

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2010

GCE

GCE History 6HI03/E

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

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

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: 0844 576 0034

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA024104

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
 - i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear
 - ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
 - iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

Section B

Target: A01a and A01b (7% - 16 marks) A02b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

A01a and A01b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-3	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1 mark The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	4-6	<p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 4 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 5 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 7 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and - as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 11 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 12 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 13 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 14 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 15 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 16 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	10-14	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Unit 3 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Section A Q	30	-	30
Section B Q	16	24	40
Total Marks	46	24	70
% weighting	20%	10%	30%

Section A

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	Candidates should have knowledge of how the European arms race (e.g. the failure of disarmament conferences at the Hague in 1898 and 1907, Anglo-German naval rivalry from 1900 and army expansion after 1912 in Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary and France) contributed to international tension and intensified nationalist feeling in the years up to 1914. The question also requires candidates to consider other factors which led to the outbreak of war, such as the role of the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente in creating rival power blocs and the impact of international crises between 1905 and 1914 on great power relations (e.g. Morocco 1905-06 and 1911, Bosnia 1908-09, the Balkan Wars 1912-13 and the evolution of the 1914 crisis). At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only implicit argument or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis but the detail may be hazy in places or the answer chronologically skewed. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis about the European arms race with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'what extent'. At Level 5, 'what extent' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	The key treaties here are the Washington Naval Treaties (1921-22) and the 1929 London Naval Treaty relating to arms limitations, which were successful, and the Geneva Disarmament Conference of 1932-33, which failed to reach agreement. Candidates may also note the impact of efforts to promote a world disarmament programme through the League of Nations. Knowledge of how the disarmament provisions of the Versailles Treaty were implemented and evaded (e.g. Germany) is also relevant. The question requires stronger candidates to link the success or failure of disarmament initiatives during this period to key factors such as war-weariness, the 'never again' mentality, economic constraints, security issues, national self-interest and great power rivalry. At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only implicit argument on the quotation or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis but the detail may be hazy in places or the answer chronologically skewed. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis about the successes and failures of disarmament during the 1920s and early 1930s with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.	30

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of 'peaceful coexistence' in the period 1953-61. Developments which helped to ease Cold War tensions might include: the end of the Korean War (1953); Soviet settlement of border disputes with Turkey and Iran (1953) and recognition of Israel (1953); Austrian independence and improved Soviet-Yugoslav relations (1955); the 'Geneva spirit' based on east-west summit diplomacy and Khrushchev's visit to the USA in 1959. Developments which sustained Cold War tensions during the period might include: US attitudes towards communism in the 1950s (domino theory, 'roll back', Eisenhower doctrine); Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence based on long-term victory of communism; the impact of the Hungarian Rising (1956) and the launch of Sputnik (1957); the U2 spy plane incident (1960) and the issue of Germany (1958-1961). At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about peaceful coexistence with either only implicit reference to the extent tensions were eased or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent tensions were eased but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of US-Soviet relations under peaceful coexistence with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of how personal rivalries contributed to deteriorating Sino-Soviet relations between 1958 and 1969 (e.g. the legacy of Mao's poor relationship with Stalin and Mao's rivalry and disagreements with Khrushchev/Brezhnev). This question also requires candidates to consider other factors which help to explain the growing Sino-Soviet rift including: competing Soviet and Chinese claims to the leadership of international communism; China's reaction to de-Stalinisation; PRC rejection of the Soviet Union's 'peaceful coexistence' with the West; Sino-Soviet tension over the nuclear question; Mao's rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine in 1968 over Czechoslovakia. Candidates are required to show how personal rivalries and other factors caused Sino-Soviet relations to deteriorate and may make reference to: Mao's concerns over Soviet de-Stalinisation (seen as veiled criticism of Mao's own leadership and giving 'encouragement' to anti-communism in eastern Europe); the failure of Khrushchev's visit to China (1958); tension over Taiwan (1958); Soviet criticism of China's 'Great Leap Forward' (1959); Sino-Soviet rivalry over Albania and China's walkout from the 1961 Moscow Conference; the impact of the Sino-India War (1962); China's criticism of Soviet handling of the Cuban Missile crisis (1962); Soviet 'peaceful coexistence' versus Mao's commitment to 'continuing revolution'; Sino-Soviet differences over the Test Ban Treaty (1963); China's developing nuclear programme (1964 - atomic bomb, 1967- hydrogen bomb); Mao's rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine (1968); Sino-Soviet border disputes such as Damansky/Chenbao (1969). At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide only implicit reference to reasons or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis why Sino-Soviet relations broke down but the detail may undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis about personal rivalries with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'to what extent'. At Level 5, 'to what extent' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 provides evidence of the League's constitutional inadequacies which candidates should link with their own knowledge for greater depth and development. Source 2 examines the impact of US non-participation in the League of Nations particularly in the 1930s and briefly comments on British and French indecision as a contributory factor. Source 3 could be linked to the evidence of the other two sources to show that constitutional defects and the USA's lack of involvement made it easier for determined nations to bypass the League. Candidates' own knowledge should be added to the source evidence and will be integrated into that evidence in support of an argument at Levels 4/5. It is acceptable to enter riders about the apparent League successes, especially in the 1920s, but the focus of good answers should be on reasons for failure. These need not be restricted to the three here, although, if well handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who do debate the relative importance of these three. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion about reasons for League weaknesses linked to understanding about constitutional defects will be offered and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of the Covenant's shortcomings. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of constitutional defects in explaining League weaknesses and the answer will be informed by precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>Source 4 gives candidates material to support the view that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 was a mistake by questioning Hitler's ideological drive to war and referring to the diplomatic errors and miscalculations made by Germany, Britain and France. Candidates are likely to use their own knowledge to examine this interpretation with specific reference to Czechoslovakia and Poland. In contrast, Source 5 maintains that Hitler was personally responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War due to his handling of the crises of 1938-39, his uncompromising approach and his determination to wage war. Here candidates are likely to use their own knowledge to identify Hitler's ambitions and aggression in the late 1930s. It is also relevant to go further back and make reference to Hitler's ideological pronouncements about <i>lebensraum</i> etc. Source 6 offers a different viewpoint by focusing on British and French motives for war - national self-interest and the preservation of great power status. Candidates can supplement Source 6 with their own knowledge to extend the analysis beyond diplomatic blunders and Hitler's responsibility by examining the outbreak of war from a more international perspective. At Levels 1 and 2 responses are likely to sift the evidence with some cross-referencing, and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements. Level 3 answers will reach a conclusion probably recognising that the argument is not all about diplomatic errors and mistakes and clearly recognising that the sources give different interpretations. Sources will be used with some confidence. For Level 4, look for sustained argument on the relative merits of the various arguments. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of diplomatic blunders and mistakes on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. They might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could debate to what extent was Hitler's pursuit of 'living space' at the expense of the Soviet Union simply political window dressing (Source 4) or British and French actions essentially a response to Hitler's aggression (Source 6).</p>	40

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 gives a clear exposition of the orthodox 'Soviet expansionism' argument and good candidates may pick up on the point about Western acceptance of a Soviet sphere of influence in central and eastern Europe. Source 8, revisionist in tone and content, emphasises US economic concerns and the rise of the American 'military-industrial complex' in starting the Cold War. Source 9 stresses that Soviet economic inferiority prompted Stalin to adopt a defensive stance behind the 'iron curtain' based on security considerations. Fear of capitalist penetration also led Russia to reject Marshall Aid. Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-48 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US 'Open Door' policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-48) which led to Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism' ; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-48), including the early stages of the Berlin Blockade. The focus of good answers should be on these two interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of Soviet expansionism and US economic aims on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. They might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could take issue with Source 7 by arguing that Soviet actions were defensive - a point clearly made in Source 9.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 suggests that the Soviet Union's inability to match Western economic growth and the USA's military-technological advance under Reagan (SDI) played a significant role in ending the Cold War. Gorbachev concluded that the USSR required western-style economic and social modernisation to survive but, in the process, the people of eastern Europe used this change in policy to break away from the Soviet Union. In contrast, Source 11 casts doubt on the success of Reagan's military-technological challenge and refutes the idea of a deliberate US policy to force the Soviet Union into 'overspend'. Source 12 focuses on Gorbachev's initiatives to end east-west tension and Reagan's ability (despite his deeply held anti-communism) to work constructively with the new Soviet leader. Candidates' own knowledge of the Cold War in the 1980s should be added to the evidence of the sources and will be integrated into that evidence in support of a sustained argument at Levels 4/5. Students should concentrate predominantly on the 1980s although candidates making the case for the West's more powerful economy and the widening gap in living standards may well begin their discussion earlier. From the 1980s, candidates are likely to know about: the policies pursued by Reagan (e.g. SDI, neutron bomb, MX missiles and growing rapport with Gorbachev); Gorbachev's rejection of 'old style' Soviet diplomacy and the Brezhnev era (<i>perestroika, glasnost</i>); the impact of the INF Treaty (1987), the Moscow Summit (1988) and Gorbachev's address to the UN (1988); 'people power' in eastern Europe 1988-90 e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion on why the Cold War came to an end will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of mounting economic pressure and other factors (e.g. role of key personalities such as Reagan and Gorbachev, impact of 'people power' in eastern Europe etc.) on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will offer a sustained discussion of the relative importance of key factors with some concentration on mounting economic pressure, using precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA024104 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH