



General Certificate of Education

A2 History 2041

Unit 3: HIS3N

Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Mark Scheme

Specimen mark scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards
This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#)

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

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

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards

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

HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Question 1

01 'NATO, in 1949, and then the Warsaw Pact in 1955, were created for purely defensive reasons.'

Assess the validity of this view.

(45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

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. **0-6**

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 establish the motives behind the creation of these two alliance systems. The question invites candidates to establish the relative importance of these motives and offers defence as the most significant. Clearly there is scope here to challenge this view. Equally there is the opportunity to develop a comparative analysis and consider the elements of similarity that may have existed in the collective motives.

In support of the proposition in the question candidates may suggest:

- NATO was a defensive alliance because it was created when the Cold War was at a high point in its early development. It was perceived as part of the essential defence strategy to protect Western Europe from the threat of Soviet expansionism from the east
- This context could be further developed by suggesting that the USA was a key part of NATO and its own foreign policy relations in terms of the USSR were founded on containment – therefore NATO was part of the containment programme and this was essentially a defensive alliance which sought to stop the spread of communism and the collapse of democracy that was supposed to come with that
- Western European states also encouraged the USA to commit itself to NATO in order to reinforce US defensive links with that region
- The Warsaw Pact may be regarded as a defensive response to NATO. This may be seen in the context of containment, which the USSR saw as a threatening and provocative policy, but also in terms of the power of the US military machine which could be turned against the communist East i.e. nuclear technology
- Both alliance systems had extensive military capability. Each was designed and equipped to defend itself from a threat from the other. Each represented a military deterrent and was therefore a defensive alliance first and foremost.

Candidates need to consider other factors which caused the development of these systems. They may suggest that other factors may be viewed as of greater significance than the merely the issue of defence.

- The Warsaw Pact drew together and strengthened Soviet control over its Eastern bloc satellite states. It created a pact which none of the members could withdraw from because the others would prevent it
- It also established a firm alliance of purely communist states all of whom were shaped in the Soviet mould. This reinforces the idea that the Pact was a device for Soviet control. That control could develop both politically and economically. The Pact served to ensure the unity of Eastern bloc states
- NATO was encouraged by many Western European states because it brought the USA closer into Europe. This was part of a strategy to protect non-communist government in Europe after 1945. European democracies allowed communism to exist and in the

difficult economic environment of early post-war Europe there was the possibility the communism would develop through democratic routes

- NATO was a way the USA could reinforce its own containment agenda. Containment was not simply about stopping the spread of communism. It was also about ensuring US influence i.e. political, economic and strategic. NATO was a way of reinforcing US interests regionally and it was part of a US strategy to establish regional alliance systems which fell under US influence in the wider sense than merely as a defence system against the spread of communism.

Candidates may develop other points to establish a clear balance and an evaluation which leads to a judgement.

Question 2

- 02** How far was the dispute over Berlin, in the years 1958 to 1961, the primary cause of the Cuban missile crisis of 1962? (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- 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. **0-6**
- 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 may seek to establish a causal link between the missile crisis and the problems between East and West over Berlin. Equally they may challenge such a link and establish an alternative causal pattern. The question invites candidates to evaluate the causes of the missile crisis in the slightly wider context than the immediate short term causes in 1962. Candidates may refer to some of the following material:

- The crisis over Berlin eventually led to the communist bloc constructing the Berlin Wall in August 1961. This brought to an apparent close the long standing attempt of the Soviet Union to force the Western powers out of Berlin and enable its return into communist East Germany. This East-West hostility was a direct causal link in the decision to place nuclear missiles on Cuba and thereby heighten the threat from the USSR towards the USA
- Berlin was a cold war propaganda failure for the USSR and the deployment of missiles on Cuba was meant to redress this. After the Wall was built Khrushchev needed a victory over the USA in order to restore his own political credibility both in the Soviet Union and amongst other Eastern bloc states. Candidates may develop this point in terms of the two leaders – Kennedy and Khrushchev. Kennedy had ‘won’ over Berlin but he could not be allowed to ‘win’ over Cuba
- Khrushchev was not interested in spreading communism. He opposed the Chinese approach under Mao Tse Tung. Therefore his primary motive was linked to the above rather than to any expansionist opportunism.

Candidates may suggest that other factors also influenced the decision to deploy missiles. These may include:

- The USSR was lagging behind in the nuclear arms race. The missile deployment significantly reduced that imbalance
- Russia simply exploited an opportunity offered to them by the USA. The USA rejected any relationship with Cuba and even supported the Bay of Pigs invasion. Cuba had to find a protector, both economically and militarily
- The USSR saw the incident as a way to negotiate the removal of US missiles from Turkey
- Khrushchev did want to spread communist influence across the volatile area of central and southern America. Cuba was a perfect opportunity to begin the process
- The USSR was faced with other priorities than the nuclear arms race. There was a real danger of its control over its satellite states diminishing unless the economies of these states strengthened and the USSR was also seen a credible world power.

Candidates may consider other factors that may reinforce a balanced analysis and judgement.

Question 3

- 03** 'It was the actions of the USA, in the years 1947 to 2004, which determined the course of international relations.'
Assess the validity of this view. (45 marks)

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

- 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. **0-6**
- 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.

This is an open-ended question which allows candidates to 'dip into' a range of examples of post-war international relations issues. Some candidates may support the proposition in the question and link international power with economic and military power. They may consider the USA as the dominant superpower. Equally others may suggest that the proposition is a misleading generalisation which fails to address the multiple factors which determine international relations outcomes. Those supporting the proposition may consider:

- The dominant position the USA held immediately after World War II. This could be illustrated through the USA's central role in terms of the defence of Western Europe, through its control of nuclear power up to 1949 and through its commitment to containment. They may suggest that the USA was interested in protecting its own vested interests and that could only be achieved by being able to have a dominant influence on international relations, or at least those that might matter in the achievement of protecting its interests. Candidates may suggest that containment drove US policy from 1947 to about 1969
- In the era of détente it was the USA that was in a strong position to protect its own interests by cooperating with detente. Equally it was the USA that broke détente as America entered an era of Reagan militarism which led to the development of the second cold war
- It was the USA that determined the nature and extent of interventionism in the post-cold war conflict in both Europe and the Middle East
- The importance of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war as a restraining force on international relations.

Overall candidates may select any range of factors over the whole period in order to suggest that US economic and military dominance enabled them to develop policies and strategies which drove international relations amongst Western states and to a lesser extent amongst the Eastern bloc.

Candidates may offer a challenge to the question and suggest that no one state may determine the course of international relations. The USA was undoubtedly important but there are numerous examples of international relations not being driven by US influence. Candidates may consider:

- The influence of the USSR, particularly over the Eastern bloc states of Europe
- The impact of the Cold War as a fundamentally important factor in driving international relations up to 1991. Numerous examples of this in action are available to candidates.

Candidates are free to develop any evidential material they wish which enables them to examine the issue of US dominance and its extent over the whole period.