



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

A2 History 2041

HIS3N

Unit 3N

**Aspects of International Relations,
1945–2004**

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, candidates will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to '*think like a historian*' and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, candidates will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 candidates will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able candidates.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2010

A2 Unit 3: The State and the People: Change and Continuity

HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Question 1

- 01** To what extent was the Soviet Union's expansion into Eastern Europe the main cause of the intensification of the Cold War in the years 1945 to 1956?
(45 marks)
- Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)*

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical
-

understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written.

38-45

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain the arguments that support the proposition in the question and balance this against the evidence that challenges the proposition. They may also refer to other historiography which offers an alternative view to both the proposition and its diametric opposite.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of an argument that supports the proposition:

- Soviet attitudes following the Yalta Conference and the failure of the Soviet Union to stand by its commitment to the Declaration on Liberated Europe. Poland became a particularly provocative issue as far as the West was concerned
- the Soviet Union did embark on a systematic programme of establishing pro-Soviet communist regimes across Eastern Europe between 1945 and 1949. This was perceived by the Western powers as a clear threat to them
- the conflict over Berlin and the Berlin Blockade and the perceptions this generated amongst Western powers, particularly the USA.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the USA had nuclear technology. The USSR saw this as threat to their security and therefore needed a means to protect themselves. This focused on establishing allies and a buffer zone in Eastern Europe
- the USA had introduced a policy of containment – the Truman Doctrine and then the Marshall Plan. Both these were perceived as threats by the Soviet Union
- the USA had ended its isolationism and appeared to want to act as the ‘world’s policeman’. This was provocative to the USSR

Furthermore, candidates may:

- Suggest that ideological differences were significant in the development of the Cold War
- argue that personalities had a role to play. Stalin was paranoid and Truman lacked foreign policy experience
- note that Western European states lured the USA into protecting Europe and this brought the USA in as a perceived threat to the USSR.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- argue that on balance, both sides – the USA had comparable levels of responsibility for the development of the Cold War
- the USSR was directly responsible for the development of the Cold War
- the USA was directly responsible for the development of the Cold War.

Question 2

- 02** 'The Cuban missile crisis was a triumph for the Soviet Union.'
How valid is this assessment with reference to the years 1962 to 1964? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain the proposition in the question which suggests that the Soviet Union emerged triumphantly from the Cuban missile crisis and balance this against the view that the Cuban missile crisis was a defeat for the Soviet Union. They may also consider the extent to which there were elements of success in the crisis for the Soviet Union.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of an argument that supports the proposition:

- Cuba remained a communist state when the missile crisis had concluded. The USA agreed not to attack Cuba in the future. The USA also removed its missiles from Turkey.
- this communist state was within 90 miles of the US mainland. The USSR had succeeded in preserving a communist state in the USA's 'own back yard'.
- Khrushchev wanted to move towards greater nuclear parity with the USA. The missile crisis undoubtedly raised awareness for the need to move towards greater efforts on nuclear arms controls. This was in the Soviet Union's interests.
- the crisis confirmed the Soviet Union's commitment to the Third World. The stance against the USA, although ultimately defeated, was a propaganda victory.
- the USA's commitment to containment had been successfully challenged.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the crisis was a defeat. The USSR had to remove the missiles.
- the importance of Kennedy's status as a world leader having been enhanced. Kennedy had won the struggle over brinkmanship as Khrushchev withdrew.
- the crisis strengthened the USA's status in West Germany and Europe. The stand over Cuba strengthened the importance of the USA as the defender against communism. This further weakened Khrushchev's position in Europe.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- explore the link between the crisis and Khrushchev's removal from office by 1964.
- consider the significance of the USA's status as a global power remaining intact.
- explore the significance of the crisis in terms of the USA's role in Vietnam and its influence on the USA's attitudes towards other Third World states in an era of increasing decolonisation.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- argue that on balance the outcomes were significantly more favourable than the withdrawal might suggest at face value.
- however the USA emerged more triumphantly from the crisis than did the USSR.
- the crisis heralded a turning point in international relations and that benefited both the USSR and the USA.

Question 3

- 03** 'In the years 1969 to 2004 the USA consistently placed its own global self-interest above any consideration for international co-operation.'
How valid is this assessment of US foreign policy? (45 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. There will be synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included showing an overall historical understanding. There will be a good understanding and use of differing historical interpretations and debate and the answer will show judgement through sustained argument backed by a carefully selected range of precise evidence. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a full understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be very well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**
-

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates will need to assess/identify and evaluate/explain the view that the USA was consistently more committed to its own global self interest rather than contributing to international cooperation and balance this against examples of US international cooperation. They may also either agree or challenge the validity of the view in the question.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the USA's commitment to its global self-interests was greater than any commitment to international cooperation:

- the USA's policies towards intervention in Iraq, Kuwait and Afghanistan between 1991 and 2004 suggests that US national and global interests were paramount. Candidates could explore US motives, particularly after 9/11.
- the issue of motive is central to this question. Candidates may consider why the USA participated in détente during the 1970s and suggest that global self-interest drove US involvement in détente.
- US cooperation was focused on global self-interest through the rapprochement with China. Candidates may explore the motives underpinning this Sino-Soviet cooperation.
- President Reagan pursued a seemingly aggressive approach towards the USSR and the so called 'evil empire'. This underlined the real agenda that was designed to protect the USA's global power.

Nevertheless, there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the USA did participate in some significant forms of international cooperation, most notably SALT I and SALT II in addition to the Helsinki Accords.
- President Reagan cooperated with Gorbachev and the USSR through a series of major summit talks in the late 1980s. These were continued by his successor, President Bush. Candidates may explore the relevancy of these to bringing the Cold War to an end.
- there was some degree of cooperation with NATO and the UN over the collapse of Yugoslavia during the 1990s.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- argue that international relations are based on self-interest. However, that might be achieved through cooperation. Some candidates may refer to the theoretical views which drive interpretations of how states interact with each other and why that position is taken.
- suggest that there was a degree of pressure on the USA that compelled it to cooperate. Candidates may consider the development of nuclear parity that was reached between the USSR and the USA. They may suggest that this inevitably necessitated greater US cooperation in order to manage this parity and thereby retain the USA's global status.

In conclusion, candidates may:

- argue that cooperation is an integral part of preserving global power. The USA wanted global power, therefore it had to cooperate internationally.

- also the idea that there would be consistent and, therefore, prolonged resistance does not stand up to scrutiny.