



Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (6HI03) Paper E

Unit 3
Paper 3E: War and Peace: Twentieth Century
International Relations

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI03_E_1706_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</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</p>

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

	<p>of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 14 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 15 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 16 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question. 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. 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.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

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

Unit 3 Assessment Grid

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

Section A

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of and assess the extent to which the European arms race (1900-1914) was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Features which support the statement in the question might include: prior to 1914, the great powers claimed that their military build-ups were primarily motivated by the desire to strengthen their defences and deterrent capabilities; the European arms race, in and of itself, did not make a major war inevitable during this period; Anglo-German naval rivalry was effectively over by 1914. Other factors played a significant role in the outbreak of the First World War including: the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente created rival power blocs; the alliance system linked 'peripheral' crises in areas such as north Africa and the Balkans directly to the European powers themselves; the impact of specific international crises between 1905 and 1914 on great power relations (e.g. Morocco 1905-06 and 1911, Bosnia 1908-09, the Balkan Wars 1912-13 and the evolution of the 1914 crisis); imperial rivalries after 1900 contributed to international tension and intensified nationalist feeling (e.g. British 'defence' of the Empire, German Weltpolitik, French interests in north Africa, Austro-Hungarian-Russian rivalry in the Balkans); Germany used the 1914 Balkan crisis to provoke war in order to pursue its expansionist aims and resolve a serious domestic crisis (Fischer thesis) etc. Features which challenge the statement in the question might include: the failure of disarmament conferences at the Hague in 1898 and 1907, Anglo-German naval rivalry from 1900 and army expansion after 1912 in Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary and France contributed to heightened international tension and nationalist feeling in the years up to 1914; the accelerating arms race after 1900 encouraged the development of military schedules which included the planning of offensives and rapid mobilisations, e.g. the Schlieffen Plan.</p> <p>At Level 5, there will be sustained analysis of the extent to which the accelerating European arms race (1900-14) was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation of 'little responsibility'. At Level 4, there will be analysis of 'little responsibility' with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis related to the extent to which the accelerating European arms race was responsible for the outbreak of the First World War but the detail may be undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will offer simple or more developed statements about the European arms race with either only implicit reference to 'little responsibility', or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of and assess how the victorious powers' self-interest and desire for revenge shaped the terms of the peace treaties (1919-22). Features which support the statement in the question might include: Germany and her allies were saddled with 'war guilt'; the imposed nature of the treaties e.g. Versailles, Trianon leading to accusations of an Allied 'diktat' mentality; the Allies' selective use of the 14 Points e.g. national self-determination did not apply to Germany and Austria when it suited their interests; German disarmament; British and French insistence on German reparations which reflected their economic and/or security concerns; Britain, the Dominions and France generally obtained the mandated territories they wanted; Japan retained the former German leasehold territory of Kiaochow in China; Italy secured South Tyrol, the Trentino and Istria which had been promised in the 1915 Treaty of London; in the Middle East, France and Britain divided the spoils from the defeat of the Turkish Empire. Features of the peace treaties which challenge the statement in the question might include: the Versailles Treaty was not excessively harsh on Germany either territorially or economically; the treaties attempted to inject idealism and morality into international relations e.g. national self-determination led to the establishment of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, plebiscites were used to foster self-determination in disputed areas e.g. Allenstein, the creation of the League of Nations and the International Labour Organisation; France initially demanded permanent German disarmament and a Rhineland Republic for security reasons but was forced to accept a demilitarised zone; similarly, French economic claims to the Saarland and other areas were modified under British and US pressure; Italy expected other territorial acquisitions e.g. Fiume, Dalmatia and former German colonies but was unable to obtain them; China (who had declared war on Germany in 1917) failed to secure Germany's former Chinese territorial rights; the impact of Brest-Litovsk on Allied peace-making.</p> <p>At Level 5, there will be sustained analysis of the role of the victorious powers' self-interest and desire for revenge in shaping the peace treaties. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the victors' self-interest and desire for revenge in the terms of the peace treaties with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide some broad analysis related to the extent to which the treaties reflected the victors' self-interest and desire for revenge but the detail may be undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will offer simple or more developed statements about the peace settlements with either only implicit reference to the extent they were based on the victorious powers' self-interest and desire for revenge, 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 of and assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on US-Soviet relations in the period 1949-63. Developments which significantly stabilised US-Soviet relations might include: the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons, e.g. US non-intervention over Hungary (1956); superpower cooperation to regulate the nuclear threat, e.g. removal of missiles from Cuba and Turkey, the Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow 'hotline'; US and Soviet leaders were aware of living in the nuclear age and acted responsibly, e.g. Khrushchev withdrew the offer of Soviet assistance for Communist China's nuclear weapons programme (1959); the impetus the nuclear arms race gave to US-Soviet summit diplomacy in the 1950s. Developments which could be said to have destabilised US-Soviet relations might include: Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) which precipitated a spiralling arms race (e.g. hydrogen bomb (1952-53), ICBM (1957), SLBM (1960)); fears about the nuclear superiority of the other side, e.g. the Gaither Report and the 'missile gap' (1957); nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. US doctrine of 'massive retaliation' (1950s), US-Soviet tensions generated during the Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA's 'nuclear option' during the 1961 Berlin crisis; the possibility of nuclear accidents engendered a culture of fear.</p> <p>At Level 5, students should provide a sustained analysis related to the extent the nuclear arms race (1949-63) significantly stabilised US-Soviet relations. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the nuclear arms race with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far' US-Soviet relations were significantly stabilised. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis related to the extent it stabilised US-Soviet relations, but the detail may be undeveloped in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Levels 1 and 2, candidates will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the nuclear arms race with either only implicit reference to the extent it stabilised US-Soviet relations or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of and assess the extent of US and Soviet commitment to Détente in the 1970s. Developments which suggest that the United States and the Soviet Union were genuinely committed to Détente in the 1970s might include: a genuine desire on the part of the two superpowers to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; the US promotion of the Nixon Doctrine and the impact of Vietnam on American policy; wider US-Soviet economic and trade considerations (e.g. to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to Western technology); a genuine Soviet desire not to be diplomatically isolated by the growing Sino-US rapprochement. Developments which suggest that the United States and the Soviet Union were not genuinely committed to Détente might include: both superpowers attempted to manipulate the terms of the SALT I (1972) and SALT II (1979) treaties to maintain military advantages (e.g. no restrictions on the deployment of MIRVs); Soviet refusal to link Détente to further concessions (e.g. over Vietnam and USSR's anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev's adherence to the long-term victory of communism; the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (e.g. Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia); US-Soviet tensions over Basket 3 of the Helsinki Accords (1975) regarding human rights issues; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979); the scrapping of SALT 2.</p> <p>At Level 5, 'how far' the United States and the Soviet Union were genuinely committed to Détente in the 1970s will be central to the answer which will also be well informed and relevant. Well selected and precise information will sustain the evaluation, leading to an overall judgement. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the level of US-Soviet commitment to Détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, students should provide a broadly analytical response related to how far the superpowers were genuinely committed to Détente 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 Detente with either only implicit reference to the level of US and Soviet commitment, or argument based on insufficient evidence.</p>	30

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question focuses on the issue of the great powers' role in the failure of the league of the nation. Source 1 provides support for the statement in the question by emphasising that the USA 'disowned', and Britain and France had a 'distant relationship' with, the League of Nations. The extract argues that the great powers' determination to preserve their vital interests and the maintenance of state sovereignty effectively circumvented the League. Source 2 examines the negative impact of the slump of the late 1920s and early 1930s arguing that it had a critical effect on the League's fortunes at that point. It also focuses on the revisionist powers' resolve to undermine the institution through the World Disarmament Conference (1931-33), the invasion of Abyssinia (1935-36) and the reoccupation of the Rhineland (1936). Source 3 argues that the League failed because of its flawed security mechanisms. In particular, the lack of consensus undermined the idea of a collective response to aggression and formal decision-making procedures required unanimity which proved elusive in the interwar period. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities e.g. the primacy of members' national self-interest, Germany and Italy disregarded the League of Nations in their attempts to undermine the post-war settlement, the problems associated with requirement for unanimity etc.</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; 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); the 'victors' club' image of the League 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; the negative impact of the economic downturn (from 1929) on the League.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates should provide a sustained analysis of the reasons for the failure of the League of Nations with particular reference to the role played by the great powers in ignoring the institution. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of the great powers' lack of engagement with the League with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis related to the extent the great powers' lack of engagement was responsible for the failure of the League but the detail may be undeveloped in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. 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>The question focuses on the issue of responsibility for the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939. Source 4 offers support for the statement in the question by noting that Britain and France declared war on Germany in 1939 'not the other way round'. Furthermore the extract argues that British and French actions in the years up to 1939 were not primarily based on moral/idealistic policies to uphold the principles of the League of Nations. Rather, Britain and France pursued self-interested policies to preserve their power and status. Source 5 maintains that Chamberlain's attempt to blame Hitler exclusively for the outbreak of war omits Britain and France's failure to restrain the Nazi leader before 1939. It also focuses on how Hitler was able to exploit the Versailles Treaty to increase Nazi Germany's power in Europe prior to war. Source 6 contends that Hitler mistakenly assumed that Nazi aggression against Poland could be localised because, in his view, both Britain and France were too weak to consider a general war. According to the author, Hitler failed to understand that western guarantees to Poland were really a sign that Britain and France would not countenance further German challenges to their status as great European powers. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities e.g. Britain and France's determination to preserve their great power status, Hitler's personal role in the outbreak of war, the failure of the post-1918 international system etc.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the outbreak of war in 1939 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: by 1939 Britain and France accepted that war was necessary because German demands could no longer be accommodated without destroying their status as great powers; Britain and France, as longstanding great powers, were determined to defend their status without resorting to dependence on the USA and Soviet Russia; Anglo-French policies of appeasement (1937-39) encouraged and accelerated Nazi expansionism; Hitler's personal responsibility for the outbreak of the Second World War due to his uncompromising ideologically-driven approach to foreign affairs in the late 1930s and his determination to dismantle the post-1918 Versailles settlement; Hitler's mistaken conviction that war against Poland could be localised – a view which disregarded Britain's military commitment and the reservations of sections of the German elite.</p> <p>At Level 5, students should provide a sustained analysis related to the extent Britain and France were responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939. 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of British and French responsibility with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis related to the extent Britain and France were responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939 but the detail may be undeveloped in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. 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

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question focuses on the issue of responsibility for the development of the Cold War in the years 1945-53. Source 7 provides candidates with material to support the statement in the question by emphasising the role played by Stalin's expansionist foreign policy in Europe and Asia in the late 1940s and early 1950s. According to the authors, the Soviet leader's policies appeared to the West to be a 'deliberate programme' to undermine Western influence and expand communist power. In contrast, Source 8 views the early development of the Cold War as a consequence of Stalin's miscalculations after 1946 rather than as the result of a conscious plan of Soviet expansionism. This extract argues that Stalin did not want to provoke the Western powers but did precisely that because he overreacted on east European and German issues and was also guilty of misjudgements over Korea. Finally, Source 9 offers an 'interactionist' perspective which widens the debate beyond the role of one leader or power. In particular, the extract stresses that important influences within the Soviet Union and the USA (such as the Soviet search for security and the USA's economically-driven sense of its own power) made superpower confrontation inevitable. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities e.g. the role played by Stalin's expansionist foreign policy in the early development of the Cold War, US perceptions of Stalin's objectives, the impact of the Soviet pursuit of security etc.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-53 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; Stalin's role in the spread of the Cold War to Asia, notably China (1949) and Korea (1950-53); the role played by Truman 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 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 in 1949.</p> <p>At Level 5, students should provide a sustained analysis related to the extent Stalin's expansionist foreign policy was responsible for the development of the Cold War (1945-53). 'How far' will be central in the answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. At Level 4, there will be analysis of Stalin's responsibility in terms of his expansionist foreign policy with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 3, candidates should provide some broad analysis related to the extent Stalin's expansionist foreign policy was responsible for the development of the Cold War but the detail may be undeveloped in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically 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>The question focuses on the reasons for the ending of the Cold War in the late 1980s. Source 10 provides candidates with material to support the statement in the question by endorsing the Reagan 'victory school' argument. According to the authors, Reagan's hard line military and ideological approach during the 1980s, together with the USA's technological advantages, effectively forced the Soviet Union to abandon the Cold War. In contrast, Source 11 challenges this interpretation by arguing that Gorbachev played the most significant role in ending East-West tension. This extract maintains that Gorbachev was the first Cold War leader to seek meaningful political accommodation with the other side. Candidates might also note Source 11 suggests that Gorbachev was motivated by the failure of the Soviet system. Source 12 focuses on the economic pressures facing the Soviet Union due to its trading relationships with its socialist allies and the sheer scale of its military budget. It also makes the point that Gorbachev wanted to end the arms race to divert funds to bring about social change. Candidates should be aware that the three sources offer several cross-referencing opportunities e.g. the role played by Reagan's military policies and ideological stance, Gorbachev's new approach to US-Soviet Cold War relations, the economic problems facing the Soviet Union etc.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the Cold War in the 1980s should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: 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 (perestroika, glasnost); the impact of the INF Treaty (1987), the Moscow Summit (1988) and Gorbachev's address to the UN (1988); 'people power' in eastern Europe 1988-90, e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall etc.; the mounting economic problems of the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s and the widening East-West gap in living standards.</p> <p>At Level 5, candidates will offer a sustained discussion of the relative importance of key factors with some concentration on Reagan's 'military and ideological assertiveness', using precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Reagan's military/ideological assertiveness 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. At Level 3, a clear conclusion on why the Cold War came to an end will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence At Levels 1 and 2, most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge.</p>	40