. Therefore, Reagan's ~~get~~ policies did ^{vastly} not affect the USSR's arms spending and production; although it did give Soviet leaders the impression of American hostility. Thus, Reagan could have said he had heightened tensions by provoking the USSR and renewing hostility with the Soviets.

Nevertheless, heightened tension cannot be purely based on the American perspective. Reagan was not the only factor affecting superpower relations. The rise of American opposition to Detente was accompanied by internal Soviet opposition to Detente. The USSR Politburo resented the image the USSR had been ^{internationally} attributed by, for example, the Helsinki Accord. And so, the Politburo opposed the relaxation of relations because it had damaged Soviet reputation and thus, the reputation of communism. The senior political spheres regarded this as ~~to~~ a victory for capitalism and were determined to protect communism's reputation. Furthermore, pressures within the USSR also came from the armed forces. This group rejected Detente and cooperation for being 'soft' and the

enemy. They demanded a hard-line approach to deal with the 'evil forces of capitalism' as was needed: with confrontation. The armed forces were set a group to be ignored, as Khrushchev had found in 1964, and was bitter about ~~the~~ perceived Soviet failures and weakness.

Yet, internal pressures in the USSR were not ~~the~~ the only domestic factors to be considered. Brezhnev's health was to have a great impact on the heightening of superpower tensions. His poor health made him unable to meet with international leaders and to manage crises effectively and immediately. This damaged superpower relations; the importance and usefulness of face-to-face meetings had been shown in the 1950s/1960s, ~~for example~~, when Khrushchev ~~had~~ ~~suspended~~ suspended an ultimatum about Berlin after a meeting with Eisenhower (although it was renewed after meeting with Kennedy). Therefore, face-to-face diplomacy had been proven to be useful, but was now not possible. ~~The~~ The succession of old leaders with poor health in the USSR (named by some historians 'gerontocracy') created a decision-making inertia that would ~~ultimately~~ ~~greatly~~ damage relations with the USA. This idea seems

to become more evident after Gorbachev's meetings with role. Gorbachev dramatically reduced Cold War tensions and his meetings with staunchly anti-communists such as Thatcher and Reagan helped to do this.

But, the ~~Soviet~~ Soviet role in the renewed tensions of the late 1970s and early 1980s ~~was~~ was not solely based on internal factors; the USSR's international actions were, too, to significantly heighten tensions with the USA.

The Soviet violations of the Helsinki Accord in the human rights ~~aspect~~ were a matter of great concern among western leaders. Not only that, but it convinced many westerners that the Soviets could not be trusted; and in doing so, the West ^{egan} began to yet again believe confrontation was essential to deal with the USSR, since ~~accords~~ accords were not respected and there was no intention ~~of preventing~~ ^{of preventing} cooperation.

Furthermore, Soviet actions in the Third World ~~also~~ also heightened tensions in the late 1970s and early 1980s. ~~Asses~~ USSR intervention in the Third World was further seen as evidence

of communist expansionism. This could be said to have provoked the USA into renewed hostility and confrontation. The USA was threatened by the spread of its rival ideology ~~&~~^{and} in political & economic terms. But further to ~~the~~ Soviet ~~technique~~ threat, the USSR's actions in the Third World was regarded by the USA as evidence of the Soviet's continuous expansionism. Much like the violations of the Helsinki accord, it convinced the USA that the USSR could not be negotiated with or stopped other than with force and confrontation.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan ^{in 1979} was to be the last straw, ^{causing} the death of Détente and renewed hostility in the early 1980s.

~~Reagan~~

Reagan's actions as President in the 1980s have been regarded as many to have provoked renewed ~~op~~ hostility with the USSR and to have prolonged, as a result, the end of the Cold War. Yet, his defenders argue his role was to have the opposite effect - ~~the~~ Reagan had been responsible for the defeat of the communist system. Nonetheless, Reagan's actions were not the only factor contributing to ~~the~~ heightening

of tensions. The USSR played a major role in this superpower confrontation; for both internal reasons, reasons and its international actions. Gorbachev and the decision-making mechanism it provoked damaged diplomatic relations that had depended very much upon face-to-face diplomacy at the height of cooperation. Also, the Politburo's and the armed forces' rejection of Detente greatly influenced the USSR attitude towards the US. Additionally, the USSR's violation of the Helsinki Accords and its increasing involvement in the Third World made the West the USSR were not to be trusted or cooperated with, thus provoking hostility among the superpowers.

In conclusion, although Reagan's presidency did make a renewed hostility from the USA and did heighten tensions, it cannot be seen as to have been ~~as~~ the most significant factor; it is important to consider Reagan in the complex context of the period and not consider his role in isolation. ~~The circumstances in which he operated would Although~~ The individuals of the period have often been thought to have driven ~~the~~ events, but these ~~big~~ individuals acted in the face of circumstances that

were greater than them ; and and played an integral part in the development of events.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should use the time available to read and consider both extracts carefully before planning their answer
- Candidates should read the question carefully and make sure that the address the view specifically stated in the question
- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors
- Candidates should aim to integrate own knowledge with the key points raised in the extracts.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative-descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

