



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 students' 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 © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Students 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. Students 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, students 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 student'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 student has begun to *'think like a historian'* and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, students 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 students 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 students.

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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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 2012

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

HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Question 1

- 01** 'In the years 1955 to 1962, Khrushchev was genuinely committed to peaceful co-existence.'
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 students 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.

Students will need to assess and evaluate the view that Khrushchev was motivated by a desire to lessen the growing hostility and the deepening Cold War relationship between the USA and the USSR and balance this against the view that this was not Khrushchev's aim at all. His real aim was to strengthen the USSR's global position and reinforce the USSR's control over its Eastern European satellite states. They may also consider the view that Khrushchev was not committed to minimising its negative impact on the Soviet Union.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the primary motive underlying peaceful co-existence was to limit the further development of the Cold War and even scale down the conflict through a commitment to international tolerance:

- the Austrian State Treaty, 1955, was a clear indicator of the Soviet Union's willingness to embark on wider co-operation
- the Soviet Union needed to develop its own economy. This was being damaged by the ever rising financial cost of the Cold War. Khrushchev was a pragmatist and he was willing to make genuine efforts to de-intensify the Cold War because this would have a direct benefit to the USSR
- the Geneva Summit, 1955 also reinforces the validity of the view.

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

- the USSR was lagging behind in the nuclear arms race. The USA was a stronger Cold War power and peaceful co-existence was a Soviet strategy to redress the power imbalance in what the Soviets saw as a lasting ideological struggle that they had to win
- the strategy was designed to reinforce the Soviet Union's position as the leader of global communism. This became particularly significant with the ever increasing rise of competition from China
- the strategy was designed to enable the USSR to consolidate its position in Eastern Europe in the face of increasing opposition to Soviet domination and Soviet models of communism, e.g. Hungary, 1956.

Furthermore, students may:

- consider the problems over Germany and Berlin and the events leading to the construction of the Berlin Wall in August 1961. These may suggest that Khrushchev's commitment to peaceful co-existence was a rather cynical and clumsy attempt at political distraction, and one that failed
- consider the pre-Cuban missile crisis events, particularly the efforts of the Soviet Union to cultivate Cuba as an ally and thereby inflame the USA. This is hardly an element of peaceful co-existence
- the treatment meted out to Soviet satellite states is also significant in measuring Khrushchev's intentions through peaceful co-existence, particularly the Soviet response to the Hungarian uprising. The USA could hardly have been unaware of this and these events confirmed its Cold War position.

In conclusion, students may:

- arrive at a balanced judgement and argue that there was a genuine commitment to reducing the Cold War's intensity but this was driven by purely pragmatic motives
- this may be further developed through a detailed analysis of the concept of peaceful co-existence.

Question 2

- 02** To what extent was the collapse of détente by 1980 due to changing attitudes in the United States? (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 students 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.

Students will need to assess and evaluate the view that it was the United States that ultimately brought about an end to détente. Students may need to explore the apparent gradual process of change in the level of support that the USA gave to the continuance of détente and balance this against other factors which may have also contributed to the decline and ultimate collapse of détente.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that:

- there was a rise in the number and influence of neo-conservatives in the USA administration. Increasingly the view was being expressed that détente was helping the USSR more than it was helping the USA. These neo-conservatives came to have an increasing influence over Carter. Hard line and influential views were expressed particularly by Zbigniew Brzezinski
- détente was seen by the USA as a means of developing an adapted version of containment. Its aim was to establish a form of 'behaviour management' over the USSR by creating a level of dependency. It became increasingly clear to many that this management strategy was not working
- by the late 1970s opposition to SALT II was increasing. More and more US Senators were doubtful about a US commitment to SALT II. There was a belief that détente was acting contrary to US interests particularly in terms of nuclear capability
- the Carter Doctrine was a clear indication that US commitment to détente had ended by 1980.

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

- détente stalled throughout the post SALT I period. Despite a series of summits neither side was able to make significant and speedy moves towards SALT II
- the Soviet Union was seen to be supporting international revolutionary socialist movements. This seemed particularly provocative to the USA in areas such as Angola and Ethiopia. The Soviets sought to legitimise these interventions in the context of détente, despite US opposition
- the ultimate intervention came in 1979 with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This act of apparent Soviet aggression stimulated a US response. US interests in the Middle East and the security and stability of that region as one of the world's largest oil suppliers, and therefore one that profoundly impacted on US and other global economies, was now presented as vulnerable to Soviet expansionism.

Furthermore, students may:

- suggest that President Carter failed to accurately analyse Soviet actions and that he acted irresponsibly and in haste
- suggest that ending détente was part of a US strategy to bring European détente to an end in order to re-establish a stronger US influence in Europe and the 'traditional' power the USA had held over Europe.

In conclusion, students may:

Arrive at the view that although the USSR acted in a manner that was a clear gamble if they wished to retain détente it was the USA that was enthusiastic to bring détente to a close. The USSR had, potentially, much more to gain by the preservation of détente than by its demise. Equally they may conclude that the USA realised its behaviour management was not succeeding and therefore needed to adopt a much more proactive approach, and one that they controlled, rather than relied on the USSR. This led into the Reagan strategy.

Question 3

- 03** 'The Cold War lasted for so long because of the United States' fears for Western European security.'
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1945 to 1991. (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 students 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.

Students will need to assess the validity of the premise of the question and evaluate the factors that support it and balance this against those factors which challenge the view. They may also explore contextual detail which both supports and opposes the view defined in the question.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of view that the USA's determination to protect Western Europe did serve to prolong the Cold War rather than shorten its duration:

- Western Europe was the focal point of the US policy of containment. This had been a major factor in the development of the Cold War. This policy was further developed through the Marshall Aid programme. From the very end of the Second World War, Western Europe, particularly Germany, became a source of Cold War confrontation
- 1949 NATO was formed. This was promoted by the USA and that state became a primary defender of Western Europe. NATO formed part of that defence system, but so did the guarantee of US nuclear capability against the Soviet Union
- confrontation over Berlin was a constant theme. This developed in 1948–9 and during the period 1958–61. President Kennedy made a seminal speech in 1963 committing the USA to Berlin's defence
- the Berlin Wall had a significant impact on US-Soviet Cold War relations. It became a symbol of the Cold War and Berlin became a symbol of defiance against the spread of Communism
- Western Europe became the location for missile deployment during the 1980s. The USA placed Cruise missiles in Europe and Britain formed a deep relationship with President Reagan, which further linked Western Europe to Cold War confrontation.

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

- Western Europe became the focal point of the development of détente. Willy Brandt was the prime mover in this process through his policy of Ostpolitik. This may be viewed as a significant impulse in the development of global détente that emerged. This is a clear link between Western Europe and the attempts to establish a new more co-operative relationship between the superpowers, which could have led to bringing the Cold War to an end much earlier
- Berlin became the focal point of the end of the Cold War. As the Wall came down in November 1989 the first most significant step towards a final end of the Cold War was taken
- Western Europe consolidated its own defence and economic security. This could be explored through the Maastricht Treaty, 1991
- ideological divisions acted as a lasting and long-term division and this was the result of both the USA and the USSR
- both sides participated in a lasting nuclear arms race, even during détente.

Furthermore, students may:

- consider the view that while Eastern Europe remained part of the Soviet satellite system, Western Europe would always be vulnerable to the further expansion of Communism. This made Western Europe a key factor in the continuance of the Cold War

- there were opportunities to reduce the tension further. One particularly significant one was détente. Students may consider the collapse of détente and the degree of responsibility taken by the USA
- containment was not merely a Western European strategy. It was a long-term global strategy.

In conclusion, students may suggest that the USA turned Western Europe into a theatre of Cold War confrontation and the region had little direct control over its contribution to the Cold War. This began to change as détente emerged and Western Europe became a major factor in the decline of the Cold War. In many respects Berlin and Germany became symbols of the Cold War and just as the Cold War had started in Germany, it came to an end there.

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