



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2011**

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 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 2011

**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 United States responsible for the collapse of the Grand Alliance at the end of the Second World War? (45 marks)

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

**Generic 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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 and explain why the Grand Alliance collapsed and the extent to which the United States was directly responsible.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that it was the result of the United States' role:

- the USA was convinced that the primary aim of the Soviet Union was to spread communist ideology into Europe at a time when Europe was at its most vulnerable. Truman was easily convinced of this view
- there were some significant influences on the USA's leadership which further served to demonise the Soviet Union. The Kennan *Long Telegram* was a significant influence as was Churchill's Iron Curtain speech
- candidates may argue that the USA always intended to protect and expand its economic interests and influence in Europe. Any expansion of communist influence and control would fundamentally undermine this and thereby threaten US vital interests.

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

- Stalin was committed to establishing Communist regimes in Eastern European states in order to establish a buffer zone to guarantee Soviet security from attack. This was inconsistent with his agreement to accept the declaration on Liberated Europe which had been finalised at Yalta
- the Soviet strategy towards Germany was based on ensuring there would be no economic recovery there. There was also the idea that the whole of Germany should only be united if it was in the form of a communist state. Problems rapidly emerged as the Soviet Union implemented this policy. The USA saw it as yet further evidence of Soviet ideological and strategic expansionism
- the Soviets blockaded Berlin in 1948. This was a final attempt to consolidate Soviet dominance in eastern Germany and it completed the USA's certainty that containment was a valid and necessary step.

Furthermore, candidates may argue that:

- there was no clear and firm joint agreement on the future of Germany at the Potsdam Conference. This left a continuing uncertainty and enabled both sides to develop their own policies and priorities towards Germany. It was likely that these would go in different and conflicting directions
- the introduction of containment was the most significant factor in the collapse of the Grand Alliance. This ensured that there would be no route to enable the protagonists to re-establish constructive relations. Some may suggest that it was a deliberate US strategy designed to ensure the USA had a role in Europe and it was part of the USA's determination to develop a global presence in the post-war world
- the USA's nuclear monopoly led to it adopting a provocative and seemingly aggressive stance towards the USSR. Nuclear diplomacy could not be the foundation of effective and lasting two power cooperation.

In conclusion, candidates may suggest that:

- the primary reason for the collapse of the alliance lay with the determination of the USA to establish itself as the dominant influence in Western Europe
- Soviet expansionism in Europe was no more than a legitimate strategy in response to the Soviet experiences in the war
- the Soviet Union had a simplistic policy which would always lead to an aggressive US response. Stalin acted too quickly and failed to accept that Soviet security could be protected through international cooperation rather than through apparent expansionism.

---

**Question 2**

- 02** 'The United Nations was an effective international peacekeeping organisation in the years 1991 to 2004.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

**Generic 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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 and explain the extent to which the United Nations was an effective peacekeeping organisation during the post cold war era up to 2004.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of the argument that the end of the Cold War enabled the UN to function as an effective peacekeeping organisation:

- the Cold War had undermined the UN's effectiveness because it was founded on the principle of collective security and international cooperation while the Cold War was based on confrontation
- some statistical detail would develop the view that the UN took part in more interventions once the Cold War had ended than it did during the Cold War. Also the number of vetoes applied in the Security Council reduced significantly
- candidates may examine specific interventions and assess their outcomes as examples of successful peacekeeping actions.

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

- the nature of the challenges facing the UN in the post-Cold War era were significantly different from those it faced during the Cold War, e.g. the rise of international terrorism, the emergence of new states
- the USA still wished to retain its status as an international superpower. It was not willing to enter into a new era of international cooperation even of its primary Cold War protagonist had disappeared. The USA was determined to intervene outside and beyond UN involvement. The UN could not be allowed to emerge as a powerful alternative to US international power
- the lack of international support continued. Also there were examples of international agencies overriding the role of the UN, e.g. in Yugoslavia.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- consider that the role of the UN was compromised in the post-Cold War era. It assumed a more pronounced role as an enforcer than merely a peacekeeper. This may be evidenced through the 1991 Gulf War
- consider examples of UN failures, e.g. Somalia and Rwanda
- 9/11 acted as a turning point in the effectiveness of the UN.

In conclusion, candidates may suggest that:

- the Cold War changed nothing because as it changed so did the rest of the international scene. The USA was particularly determined not to abandon its global influence to the UN
- the UN could only ever succeed as an effective peacekeeper if specific conditions were met, e.g. the willingness of the protagonists to cooperate; lack of international self-interest.

---

**Question 3**

- 03** 'In the years 1949 to 1991, the Cold War continued only because of the ideological divisions between the United States and the Soviet Union.'  
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

**Generic 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 an 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good 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 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 and explain the reasons why the Cold War lasted so long and balance this against other causal factors.

Candidates may refer to some of the following material in support of role of ideological differences:

- neither the Soviets nor the USA ever lost sight of their ideological divisions. There are numerous examples of ideological conflict, e.g. the Berlin Wall
- the early pre-1949 conflicts focused on containment. This had a solid ideological foundation and became the cornerstone of US policy for the next 40 years at least
- even in the 1990s there was the real certainty by US leaders that the USSR remained a threat to freedom.

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

- the nuclear factor and the lasting nature of nuclear competition which acted as a profound barrier to conflict resolution
- the Cold War was about global status not ideological differences
- the idea that the USA wanted a Cold War in order to ensure its global superpower status.

Furthermore, candidates may:

- consider the role of individual leaders such as Kennedy and Khrushchev
- focus on specific Cold War hot spots, e.g. the Cuban missile crisis
- examine why initiatives such as 'peaceful co-existence' failed.

In conclusion, candidates may suggest that:

- ideology was merely a factor in the continuance of the Cold War and became increasingly less so as time passed
- the nuclear factor was more fundamental in terms of the continuance of the Cold War.

## Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)