

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/33**

Paper 3, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

## GENERAL MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Examiners should refer to the CIE booklet 'Instructions for Examiners' for detailed guidance.

### 1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

The Assessment Objectives are as follows:

- (a) the ability to make effective use of relevant factual knowledge to demonstrate the understanding of an historical period or periods in outline and of particular topics in depth;
- (b) the ability to distinguish and assess different approaches to, interpretations of, and opinions about the past;
- (c) the ability to express awareness of change and continuity in the past;
- (d) the ability to present a clear, concise, logical and relevant argument.

It is possible that evidence of attainment in any one of the Assessment Objectives may be demonstrated in an answer to an essay question. However, no attempt is made to allocate marks in essay questions to individual Assessment Objectives.

### 2 GENERAL GUIDE TO THE ASSESSMENT OF SCRIPTS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS

Each answer should be marked bearing in mind the Assessment Objectives stated above and the following basic criteria:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the question set (Examiners with scripts which may be in the candidate's second language must be particularly vigilant against penalising candidates over and above a self-imposed penalty);
- (c) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and of the **awareness of historical context**.

It is not intended that examiners should attempt to isolate these qualities and reward them separately because they are inter-related. Their proper application will mean, for example, that long answers crammed with detailed knowledge will not be rewarded highly if the knowledge is not effectively applied and the answers show a lack of historical judgement. Conversely a convincingly argued, highly relevant and perceptive answer may be well rewarded although based on less overtly expressed knowledge.

All essay answers should be marked in such a way that the final mark awarded is a true reflection of attainment in the Assessment Objectives. Different answers awarded identical or similar marks may display very different combinations of qualities and marking therefore should be responsive enough to reward answers which demonstrate different combinations of argument and historical knowledge. However, in almost all cases, the generic mark bands and the question-specific mark scheme will provide guidance to examiners on the appropriate marks to be awarded. Examiners should seek the advice of the Principal Examiner about highly unusual approaches to a question.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

### **3 ASSESSMENT OF DOCUMENT-BASED QUESTIONS**

Guidance on the assessment of the Document-based questions is given separately in this Mark Scheme.

### **4 GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS**

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.</i>
2	18–20	<i>Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.</i>
3	16–17	<i>Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.</i>
4	14–15	<i>Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.</i>
5	11–13	<i>Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.</i>
6	8–10	<i>Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.</i>
7	0–7	<i>Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.</i>

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

## **SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**

### **Section A**

- 1 The United Nations and Decolonisation: ‘The established members of the United Nations welcomed the expansion of the UN that resulted from decolonisation.’ How far do Sources A–E support this view?**

**L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID USE OF SOURCES [1–5]**

These answers will write about the impact of decolonisation on the UN and might use the sources. However, candidates will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. If sources are used, it will be to support an essay-style answer to the question.

**L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]**

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

**L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]**

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disprove it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

**L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [14–16]**

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value.

**L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [17–21]**

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

**L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED [22–25]**

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

## Context

From its inception, the UN's effectiveness was severely impaired by Cold War rivalry which, combined with the big powers' right of veto, rendered the Security Council largely impotent. The USSR, feeling isolated and believing that the UN was dominated by the USA and its allies, made use of its veto rights on numerous occasions during the UN's early years. This led to a power shift away from the Security Council towards the General Assembly where, initially, the USA and its allies could count on a majority. Decolonisation led to a vastly increased membership of the UN after c.1960. The newly-independent states which became members changed the geographical composition of the UN so that it was no longer dominated by countries from Europe/America. This threatened the USA's ability to rely on a majority in the General Assembly. It also led to calls for reform of the UN's administrative structure, such as increased membership of the Security Council and an end to the right of veto. Such reforms could potentially undermine the position of established members of the UN, particularly the USA and the Soviet Union.

## Source A

**Context:** Article from a US Department of State website, 2012.

**Content (Face Value):** Argues that decolonisation greatly increased the number of states which were members of the UN. This both changed the balance of power within the UN and led the General Assembly to focus on the issue of decolonisation, a different agenda from that of the Security Council. The USA was concerned that the new member states might fall under the influence of Soviet-backed communism, which would clearly undermine the USA's control over the UN General Assembly. The USA used a variety of strategies to ensure that newly-independent states did not fall under communist influence, while the USSR used similar tactics to ensure that they did. Hence, both the USA and the USSR felt threatened by the increase in UN membership. **Challenges the hypothesis.**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** An official US government source produced long after the culmination of the Cold War, reflecting (with the aid of hindsight) on American foreign policy during the 1960s/1970s. Inevitably, therefore, it focuses more on the USA than on the USSR. It argues that the USA was determined to prevent newly-independent states falling under the influence of Soviet communism because this would undermine the USA's dominance within the UN General Assembly (**X-Ref with E**). Therefore, the USA 'used aid packages, technical assistance and sometimes even military intervention to encourage newly-independent nations in the Third World to adopt governments that aligned with the West', a clear reference to the USA's role in globalising the Cold War.

Prior to the increase in UN membership due to decolonisation, the USA had been able to influence the decisions of the General Assembly, since most UN member states were in some way dependent on the USA (**X-Ref with E**). The USSR greatly resented this as evidenced by its frequent use of the Security Council veto, its continued efforts to get Communist China admitted to the UN and its attempts to undermine the increasing power of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General (e.g. Soviet proposals for a Troika – three Secretaries-General representing the Soviet bloc, the Western Powers and the non-aligned states). To the USSR, the increased membership of the UN following decolonisation would have presented an opportunity to end the USA's control over the General Assembly, which is why the USSR 'deployed similar tactics in an effort to encourage new nations to join the communist bloc'. Hence it could be argued that the USA saw increased UN membership as a threat, while the USSR saw it as an opportunity (**X-Ref with B**). **Supports and challenges the hypothesis – USA felt threatened, but USSR saw the new situation as an opportunity.**

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

## Source B

**Context:** The leader of the USSR addressing the UN General Assembly in 1960, at a time when membership of the UN was increasing greatly as a result of decolonisation.

**Content (Face Value):** Argues that the increased membership of the UN is ‘causing apprehension in certain Western countries’ since the influx of new UN member states is threatening their control over the General Assembly. However, the source argues that the USSR welcomed the growth in UN membership. **Balanced – Western countries feared and resented the increased membership, but the Soviet Union actively welcomed it.**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The Soviet leader was addressing a General Assembly which already contained representatives from many newly-independent states. He argues that this situation was of concern to ‘certain Western countries’, clearly referring primarily to the USA (**X-Ref with A and E**), and claims (without providing evidence) that they are looking for ways to limit the number of newly-independent states which are allowed to join the UN. The USSR, on the other hand, greatly supports the presence of newly-independent states at the UN and argues that they have a key role to play in preserving future international peace.

However, Khrushchev was clearly trying to gain the support of the newly-independent members of the UN (**X-Ref with A which argues that the USSR wanted to gain the support of newly-independent states in order to increase its own international power**). Hence, he uses emotive language, such as ‘struggle for freedom’ and ‘nations are liberating themselves from foreign domination’. He flatters the new members by arguing that they have significant power within the UN (‘let him try to disregard the votes of the representatives of the Asian, African and Latin American states in the UN’). He criticises the USA (by implication) for trying to limit the rights of these new member states, while claiming that the USSR opposes ‘any curtailment of the rights of peoples who have won their national independence’. He argues that the USSR shares the overwhelming desire of the new member states to ensure ‘the peaceful coexistence and co-operation of countries regardless of their political and social structure’. Contextual knowledge shows that, at this time, the USSR was trying to gain influence over newly-independent countries as part of the globalisation of the Cold War (**X-Ref with C**). In part, therefore, the USSR was trying to exploit the situation created by so many new members of the UN in order to end the USA’s domination of the General Assembly. **Balanced – Western countries felt threatened by the increased membership of the UN, but the USSR actively welcomed it and wished to exploit it.**

## Source C

**Context:** From a speech given to the UN General Assembly by the representative from Venezuela in 1960.

**Content (Face Value):** Welcomes the newly-independent states to the UN, seeing the increased membership as an opportunity to reform the UN, in particular by increasing the size of the Security Council and abolishing the right of veto. **Supports the hypothesis.**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** Venezuela was not one of the newly-independent states and, indeed, had been a member of the UN since 1945. Venezuela welcomes the new members to the UN. (**Supports the hypothesis.**) However, the writer clearly feels that the UN’s effectiveness has been impaired by Cold War rivalry which also poses a significant threat to world peace (**X-Ref with D and E**). The source argues that there should be major reforms of the UN structure in order to ensure that the newly-independent members are adequately represented. This would involve increasing the membership of the Security Council and removing veto rights. Such reforms would grant extra powers to non-aligned states and undermine the power of the established major powers within the UN, particularly the USA and the USSR. Although these reforms were not carried out, there were clear

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

signs that non-aligned states were beginning to unite in opposition to the power exerted over the UN by the major powers, especially the USA, which would inevitably feel threatened (**X-Ref with B, D and E**). **Challenges the hypothesis – calls for reform would inevitably threaten the power of some established members of the UN.**

#### Source D

**Context:** Written by German academics in 1995.

**Content (Face Value):** Argues that the newly-independent states joined the UN, changing it from a 'committee' of WWII allies into 'a genuine world organisation'. These new members formed a majority in the General Assembly – this upset the USA which, as the major financial contributor to the UN, objected to its money being used for things of which it did not approve. Thus, the USA's power within the UN was clearly threatened by the influx of newly-independent member states which undermined its ability to dominate the General Assembly. The source makes no reference to the reaction of other established members of the UN, just the USA. **Challenges the hypothesis in terms of the USA, but makes no reference to any other established member.**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The source was written in 1995. With the Cold War recently ended, this was a time when many academics were assessing the UN's performance since 1945 and its prospects for the post-Cold War era. Many hoped that the end of the Cold War would, at last, enable the UN to become effective. The source argues that Cold War rivalry had prevented the UN from carrying out its mission effectively. It is heavily sarcastic, e.g. showing how 'the peace-loving major powers' threatened world peace by seeking to gain influence in the newly-independent states (e.g. Congo). Decolonisation superimposed a new problem onto a UN already impaired by Cold War rivalry:

- It increased membership of the UN (**X-Ref with A, B, C and E**)
- It changed the geographical distribution of UN membership (less European-centred) (**X-Ref with B and E**)
- Newly-independent states formed a majority in the General Assembly after c.1960 (**X-Ref with A and E**)
- The USA and its western allies no longer had control over the General Assembly (**X-Ref with A and E**)
- The USA, as the major financial contributor to the UN, resented the increasing power of the Third World states in the General Assembly

As such, it posed a greater threat to the USA than to any other established member, since it threatened American dominance over the General Assembly. However, just like the USA, the USSR was prepared to fight in order to 'achieve influence in the Third World'. This could be interpreted as the USSR being equally concerned about the growing number of newly-independent states joining the UN, with the potential to undermine the USSR's international power. Or, it could be interpreted as the USSR seeking to exploit an opportunity to finally end the USA's control over the General Assembly. Given the USSR's frequent use of the veto in the Security Council and its attempts to undermine the power of the General Assembly, it is more likely that the USSR saw the impact of decolonisation as an opportunity to exploit rather than a threat. **Challenges the hypothesis in terms of the USA, whose control over the General Assembly was threatened. Makes no explicit reference to how other established members felt about the influx in UN membership, but implies that the USSR saw it as an opportunity to end American control over the UN.**



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

## Source E

**Context:** From an article in a journal dedicated to analysing Third World issues, 2005.

**Content (Face Value):** Before newly-independent countries joined the UN, the USA and its western allies could depend on a majority in the General Assembly, 'despite the Cold War divide'. With the influx of new member states from the 1960s onwards, the USA lost control of the General Assembly and many of the UN's other bodies. This is confirmed by the fact that the USA used its first veto in 1970 and cast 70 more over the next twenty years. No mention is made of the USSR. **Challenges the hypothesis in terms of the USA, but makes no reference to any other established member.**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** Argues that, despite the Cold War, the USA and its allies had effective control over the UN General Assembly prior to c.1960 (**X-Ref with A and D**). While the USSR could veto decisions in the Security Council, it could not do so in the General Assembly, whose power grew as a result of the Uniting for Peace Resolution and the work of Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld. The influx of newly-independent states into the UN meant that the USA could no longer guarantee control over the General Assembly (**X-Ref with A, B, C and D**). The USA was concerned that this situation might shift the international balance of power in favour of the Soviet Union (i.e. the USSR gaining increasing influence over the General Assembly and the UN in general) (**X-Ref with A and D**). It was this which led the USA to become involved in the Third World in an attempt to gain the support of the newly-independent states. The USSR was responsible for casting most of the early vetoes in the UN Security Council. As the USA's control over the UN diminished as a result of decolonisation, it was the USA which cast most vetoes. **Challenges the hypothesis in terms of the USA, but makes no reference to any other established member.**

## Conclusion

There is no doubt that the vastly increased membership of the UN which resulted from decolonisation posed a major threat to the international power of the USA. Sources A, D and E all show how the USA's ability to control the decisions made by the UN General Assembly was threatened by the presence of so many new member states. Source B claims that the USA was so concerned by this that it was even considering limiting the number of new admissions to the UN. The threat to America's control over the UN is also confirmed by the fact that the USA began to use the Security Council veto on a regular basis. Even this right of veto was threatened by the presence of so many new member states, as evidenced by Venezuela's call for reforms of the UN structures. Sources A, D and E all argue that it was fear of losing control over the UN which led the USA to become involved in the globalisation of the Cold War, seeking to ensure that newly-independent states supported the West rather than the Soviet bloc.

The USSR's international power was also threatened by calls for reform of the UN. It is clear from Source C that many UN member states resented the power held by the USSR and the USA and the threat to world peace which Cold War rivalry created. Non-aligned states, which included many of the newly-independent members of the UN, were beginning to exert their own power. The extension of the Security Council and ending of the right of veto would have affected the USSR greatly. However, in terms of the UN, the USSR had less to lose than the USA. The USSR had long believed, with some justification, that the UN was controlled by the USA, and had actively tried to either change or subvert it (e.g. criticisms of S-Gs Trygve Lie and Dag Hammarskjöld, proposals for reform such as the Troika concept, frequent use of the veto). The admission of so many new member states would have provided the USSR with an opportunity to finally end the USA's dominance of the UN. Hence the USSR's determination to gain the support of as many newly-independent countries as possible. Decolonisation therefore exacerbated superpower rivalry and was a prime causal factor in the globalisation of the Cold War.

On balance, the hypothesis is supported. While the increase in UN membership posed a major threat

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

to the international power of the USA, it was welcomed by most established members and provided an opportunity for the USSR to end the USA's monopoly and gain greater balance within the UN.

## Section B

### 2 'The development of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949 was due to Stalin's expansionist policies.' Assess the validity of this judgement.

In support of the view, which reflects the traditional interpretation of the causes of the Cold War, it could be argued that –

- Stalin failed to honour the promises he made at Yalta
- As a result, Truman distrusted Stalin and believed he was trying to expand Soviet influence in Europe
- This was 'confirmed' by Kennan's telegram and Churchill's iron-curtain speech
- The USA adopted policies designed to prevent the spread of communism in Europe – e.g. Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, NATO
- The USSR retaliated with Cominform – two rival economic systems thus split Europe
- The Berlin Blockade was perceived in the west as a further example of Soviet expansionism
- Evidence recently derived from the opening of Soviet archives suggests that Stalin did indeed have expansionist intentions

In challenging the view, it could be argued that –

- Stalin was not being expansionist, but merely seeking security for the USSR. The USA's anti-communist measures could, therefore, be seen as based on a misunderstanding of Soviet intentions (post-revisionist view)
- Stalin distrusted Truman – e.g. Truman failing to inform Stalin of the USA's possession of nuclear weapons and his intent to use them against Japan
- Stalin saw the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan as the USA's attempt to enhance its political and economic control over western Europe ('dollar imperialism') (the revisionist view)
- Stalin ordered the Berlin Blockade because of his fear that the western powers were trying to restore western Germany to its former political and economic power – a clear threat to the security of the USSR

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

**3 To what extent was the globalisation of the Cold War in the period from 1950 to 1985 caused by the USA's determination to follow a policy of containment?**

In support of the view, it could be argued that –

- The Truman Doctrine and NSC-68 forced the USA into a global stance against communism, thereby causing the globalisation of the Cold War
- American fear of a monolithic communist bloc intent on world domination grew after the fall of China to communism in 1949
- The USA saw the spread of communism as a threat to its political and economic interests – hence it had to be contained
- Due to containment, USA became involved in regional disputes which had more to do with nationalism than communism – e.g. Korea, Vietnam
- Containment led the USA to become involved in supporting anti-communist groups in Latin America and Africa
- Containment, together with belief in the domino theory, was the main reason for the USA's involvement in SE Asia

In challenging the view, it could be argued that –

- The US policy of roll-back was more significant than containment in causing the globalisation of the Cold War – e.g. Cuba, Guatemala and Chile
- It was the expansionist policies of the USSR and the PRC which caused the globalisation of the Cold War – e.g. Cuba, Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Vietnam, Afghanistan
- The USA was merely responding to communist expansionism in order to protect its own political and economic interests
- It was regional issues which caused the globalisation of the Cold War – e.g. the desire for national unification in Korea and Vietnam, Castro's revolution in Cuba. The superpowers were forced to get involved in order to maintain their international prestige and protect their national interests
- Decolonisation was a major factor in causing the globalisation of the Cold War, especially in Africa

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

**4 'A war which had to be fought.' How far do you agree with this assessment of American involvement in the Vietnam War?**

In support of the view that the USA had to get involved, it could be argued that –

- Adherence to the policy of containment meant that the USA needed to resist the spread of communism
- The domino theory and the idea that allowing communism to spread in Vietnam would encourage its spread elsewhere in the area
- The need to protect US economic interests in the region
- The need to maintain international prestige as the defender of 'free people'
- The fear of a monolithic communist plot for world domination
- Public opinion and strong anti-communist sentiments in the USA

In challenging the view, it could be argued that –

- While the USA claimed to be protecting the Vietnamese people, in reality it was simply protecting its own vested interests
- Unlike in Korea, the USA acted alone without UN support
- The USA was supporting Diem's unpopular, corrupt and unsustainable government in South Vietnam
- It was a war which the USA was unlikely to win because:
  - 1954–63 communist forces had been able to consolidate in North and South Vietnam and Laos
  - By 1963, South Vietnam was on the verge of collapse – the USA was trying to sustain something which was unsustainable
  - The involvement of the PRC and the USSR
  - The strong nationalistic feelings of the Vietnamese people
  - UN opposition to America's escalation of the war
  - Insufficient knowledge of the local area and the guerrilla methods deployed by the communist forces

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

**5 How justified is the view that economic problems were the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union by 1991?**

In support of the view, it could be argued that –

- Restrained by communist ideology and adversely affected by the attempt to match the USA in the arms race, the Soviet economy was in long-term decline
- This caused anger and resentment, especially in Eastern Europe where people were increasingly able to see the wealth enjoyed within Western Europe – this added impetus to nationalistic movements
- Gorbachev’s attempts to improve economic efficiency (e.g. perestroika) simply increased the demands for reform and helped to undermine the power of the Communist Party
- Economic problems made it impossible for the USSR to put down nationalist movements both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself – Gorbachev rescinded the Brezhnev Doctrine
- Gorbachev sought improved relations with the USA in an attempt to reduce the high costs involved in maintaining the Cold War/arms race. This led him to pass political as well as economic reforms (e.g. glasnost), which, again, undermined the power of the Communist Party

In challenging the view, it could be argued that other factors were as or more significant –

- Long periods of weak and ineffective leadership
- Pressure imposed by the USA – e.g. Reagan and ‘star wars’
- Growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe and within the USSR itself
- Long, costly and unproductive war in Afghanistan
- Gorbachev’s reforms – in attempting to reform both economically and politically, he undermined the power of the Communist Party
- Splits within the Communist Party

The most effective responses will demonstrate understanding of how the various causal factors are inter-connected.

<b>Page 14</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

**6 To what extent were changes in the USA's nuclear defence strategies in the period from 1950 to 1980 a direct result of the USSR's increasing nuclear capability?**

In support of the view, it could be argued that –

- Massive retaliation (1954) largely assumed American superiority in the nuclear arms race, for example:
  - USA developed hydrogen bomb in 1952 (USSR 1953)
  - Soviet development of ICBMs led the USA to develop Atlas and to locate shorter range Jupiter missiles in Europe and Turkey
  - When USSR launched sputnik in 1958, USA quickly followed suit
- Mutually Assured Destruction (1964) was a response to the Cuban missile crisis, which showed the reality of the danger of nuclear weapons. Balance of nuclear power was now seen as the key to stability, for example:
  - Test Ban Treaty, Non-Proliferation Treaty, etc.
  - USSR developed greater numbers of ICBMs and SLBMs and increasingly gained nuclear equality with the USA
  - USA had to respond with developments of its own (e.g. Polaris and Poseidon) in order to maintain a balance of nuclear power
  - USSR wanted to pressure USA into limiting the arms build up

In challenging the view, it could be argued that –

- Flexible response (agreed by NATO in 1967) was originally developed under Kennedy and was designed to meet specific American foreign policy needs – e.g. proxy wars
- The USA's need to develop conventional as well as nuclear weapons was highlighted by, for example, the Vietnam War
- USA's budgetary problems (due in part to the high cost of the Vietnam War) meant that America had less to spend on its nuclear developments

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

**7 Which did more to stimulate Japan's economic recovery after World War II: the USA or Japanese governments?**

In terms of the USA, it could be argued that –

- The USA saw Japan as a bulwark against the spread of communism in SE Asia
- The USA provided Japan with aid and new equipment
- With the USA taking care of Japan's security, Japan was able to invest in industry without having to fund defence and armaments
- The USA allowed Japanese goods into American markets on favourable terms
- The Korean War gave an enormous boost to Japan's recovery – Japan provided a base for the UN mission to Korea and Japanese manufacturers were used to provide a wide range of materials and supplies

In terms of the Japanese government, it could be argued that –

- While American support was vital to 'kick-start' the Japanese economic revival, it was the policies of the Japanese government which sustained it
- A land reform plan was introduced – government subsidies and regulations enabled farming to develop more effectively
- The creation of MITI (Ministry of International Trade and Industry) in 1949 was vital to Japan's economic recovery. Its mission was to address the problems of rising inflation and falling productivity by coordinating Japan's international trade policy. By working closely with other key institutions, such as the Bank of Japan, MITI facilitated the early development of nearly all major industries by providing protection from import competition, technological intelligence, help in licensing foreign technology, access to foreign exchange, and assistance in mergers. It provided industries with administrative guidance and other direction, both formal and informal, on modernisation, technology, investments in new plants and equipment, and domestic and foreign competition
- Much of Japan's industry was destroyed in WWII. The government coordinated the development of new industrial plants using the latest technology. Japan was able to concentrate on high-tech goods for both home and export markets
- Government initiative helped to raise incomes
- Japan benefited from a series of stable governments – LDP (conservative and pro-business) was consistently in power 1952–93

Page 16	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9697	33

**8 To what extent did international aid benefit the developing world in the period from 1950 to 1991?**

In terms of benefit, it could be argued that –

- Non-Government Organisations did much to help the relief of poverty
- The positive work of CAFOD, Oxfam, etc.
- One-off aid – e.g. Live Aid after 1985
- Some countries did benefit from investment from rich industrial countries and were able to sustain their own rapid industrialisation (e.g. Tiger economies, Brazil, Mexico)

However, international aid also led to problems, for example –

- Much international aid was part of the superpowers' attempt to gain influence in their Cold War rivalry. A great deal of this aid was in the form of military equipment – this inflamed regional conflicts (e.g. Ethiopia v Somalia 1978–79, Ethiopia v Eritrea 1980s, Angola 1975–1990s)
- Kleptocracy – international aid enriched corrupt leaders (e.g. Bokassa in the Central African Republic)
- Neo-colonialism – rich nations continued to exploit the developing world and its resources. Aid did little to encourage industrialisation in most developing world countries, which remained dependent on one-product economies – e.g. Ghana (cocoa), Zambia (copper), Ethiopia (coffee)
- Financial aid was usually on a business basis – i.e. had to be repaid with interest – led to debt crisis
- International aid did nothing to prevent the exploitation of the developing world by multi-national companies
- Much international aid tended to focus on providing charitable assistance regarding immediate problems caused by droughts and famines, etc., rather than dealing with the underlying problems facing the developing world