

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2011

GCE History (6HI03/E)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:  
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on  
[HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk)

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code UA028163

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less</p>

		<p>convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>13-18</b>	<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><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>19-24</b>	<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><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p>

		<b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b>
--	--	----------------------------------

		The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.
--	--	--

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><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b> 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</p>

		<p>errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--	---

<b>3</b>	<b>7-10</b>	<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><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>11-13</b>	<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><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--	--

<b>5</b>	<b>14-16</b>	<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><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> 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)**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-9</b>	<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><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>10-14</b>	<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><b>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>15-19</b>	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors</p>

		<p>and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and 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><b>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</b> 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
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>

## Section A

### E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the system of European alliances and its relationship to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. Candidates may point out that the primary purpose of the alliances was defensive (e.g. the 1879 Dual Alliance and the 1894 Franco-Russian alliance) rather than aggressive and, in themselves, could not lead to war. Furthermore, the actual outbreak of war bore little relation to the European powers' treaty obligations (e.g. Russia had no formal obligation to assist Serbia, Germany had no formal obligation to give Austria-Hungary a 'blank cheque' etc.) Nevertheless, candidates should also point out that the alliance system did contribute to the outbreak of war in important respects. The alliance system linked 'peripheral' crises in areas such as north Africa and the Balkans directly to the European powers themselves. Moreover, the alliances had a direct bearing on the arms race and the development of military schedules, e.g. the Schlieffen Plan.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will provide simple or more developed statements will provide either only implicit argument or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis but the detail may be hazy in places or the answer chronologically skewed. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the system of European alliances with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</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: 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. Features which challenge 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.</p> <p>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 were 'firmly based' on Wilson's 14 Points or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained 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 Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the factors shaping the peace treaties with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30



## E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of détente in the 1970s. Developments which sustained US-Soviet tensions during the period might include: Soviet refusal to link détente to further concessions and Brezhnev's commitment to the long-term victory of communism; the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s: the impact of US withdrawal from Vietnam on both sides; the Helsinki Accords (1975) and Soviet human rights issues; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) and the scrapping of SALT 2. Developments which helped to improve US-Soviet relations might include: the Nixon Doctrine and 'triangular diplomacy'; Soviet fears of isolation due to growing Sino-US rapprochement; desire to control the spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; growing Soviet-US trade in the early 1970s.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will provide simple or more developed statements about detente with either only implicit reference to the extent US-Soviet relations were improved or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent relations were improved but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of US-Soviet relations under détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of the nuclear arms race in the period 1949-63. Developments which helped to destabilise Cold War 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), Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA's 'nuclear option' during the 1961 Berlin crisis. Developments which stabilised the Cold War 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'.</p> <p>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 destabilised the Cold War or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent it destabilised the Cold War, but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the nuclear arms race with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

## Section B

### E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 maintains that the League, in the absence of US involvement, was dominated by Britain and France and reflected their narrow concerns (e.g. stability in Europe and an anti-revisionist agenda). Source 2 examines the impact of power politics. In particular, it argues that the League faced a growing threat after 1931 from powers seeking to challenge the <i>status quo</i>. Source 3 points out that the League was based on mistaken assumptions about how states would act in the post-war world (e.g. pro-peace, rejecting war as an instrument of policy and willing to use League machinery to settle disputes). Source 3 could be linked to the evidence of the other two sources to show that actual or perceived Franco-British dominance and the emergence of revisionist powers undermined the assumptions on which the League was originally based.</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 'victors' club' image of the League and the prominent role played by Britain and France in its affairs in the 1920s and 1930s; the challenge of the revisionist powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) in the 1930s, e.g. Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1935); defects and loopholes in the League's constitution; the negative impact of US rejection of the League.</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 and 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. These need not be restricted to the three here although, if well handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who do debate the relative importance of these three. At Levels 1 and 2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion about reasons for League weaknesses linked to understanding about the consequences of Franco-British dominance will be offered and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Britain and France's interests in the League's shortcomings. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of French and British interests in explaining League weaknesses and the answer will be informed by precisely selected evidence from both sources and 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 by necessity. It argues that Hitler decided to act due to Britain holding out, the looming threat of US involvement, and the need to obtain or safeguard resources for war effort. In contrast, Source 5 sees Operation Barbarossa 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. Source 5 could be linked to Source 4 as another aspect of necessity. Source 6 focuses on the interlinked economic and ideological motives for the invasion and also points to Nazi overconfidence in its military capability due to successful campaigns earlier in 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: Hitler's conviction that a successful Nazi campaign would remove Russia as a potential ally for Britain and induce the latter to negotiate; the extent to which Stalin's regime was economically and militarily ready to launch an attack on the Third Reich in mid-1941; 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 lack of realism fostered by previous successful campaigns, e.g. against France.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 responses are likely to sift the evidence with some cross-referencing, and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements. Level 3 answers will reach a conclusion probably recognising that the argument is not all about 'necessity' and clearly recognising that the sources give different interpretations. Sources will be used with some confidence. For Level 4, look for sustained argument on the relative merits of the various arguments. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of necessity and ideology on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. They might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could debate to what extent was Hitler's decision a pre-emptive strike (Source 5).</p>	40

**E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 gives a 'great power rivalry' view of the origins of the Cold War based on Kennan's assessment of Russia's long-term conduct in international affairs. Candidates may note that the source also makes two specific references to the importance of ideology. Source 8, in contrast, locates the start of the Cold War firmly in an ideological context by stressing the USA's commitment to free trade capitalism and the Soviet Union's adherence to Marxism-Leninism. These opposed ideological positions encouraged a sense of mission and made conflict inevitable. Source 9 emphasises the role played by authoritarianism and, more particularly, Stalin. The Soviet leader's hard-line 'cold war' mentality, which was previously evident in his handling of domestic affairs, informed his approach to international affairs after 1945.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-49 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: 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 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; 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 divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the role of key personalities, particularly Stalin, Truman and Roosevelt.</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 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. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of traditional great power rivalry and ideological conflict on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 suggests that the Reagan's uncompromising policies established a dominant position for the USA and forced the Soviet Union to reconsider its position. Reagan's stance represented a sharp break with the Carter years which, the source indicates, merely prolonged the Cold War. In contrast, Source 11 examines the impact of the 'popular revolutions' in eastern Europe in 1989 and Gorbachev's personal role in bringing about regime change in the Soviet bloc. 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.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the Cold War in the 1980s 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. From the 1980s candidates are likely to know about: 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, glasnost</i>); 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 Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. 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 Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Reagan's policies and other factors (e.g. the role of other key personalities such as Gorbachev, the impact of 'people power' in eastern Europe, and mounting economic problems for the Soviet Union) on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will offer a sustained discussion of the relative importance of key factors with some concentration on Reagan's policies, using precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UG028172 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit  
[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

