

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2012

GCE History (6HI03/E)

Unit 3: Depth Studies & Associated
Historical Controversies

Option E: War & Peace: 20th Century
International Relations

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2012

Publications Code UA032436

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

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.

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.

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.

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	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of how the Balkan crisis of summer 1914 contributed to the outbreak of the First World War. Features which suggest that the Balkan crisis was only the occasion for the First World War might include: the system of alliances (Triple Alliance and Triple Entente) was responsible for creating the rival power blocs and escalating an Austro-Serb dispute into a general European war; the impact of 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); the Balkan crisis reflected broader imperial rivalries after 1900 which contributed to international tension and intensified nationalist feeling in the years up to 1914 (e.g. British 'defence' of the Empire, German <i>Weltpolitik</i>, French interests in north Africa, Austro-Hungarian-Russian rivalry in the Balkans etc.); Germany used the 1914 Balkan crisis to provoke war in order to pursue its expansionist aims and resolve a serious domestic crisis (Fischer thesis). Features which suggest that the 1914 Balkan crisis was the cause of the First World War might include: longstanding tension between Austria-Hungary and Russia over the Balkans had been sharply renewed in the Bosnian Crisis of 1908-09, the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 and the Summer 1914 crisis; the conflict between Austria-Hungary and Serbia was a critical issue in 1914 because the latter's desire to create a Greater Serbia was a direct challenge to the multinational Habsburg Empire; in this context Russia's support for the Serbs (as part of its Pan-Slav policy) was a natural but dangerous development, particularly since Russian influence over Serbia was limited.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements about the Balkan crisis of 1914 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 of the 'occasion' view of the 1914 crisis 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
2	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the factors which shaped the peace treaties of 1919-22. Features which support the statement in the question might include: Germany and her allies were saddled with 'war guilt'; the imposed nature of the treaties (e.g. Versailles, Trianon) leading to accusations of an Allied 'diktat' mentality; selective use of the 14 Points (e.g. national self-determination did not apply to Germany and Austria); the Allied powers followed their own narrow national interests, e.g. France's insistence on large-scale German reparations; the Habsburg Empire was replaced by a mosaic of small unstable states; the treaties helped to destabilise domestic politics in Weimar Germany and post-war Italy etc. Features which challenge the statement in the question might include: the Versailles Treaty was not excessively harsh on Germany either territorially or economically; the treaties attempted to inject idealism and morality into international relations e.g. national self-determination led to the establishment of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, plebiscites were used to foster self-determination in disputed areas e.g. Allenstein, the creation of the League of Nations and the International Labour Organisation; the impact of Brest-Litovsk on Allied peacemaking; the real problem with the treaties was the lack of effective enforcement due to the USA's non-participation, Anglo-French divisions etc.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the peace settlements with either only implicit reference to the extent they were vicious and/or short-sighted or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent the treaties were vicious/short-sighted 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 the factors shaping the peace treaties 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

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of Eisenhower's cold war diplomacy in the years 1953-60. Developments which support a confrontational US approach might include: Eisenhower's hard line 'New Look' foreign policy (based on the 'roll back' of communism, the doctrine of 'massive retaliation' and nuclear brinkmanship etc.); declaration of the Domino Theory (1954) and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957); the use of covert operations, e.g. Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954); the U2 spy plane programme; confrontation with China over Quemoy and Matsu (1954 and 1958); leadership attitudes, e.g. Eisenhower 'same old girl' and Khrushchev 'We will bury you'. Developments which support the coexistence view might include: settlement of the Austrian issue (1955); summit diplomacy in the 1950s and the 'Spirit of Geneva' and the 'Spirit of Camp David'; US acceptance of Soviet sphere of influence, e.g. East Germany (1953) and Hungary (1956); Soviet recognition of West Germany (1955); exchange visits for Russian and American scientists.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about Eisenhower's cold war diplomacy with either only implicit reference to the extent it was based on confrontation or coexistence, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent cold war diplomacy was based on confrontation or coexistence 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 cold war diplomacy under Eisenhower 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 about the main reasons for the easing of US-Soviet tensions in the 1970s. Developments which suggest that improving Sino-US relations fostered US-Soviet détente might include: the Nixon Doctrine and 'triangular diplomacy' in the early 1970s; the impact of the US-Sino Shanghai Communique (1972); growing tension between China and the USSR in the late 1960s (e.g. 1969 Ussuri River incident); Soviet fears of isolation due to growing Sino-US rapprochement. Developments which suggest that other factors promoted US-Soviet détente might include: desire to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; wider US and Soviet economic considerations (e.g. to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to western technology); the impact of the Vietnam war on America; the pressure for détente generated by Ostpolitik in opening up channels between east and west Europe.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about improving Sino-US relations with either only implicit reference to the extent they promoted US-Soviet détente or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent Sino-US relations promoted US-Soviet détente 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 the causes of détente 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

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 maintains that the USA rejected the League and adopted an isolationist policy after 1918 to avoid becoming involved in another 'European' war. Without the stabilising influence of American economic, human and military resources, the League and the international system were vulnerable to the challenges posed by Germany, Italy and Japan. Source 2 argues that the League failed because of its flawed security mechanisms. In particular, the lack of consensus undermined the idea of a collective response to aggression and formal decision-making procedures required unanimity which proved elusive in the interwar period. Source 3 focuses on how fundamental Anglo-French differences (e.g. over the treatment of Germany) weakened the League and prevented it from assuming a clearly defined role.</p> <p>Candidates own knowledge of the League's weaknesses and failings should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: how US rejection of the League helped to facilitate the challenge of the revisionist powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) in the 1930s e.g. Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1935); the 'victors' club' image of the League and the prominent role played by Britain and France in its affairs in the 1920s and 1930s; the various defects and loopholes in the League's constitution which made concerted action against aggression difficult to achieve.</p> <p>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 the consequences of the USA's isolationist policy, 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 an isolationist USA in the League's shortcomings. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of American rejection 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 USA's decision to confront Japan was driven by a desire to protect its economic interests in the Far East. Japan's determination to assert its political and economic dominance over south-east Asia was a direct challenge to American trade and investment in the region. Source 5 mentions economic motives too but widens the argument. According to this extract, America's decision was also influenced by its anti-imperialist stance, its desire to maintain good relations with Britain and France, and concern about the security of its Pacific possessions. Source 6 focuses on how the British position in 1940-41 in Europe and Asia had a direct bearing on American attitudes. In the west, a neutralised Britain would enable the Nazis to gain greater control over the Atlantic. Similarly, Japan's southward drive threatened to undermine the British Empire in the Far East which was a key element of the USA's security system.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the USA's decision to confront Japan in 1941 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the impact of the surprise Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor; Japan's expansionist policies in the region, e.g. war against China (1937) and the creation of the Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere (1940); US determination to uphold its Open Door policy; American economic sanctions (e.g. oil, copper, zinc) 'forced' Japan into a pre-emptive strike; the impact of Hitler's victories in Europe (and growing influence in the Atlantic) on the decision-makers in Washington and Tokyo (1940-41); the threat posed to US security by the Japanese challenge to British imperial interests in the region.</p> <p>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 'economic interests' 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 economic interests on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 argues that the US misread Soviet security needs in Europe as communist expansion. In turn, the American hard line response led the Soviets to regard US policy as capitalist imperialism. These polarised positions created a 'vicious circle' in superpower relations. This interpretation can be supported by material from Source 8 which focuses on Stalin's miscalculations after 1946. According to this extract the Soviet leader overreacted on east European and German issues and was also guilty of misjudgements over Korea. Source 9 emphasises the conflicting aims and objectives of the USA and the USSR in the years after 1945. It also contends that the USA was in a much stronger position to shape the post-war international order. Candidates may note that, according to Source 9, these competing visions of the post-1945 world were ideologically driven.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-53 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of 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 (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism'; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the role of key personalities particularly Stalin, Truman and Roosevelt; the formation of the People's Republic of China (1949); the impact of the Korean War (1950-53).</p> <p>The focus of good answers should be on these 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 superpower misjudgements and conflicting national interests on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 suggests that growing opposition in eastern Europe in the late 1980s played a major role in ending the Cold War because popular protest rejected communist rule and undermined the Soviet bloc. This public opposition took a variety of forms - political, economic, religious, patriotic etc. In contrast, Source 11 examines the role played by Gorbachev in persuading the USA and other Western powers to bring the conflict to a close. It also notes that Reagan made a particular contribution to this process by abandoning the Washington 'cold war warrior' mindset in order to deal constructively with the Soviet leader. Source 12 focuses on the economic pressures facing the ailing Soviet system by the 1980s at a time when the US economy was surging ahead into the computer and information technology age.</p> <p>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. From the 1980s candidates are likely to know about: 'people power' in eastern Europe in the late 1980s, e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall etc; Gorbachev's rejection of 'old style' Soviet diplomacy and the Brezhnev era (<i>perestroika</i>, <i>glasnost</i>); the impact of the INF Treaty (1987), the Moscow Summit (1988) and Gorbachev's address to the UN (1988); the policies pursued by Reagan (e.g. SDI, neutron bomb, MX missiles, hard-line 'evil empire' rhetoric and, later, growing rapport with Gorbachev) and their impact; the mounting economic problems of the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s and the widening East-West gap in living standards.</p> <p>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 the popular protests in eastern Europe and other factors (e.g. the role of other key personalities such as Gorbachev and mounting economic problems for the Soviet Union) 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 the popular protests in eastern Europe, 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 publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032436 Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

