

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History (6HI03) Paper E

Advanced Unit 3

Option E: War and Peace: Twentieth Century
International Relations

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 2016

Publications Code 46672

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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.

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.</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: 1-2 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 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</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|---|
| | | <p>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 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 The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| 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> |
| 5 | 14-16 | <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</p> <p>and</p> <p>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> |
| 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. Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and 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. 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. 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 the destabilising and stabilising features of the European alliance systems from 1879 to 1914. Arguments which support a destabilising effect on great power relations might include: the alliance systems (Triple Alliance and Triple Entente) were responsible for creating two rival power blocs; the alliance systems linked 'peripheral' crises in areas such as north Africa and the Balkans directly to the great powers themselves; the alliances also had a direct bearing on the accelerating arms race which helped to generate increasing great power tensions after 1900; the alliance systems encouraged the great powers to develop military schedules which included the planning of offensives and rapid mobilisations, e.g. the Schlieffen Plan. Arguments which support the 'stabilising' viewpoint might include: the primary purpose of the alliances was defensive (e.g. the 1879 Dual Alliance and the 1894 Franco-Russian alliance) rather than offensive and, in themselves, could not lead to war; the alliance systems stabilised great power relations by helping to prevent a general war until 1914; the actual outbreak of war in 1914 bore little relation to the European powers' alliance obligations (e.g. Russia had no formal obligation to assist Serbia, Germany had no formal obligation to give Austria-Hungary a 'blank cheque' etc.).</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will provide a sustained analysis of the destabilising/stabilising effects of the European alliance systems on great power relations in the years 1879-1914. The answer will offer a reasoned judgement on 'how far' the European alliance systems destabilised great power relations, and will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the destabilising/stabilising impact of the European alliance systems between 1879 and 1914 although coverage may be unbalanced. There will be some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis of the destabilising/stabilising effects of the great power alliances 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 European alliance systems (1879-1914) 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 how Wilson’s 14 Points, and other factors, shaped the peace treaties of 1919-23. Features which support the statement in the question might include: selective use of the 14 Points (e.g. national self-determination did not apply to Germany and Austria); the ethnic complexity of the Balkans and eastern and central Europe made it impossible to apply the principle of national self-determination fully; the Allied powers followed their own national interests (rather than the 14 Points) e.g. France’s insistence on German reparations reflected its own economic and security concerns; the imposed nature of the settlement (e.g. Versailles, Trianon) which ran counter to Point 1; the impact of Brest Litovsk on Allied peace-making. Features which challenge the statement in the question might include: acceptance by the Allies and the Central Powers, in principle, that the 14 Points should form the basis of the post-war settlement; creation of the League of Nations, the International Labour Organisation and a mandatory system of government for former German colonies; return of Alsace-Lorraine to France; the restoration of Belgium; the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires; the creation of an independent Poland with access to the sea; national self-determination led to the establishment of two new states - Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; the use of plebiscites to foster self-determination in disputed areas, e.g. Allenstein.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will provide a sustained analysis of the extent to which the peace treaties of 1919-23 ignored Wilson’s 14 Points. Here, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the extent to which the 14 Points were ignored although coverage may be unbalanced. There will be some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis related to the extent the 14 Points informed the treaties, but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2, candidates will provide simple or more developed statements about the peace settlements with either only implicit reference to the extent they ‘largely ignored’ Wilson’s 14 Points 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 Soviet Union's pursuit of 'peaceful coexistence' in the years 1954-62. Developments which suggest that the Soviets were seriously committed to peaceful coexistence with the US might include: Austrian independence and improved Soviet-Yugoslav relations (1955); the 'Geneva spirit' based on east-west summit diplomacy in the mid-1950s and Khrushchev's visit to the USA in 1959; the growing economic and military implications of the arms race in the 1950s and early 1960s; reduction in Soviet conventional forces from the mid-1950s. Developments which suggest Soviet lack of commitment might include: Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence based on long-term victory of communism (did not accept ideological coexistence); the impact of the Hungarian Rising (1956); the USSR's development of nuclear weapons and rocket technology (e.g. ICBMs and the launch of Sputnik in 1957); the decline of summit diplomacy (e.g. Paris (1960) and Vienna (1961)); Soviet policy over Germany (1958-1961) and Khrushchev's intervention in Cuba leading to the 1962 missile crisis.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will provide a sustained analysis of the extent to which the Soviet Union was seriously committed to peaceful coexistence with the US in the years 1954-62. Here, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of Soviet commitment to peaceful coexistence with the US although coverage may be unbalanced. There will be some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis related to the extent of Soviet commitment but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2, candidates will offer simple or more developed statements about peaceful coexistence with either only implicit reference to Soviet commitment or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p> | 30 |

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 4 | <p>Candidates should have knowledge of the reasons which explain why Sino-Soviet relations changed so dramatically from alliance to confrontation during the 1960s. These reasons may include: personal rivalry between Mao and Khrushchev (1960-64); competing Soviet and Chinese claims to the leadership of international communism; Sino-Soviet rivalry over Albania and China's walkout from the 1961 Moscow Conference; the impact of the Sino-India War (1962); China's criticism of Soviet handling of the Cuban Missile crisis (1962); Soviet 'peaceful coexistence' versus Mao's commitment to 'continuing revolution' e.g. Cultural Revolution; Sino-Soviet differences over the Test Ban Treaty (1963); tensions over China's developing nuclear programme (1964 - atomic bomb, 1967- hydrogen bomb); Mao's rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine (1968) regarding Czechoslovakia; Sino-Soviet border disputes such as Damansky/Chenbao (1969). Better candidates will probably organise these reasons into categories based on personal rivalry, competing national interests and ideological differences.</p> <p>At Level 5, 'so dramatically' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information. Here, candidates will offer of a sustained analysis of the reasons for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations in the 1960s. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the reasons undermining Sino-Soviet relations although coverage may be unbalanced. There will be some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'so dramatically'. At Level 3, students should provide broad analysis on why Sino-Soviet relations changed from alliance to confrontation in the 1960s but the detail may undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2, candidates will provide simple or more developed statements with only implicit reference to reasons for the Sino-Soviet relationship changing so dramatically 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 examining how the lack of great power commitment (notably regarding Japan, Italy, Britain and France) undermined the League over Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1932). This argument can be cross-referenced and extended with Source 2's observation that the refusal of the USA to participate in the League further weakened the organisation. It should also be noted here that Russia and Germany had been excluded from the League and were critical of it. Finally, Source 3 widens out the analysis of the League's frailties by focusing on the unstable post-war international system, the weaknesses and divisions of the two major League powers (Britain and France), and the organisation's European base which curtailed its global peacekeeping ambitions. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross referencing opportunities (e.g. the weakness of Anglo-French leadership of the League, the non-participation of the USA and Russia).</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 British and French national interests and differences had on the functioning of the League; the 'victors' club' image of the League which alienated other powers, notably Germany and Russia; 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 limited great power commitment 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 an analysis of the relative importance of the lack of great power commitment in the failure of the League. This will be based on 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 some understanding of the impact of limited great power commitment, will be offered. 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 |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 6 | <p>Source 4 gives candidates material to support the view that Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union was driven purely by ideological considerations. The extract makes reference to the Nazi pursuit of <i>lebensraum</i> in the east and the campaign against 'Jewish-Bolshevism'. Candidates should note that the extract emphasises the importance of ideological considerations in the decision to attack the USSR. Source 5 appears to offer a more 'rational' explanation for Hitler's decision to fight the Soviet Union. It argues that Barbarossa was designed to (1) secure dominance over Europe as a platform from which to attack the British Empire or the USA (2) check Soviet expansion in central Europe (3) obtain Soviet resources for a future Nazi conflict with the West. Nevertheless, Overy emphasises that the underlying Nazi motives were based on anti-communism, anti-Semitism and the conquest of living space in the east. Source 6 puts forward a more strategic interpretation by stressing that the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union aimed to bring Britain to the negotiating table. The extract also points to Hitler's calculation that Barbarossa would relieve Soviet pressure on the Japanese, thereby encouraging Japanese expansionism and US interventionism in the Far East, leaving Nazi Germany with a free hand in Europe. Candidates should be aware that the sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities (e.g. ideological motives, the removal of the British from the war).</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the 1941 decision to invade should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the ideological roots of the invasion, including Hitler's longstanding anti-Bolshevism, desire for <i>lebensraum</i> at Russia's expense, and anti-Slav racial views; Hitler's conviction that a successful Nazi campaign would remove Russia as a potential ally for Britain and induce the latter to negotiate; Hitler's lack of realism fostered by previous successful campaigns, e.g. against France; the extent to which Stalin's regime was economically and militarily ready to launch an attack on the Third Reich in mid-1941; Operation Barbarossa can be seen as a pre-emptive strike against a regime which was planning to attack the Third Reich (according to this view, Stalin intended to launch an offensive following a huge arms build-up); the need to obtain or safeguard resources for Nazi war effort.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will offer a reasoned judgement about the relative importance of ideology in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union. Here, the response will offer a sustained evaluation, informed by precisely selected evidence from both the sources and own knowledge. Candidates might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could debate to what extent was Hitler's decision driven by strategic considerations (Sources 5 and 6). At Level 4, there should be an analysis of the relative importance of ideological motives in the decision to invade. This will be based on 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 all about 'ideological considerations' 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 draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge.</p> | 40 |

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

| Question Number | Indicative content | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 7 | <p>Source 7 argues that Truman's actions (e.g. the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and NATO) contributed to the growth of Cold War tensions by exaggerating the threat posed by the USSR to Europe's security. Candidates should note, however, that the first sentence of the extract is careful to state that not all of Truman's measures should be seen in this light. Source 8 notes that the destabilising effects of the Second World War encouraged the major states to intervene abroad in order to strengthen their positions and check any potential advance by their rivals. Source 9 examines Soviet responsibility and maintains that (1) Stalin's misperception by 1947 that a global bi-polar conflict was underway made the Cold War inevitable (2) the pursuit of Soviet interests in East Germany and Korea further exacerbated the situation. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities (e.g. the role of key personalities, Greece, Eastern Europe).</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-53 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the role of Truman and other key personalities, particularly Stalin and Roosevelt 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 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 offer a reasoned judgement about the relative importance of Truman's actions in prompting the onset of the Cold War in the years 1945-50. Here, the response will offer a sustained evaluation, informed by precisely selected evidence from both the sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be an attempt to reach a reasoned judgement about the relative importance of Truman's actions. This will be based on confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 3, a clear conclusion about reasons for the development of the Cold War, linked to some understanding of the impact of Truman's actions, will be offered. 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 suggesting that ‘dissatisfaction with dictatorship’ (‘people power’) played a major role in ending the Cold War because popular protest rejected communist rule and undermined the Soviet bloc. The extract also notes that this process took place without a civil war and that the right-wing in the US saw Reagan’s hard-line policies as responsible for these developments. In Source 11, the mounting economic problems of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc are considered. In particular, the corrosive effects of economic stagnation, weakening trade links and deteriorating military relations within the Soviet bloc are identified. Source 12 briefly alludes to the triumphalist perspective before arguing that it was Gorbachev’s personal contribution that made the difference over key issues such as the arms race and communist control in Eastern Europe. Candidates should note that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities (e.g. the growth of popular discontent in the Soviet bloc, the triumphalist perspective etc.).</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: 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.; 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).</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will offer a reasoned judgement about the relative importance of the ‘dissatisfaction with dictatorship’ in bringing the Cold War to an end in the late 1980s. Here, the response will offer a sustained evaluation, informed by precisely selected evidence from both the sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be analysis of the relative importance of the ‘dissatisfaction with dictatorship’ and other factors (e.g. the role of Gorbachev) on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. Here, there should be an attempt to reach a reasoned judgement. At Level 3, a clear conclusion about reasons for the end of the Cold War, linked to some understanding of the impact of the ‘dissatisfaction with dictatorship’, will be offered. 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 |