

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE History 6HI03 E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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.

June 2016

Publications Code 6HI03_E_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the seventh session of the 6HI03 E examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher grade categories. The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question, and Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. Examiners want to see candidates who can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was diverse but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for *E2 – A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944–90* than for *E1 – The World in Crisis, 1879–1941*

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis. The paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. Candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means and this approach does not, in itself, prevent access to the highest levels. However, in some cases, judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were either only partially stated or implicit. Consequently, candidates should be aware that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle Questions 3 and 4 and produced a catch-all commentary on the stipulated time period, with obvious repercussions. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those on the 1879–1941 option – showed some impressive study of international relations and Cold war history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

When attempting the Section (B) questions, a small number of candidates engaged more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 7, although it was still a small minority. The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses had a sharp focus on the European alliance systems and the extent to which they destabilised great power relations.

High scoring responses considered a range of developments/issues, such as: (1) the alliance systems linked 'peripheral' crises directly to the European powers; (2) the alliance systems created two rival power blocs and encouraged military planning and the arms race (3); the alliances were defensive rather than offensive; (4) they stabilised great power relations by preventing war until 1914.

Weaker responses tended to: (1) offer very little on the European alliance systems, or struggle to focus on specific events from 1879 to 1914; (2) produce narratives with weak links to some of the alliances, but no real consideration of the extent to which they destabilised great power relations; (3) focus only on the crisis of 1914 and neglect much of the earlier period contained in the question.

Pian convention -> stabilised - two groups

~~Destabilised~~

Criteria 1 -> Dual Empire Alliance stabilised
in central Europe's relations

Criteria 2 -> Entente cordiale + Anglo Russian
alliance stabilised Britain, France
and Russia

~~Criteria 3 -> Treaty of London + Reinforce
Treaty.~~

It is the notion of this essay that one to
consider the European alliances between
1879 and 1914 as destabilising relations
would be oversimplifying what in truth
stabilised relations. In order to

Between 1879 and 1914 Europe had
gradually transformed from

It is the notion of this essay to
discuss how between the years 1879 to
1914 Europe's relations here in fact
stabilised by the alliances. It is ~~the~~
mean the criteria of this essay to
evaluate how in turn the Dual and
Triple Alliance stabilised across Europe,
the entente cordial and ^{French} Anglo ^{Russian} French
entente brought together countries ~~by~~
bound by 1000 years of intimate
contact and finally how the kindred
treaty stabilised briefly a local conflict.

It is mean my first criteria to evaluate
the stabilising effects of the Dual and
Triple Alliance. Formed in 1879 the Dual
Alliance consisted of Germany and Austria-
Hungary. The neighbouring pair here
brought together when Germany had
imposed a tariff on Russian grain
and consequently angered them. Austria-
Hungary and Germany had competing
Balkan interests with Russia and thus

had a similar aim to form an alliance in doing so, ~~both~~ Germany now had control over Austrian foreign policy

and so could stabilise its affairs in order to not provoke an unnecessary war. The alliance was to last 5 years and meant that ~~Austria and~~ Austria-Hungary and Germany had military backing from ~~Russia~~ even if one of them be attacked by Russia. In creating this alliance Germany was keen to settle fraying embers between Austria-Hungary and Russia because of the newly exposed conflict between Russia and Germany. Thus by forming ~~this~~ this alliance in a defensive light it cannot be considered as destabilising European relations, but in the turn strengthening relations in central Europe. The same can be said ~~too~~ regarding the 1882 Triple Alliance because this alliance acted as a defensive rather than offensive alliance. The inclusion of Italy to the Triple Alliance meant that Germany now acted as the diplomatic leader of

central Europe and stabilised somewhat precarious affairs.

In addition, the entente cordiale

1904
of ~~1904~~ saw the stabilising of 1000 years of intermittent conflict between Britain and France. The pair decided to form a defensive alliance because of territorial aims in Northern Africa, with the French moving to control Morocco and the British with imperialist desires in ~~the~~ Egypt. This alliance had to be considered one of the most necessary because of long standing issues between the two countries concerning imperialist aims. In this sense it is clear that despite ~~the~~ this alliance appearing to act as an opposing alliance, its intentions ~~should~~ could be interpreted based on colonial desires because of its lack of offensive terms. Furthermore, the Franco-Prussian alliance of 1894 saw the stabilisation of two vulnerable countries. Due to the fact that ~~the~~ France had been

left isolated since the Franco-Prussian war they began to invest in Russian infrastructure in 1888. In a similar situation, Russia had been left vulnerable by Germany not reinstating

the ~~Russo~~ Reinsurance Treaty that prevented a German and Russian conflict. In order to stabilise Franco-German and Russian relations in central Europe the ~~two~~ alliance ensured their backing and removed them from a somewhat destabilised situation.

~~This alliance stabilised~~

Upon analysis, it is mainly this essay's contention that the stabilisation of Europe meant that two superpower alliance networks had formed originally as ~~simple~~ defensive for defensive purposes. In turn it cannot be the agreements made between ~~1871~~ 1879 and 1914 that are responsible for the destabilisation of European relations, it is in fact the short term frame of the Bosnian crisis in 1908 that left an ember of causes such as the alliances without the

alliances countries would not have stabilised their affairs in order to prevent war until the ~~Box~~ annexation of Bosnia. Overall, it is the contention of the essay that despite in the long

term turning a local conflict into a global affair, the alliances should be considered to have stabilised somewhat vulnerable and fractured relations.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response is broadly analytical, and attempts to address the question, but offers limited development in three ways:

- (1) no real counter-argument to the 'stabilising' view is put forward
- (2) the analysis only goes up to 1904
- (3) it focuses on relations within, rather than between, alliances.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

To gain high marks on the Depth Study question you must have sound subject knowledge. Check the specification for the key topics.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses had a good focus on the extent to which the terms of the peace treaties of 1919-23 ignored Wilson's 14 Points and addressed both sides of the argument. At this level, candidates included consideration of developments or issues such as: (1) national self-determination was not applied to Germany, the Balkans or eastern Europe; (2) pursuit of national self-interest e.g. French reparation demands; (3) the imposed nature of the settlement; (4) creation of the League of Nations; (5) dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires.

Weaker responses tended to be (1) narratives about some or all of the 1919-23 peace treaties with few or no links to the role played by the 14 Points in their formulation; (2) answers with restricted range and depth because only one or two of the 14 Points were discussed.

Wilson's 14 points laid out what Wilson and his United States wanted to achieve from after the destruction of World War I. The Treaty ~~which~~ were put in place in order to not necessarily achieve the 14 points, ~~was~~ but nonetheless, they wanted to achieve stability after the war. The main peace ~~and~~ Paris Treaty that should be discussed is the Treaty of Versailles ~~as well as~~ dealing with Germany. However, the treaty of ~~Trianon~~ Neuilly with Bulgaria in 1919, St Germain with Austria also in 1919, Trianon with Hungary in 1920, Sevres with Turkey in 1920 ~~also and~~ ~~partly~~ the revised treaty ~~on~~ with Turkey in Lausanne in 1923. In order to come to a conclusion on whether, President Wilson's points were ignored, we must discuss to what extent these treaties covered the points.

Arguably one of the main points of Wilson's was the aim of a general disarmament to a point of coherence with national security. The ~~Treaty~~ ~~and~~ The Treaty of Versailles did lean to this idea through its strict military obligations of which Germany were to comply with. The German army was to be reduced to 100,000 members with a ban on conscriptions, ~~and~~ as well as other significant cutbacks such as no tanks or aircraft and a limit of

6 battleships. This clearly shows attempts at disarmament, complying with one of the 14 points. As well as this there were other treaties also all included arms reduction policy for the nations involved.

A second key point of Wilson was the final point on his list which aimed to set up a ~~open~~ ~~open~~ union of nations.

Undoubtedly this was created as shown by the League of Nations. However the Treaty of Versailles specifically states that Germany could not be admitted to the League of Nations until they were shown to be a peace loving country. This therefore suggests that the point of a union of all nations, with being the key word, was not achieved through the Paris treaties most notably the Treaty of Versailles.

However, this was not the only factor that was not achieved.

A further point Wilson wished to pursue was the ~~free~~ ~~navigation~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~seas~~. Although the Treaty of Sèvres agreed ~~realignment~~ realignment of Turkey's frontiers and the opening up of the Dardanelles.

Initially this point was achieved at the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920, however this changed in 1923. A rebel group in Turkey led by Kemal Atatürk (Mustapha Kemal) opposed the acceptance and overthrow their government, this led to the Treaty of Sèvres being revised in the form of the Treaty of Lausanne. Sovereignty of which had been given to Greece was returned to Turkish control. Furthermore the Dardanelles, the straits which led to Black sea, were also returned to Turkish control. Therefore the Treaty of Lausanne suggests

that the statement is true and the Paris Peace treaties did ignore the 14 points of Wilson's.

However, the second of Wilson's points aimed for free navigation of the sea and arguably, but the Dardanelles this was included in the Paris Peace Treaty, through the rearranging of frontiers. Germany lost land to Poland in the form of the port Danzig, which became the free port Gdansk. This offered Poland access to the sea as well as other European countries who were awarded ports in some form or another. It was not just the second of Wilson's points that was achieved through the Paris Peace Treaty. Russia had its losses restored, as well as Poland becoming its own and independent state. Italy's frontiers were pushed north after the Treaty of St. Germain by taking land away from Austria. This covered the point of "Italy's frontiers to be extended coherent with national identity."

Nonetheless there was still other Wilson's points of which got disregarded. Austria-Hungary to be given allowed Autonomous development, never occurred. This was for two reasons, one, the treaties of Trianon and St. Germain repeated banned the coalition of Austria and Hungary as one large state. Secondly, Austria and Hungary both lost considerable amounts of their population, Austria lost the regions of Bohemia and Moravia, whereas Hungary lost Transylvania and other regions which led to them losing effectively two thirds of their population. This in suggests that both the Treaty of Trianon

and the Treaty of St. Germain, disregarded, in Wilson's fourteen points, therefore simplifying the statement is correct.

Ultimately, though we can see that many of Wilson's fourteen points were achieved and considered, particularly in the form of Disarmament and the League of Nations bear its discussions of the defeated powers, which are arguably the two most important points. Therefore I conclude that although it is the Paris peace treaties did not achieve all of Wilson's 14 points, the statement 'The peace treaties of 1919-1923 largely ignored President Wilson's fourteen points' is false.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a solid Level 4 answer by offering detailed knowledge within a focused analytical structure. Care has been taken to

- (1) focus on the role played by Wilson's 14 Points and
- (2) develop the argument across several treaties.

Consequently the response has good range and depth.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses had a confident grasp of the extent of Soviet commitment to peaceful coexistence in the years 1954–62 and offered good range and depth. At the higher levels, a range of relevant developments were considered (e.g. Austrian independence, the 'Geneva spirit' and summit diplomacy, reduction in Soviet conventional forces, Soviet progress in the nuclear arms race, the Hungarian Rising of 1956 and Soviet policy over Germany and Cuba) and a judgement was reached.

Weaker responses tended to be (1) answers with no real development on the extent of Soviet commitment to peaceful coexistence (1954–62) – typically weak narratives or focused but largely unsupported responses; (2) answers which offered a limited account of one or two relevant developments such as Austrian independence (1955) or the Cuban missile crisis (1962).

I would disagree with the statement that 'the Soviet Union was seriously committed to peaceful coexistence with the US in the years 1954–62'. Certainly after the death of Stalin in 1953 superpower relations seemed to improve going into 1954. This 'thaw' was epitomised by 'spirit of Geneva' and summit diplomacy. However, the Soviet Union was never fully committed to any notion of 'ideological peaceful coexistence'. Moreover, the Soviet Union did not place much faith in America's commitment to 'peaceful coexistence' which made them take a hard-line stance.

The competing world views championed by the Soviet Union made confrontation with the US inevitable and made 'peaceful coexistence' highly problematic. Khrushchev certainly did not accept any notion of 'ideological peaceful coexistence' as he believed that "victory will inevitably be ours" in the battle between capitalism and communism. As he stated "peaceful coexistence between different systems of government ^{is} possible but peaceful coexistence between

tactics throughout this period was to; wait, avoid a nuclear war, take advantage of any favourable situation, and wait for the fall of capitalism due to an "inevitable" economic slump. Therefore it is clearly evident that the Soviet Union was not 'sincerely committed to peaceful coexistence with the US' as they continued to believe that their relationship would be based on ~~aggression~~ rather than coexistence.

These attitudes dominated Cold War politics in the period of 1954-62. The continuing nuclear arms race heightened tensions as each side tried to gain technological superiority with the development of ICBMs and hydrogen bombs. Also, as Britain and France abandoned their imperialist roles in Africa, the Middle East and Asia, Khrushchev was keen to take advantage of these nations as he believed that they would turn to communism after decades of capitalist exploit. In Europe, the Soviet Union's lack of desire to follow 'peaceful coexistence' centred around the status of Berlin. Khrushchev's attempts to close the city to the west and stem the exodus from East Germany provoked strong US resistance. We know that at the height of tensions Kennedy even considered a 'first strike' against Soviet targets. As a tank hand-off between the US and Soviet Union took place at Checkpoint Charlie, the Berlin Wall was built - something that would become a symbol of ever

enduring Cold War tensions. In such an atmosphere suspicion was heightened - we know that the 1955 US 'open skies' proposal was turned away by Khrushchev as a plot to "look inside our bedrooms". ~~Therefore it is true that this period continued to be dominated~~
Also in 1962, as the Cuban Missile Crisis occurred just off the coast of Cuba, the Soviet Union were willing to bring the world to the brink of nuclear oblivion - certainly not a promotion of 'peaceful coexistence'. Therefore it is true that this period continued to be dominated by confrontational tactics by the Soviet Union.

However, to a certain degree, we know that the Soviet Union saw the advantages of promoting 'peaceful coexistence with the US' now that both sides possessed nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union did act as a moderating influence as they ~~brokered a peace agreement to~~ ~~bro~~ did not respond to Mao's requests for nuclear weapons throughout the 1950s - as they believed that Mao² would actually use them in the far East which would ultimately destabilise US-Soviet relations. Also, when the US began covert operations in Guatemala in 1954, ~~the Soviet Union~~ as they supported coup's against the 'left wing' regime, the Soviet Union did not respond with force. The Soviet Union also reduce the size of the Red Army from 5.8 million men to 3.7 and

began to have friendlier relations with Greece. They also supported 'peaceful coexistence' as they recognised the status of West Germany and reconciled border disputes with Turkey. Clearly, the ever-present threat of a nuclear war was a powerful motive for the Soviet Union promote policies of 'peaceful coexistence'. As Khrushchev stated, "There are only two ways - either peaceful coexistence or the most destructive ~~To a certain extent, too, since~~ ^{war} ~~way~~ in history. There is no third way", this was a motive behind promoting coexistence with the US.

To a certain extent, too, summit diplomacy is evidence of the Soviet Union showing commitment to 'peaceful coexistence'. In 1955, the 'Big Four' attended the Geneva Summit, significant as it was the first time the Soviet Union and the US had met since Potsdam in 1945. Also Khrushchev visited Camp David in 1959 - this is evidence that the two superpowers attempted to break down some Cold War barriers. This was also the case as on both sides accepted a neutral Austria through the Austrian Treaty of 1955, and there was also an increase in scientific exchanges between the US and the Soviet Union. Anthony Eden, the British Prime Minister, summed up the 'Spirit of Geneva' as he stated that "no country attending wanted war and each understood why". But I would only

See no significance of summit diplomacy as only working to a certain extent, as the two sides were met in the face of controversial issues, summit diplomacy quickly broke down. This was the case at the 1960 U2 spy plane incident, as a spy plane was shot down over the Soviet Union. Talks at Vienna between Kennedy and Khrushchev soon broke down as they were met with controversial issues. To some extent this was seen at the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis as both sides were not willing to talk through the issue but instead were willing to bring the world to the brink of nuclear annihilation. Clearly the success of summit diplomacy can only be to a certain extent as the Soviet Union was only willing to show its 'commitment to peaceful coexistence' when it was concentrating on non-controversial issues with the US. However, when that was not the case, we know that the Soviet Union reverted back to its lack of commitment to pursuing peaceful coexistence.

In conclusion, I would disagree with the statement that 'the Soviet Union was seriously committed to peaceful coexistence' as I do not believe this to be the case and it was wrong to assume that it was. Issues such as the status of Berlin, the spiralling nuclear arms race, ideological differences and both sides' lack of belief in each others' commitment to 'peaceful coexistence' allowed for both sides to continue

to take a confrontational stance against their opponent. Clearly the biggest ~~part~~^{piece} of evidence to show that the Soviet Union was not committed to 'peaceful coexistence' was the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. However, I do not believe that 'peaceful coexistence' was a meaningless concept, especially not when both sides now had nuclear weapons. But ultimately the issues which occurred in the 1954-62 period made both sides take an increased confrontational stance as the period was dominated by competing objectives and considerable suspicion. Clearly the Soviet Union was never really committed to any notion of 'peaceful coexistence' with the US in the years 1954-62'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This strong Level 5 response offers a precisely focused analysis of the extent to which the Soviet Union was 'seriously committed' to peaceful coexistence with the US in the years 1954-62. Strong range and depth is evident across the period being considered. The arguments deployed are reinforced with detailed support throughout and the essay is rounded off with a nuanced judgement in the conclusion.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses analysed (with decent range and depth) the reasons why Sino-Soviet relations changed from alliance to confrontation in the 1960s. High scoring answers tended to focus on relevant causal factors such as ideological differences, the personal rivalries of the leaders, and competing national interests. They also offered convincing development across the 1960s. Weaker responses tended to (1) offer little development on reasons for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations during the 1960s – typically weak narratives or focused but largely unsupported responses; (2) drift from the time frame by concentrating on Sino-Soviet relations in the years 1949-59 or neglecting the Brezhnev period (1964-69); (3) mix up Sino-Soviet relations under Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev.

Sino-Soviet relations deteriorated dramatically in the 1960's as obvious allies the two signed a treaty in order to unite the two communist powers, however personally I believe the biggest cause of the split to be down to a difference in interpretation of communism.

To begin with the alliance was mutually beneficial Mao's China received soviet expertise and aid and the soviet union gained a powerful deterrent against any attack on them by the USA. Mao wanted a united China, which included Taiwan. Taiwan was occupied by the defeated US backed forces so any conflict against Taiwan could trigger a nuclear war as the US signed a treaty swearing to protect them. This resulted in the beginning of a rift between Sino-Soviet relations as Mao believed that the USSR was becoming soft on the USA and called Khrushchev a 'revisionist'.

Khrushchev stalled in sharing Soviet nuclear secrets with China as he regarded Mao as unpredictable, this aura of

Secrecy resulted in Mao becoming more and more frustrated with the USSR and he began to believe that the USSR's adaptation of Communism was 'phony'. Extensive propaganda was distributed to make a meal over the fact that Chinese explorers had climbed Everest quite than Soviet ones.

After the success of the Korean war, essentially Chinese troops fought for the USSR, as they could directly be involved against fighting US troops. The USSR agreed a huge loan and sent experts to start the first of China's five year plans, there was resulting in a huge economic boom in China. As a result of this Mao now wanted to become the face of the communist world, as he was increasingly unhappy about the USSR and its consolidation with the West.

It can be argued that Khrushchev and Mao clashed heads as previously Mao nearly worshiped Stalin, but as China was not in the possession of nuclear weapons and not in the same position as the USSR it is much easier for Mao to criticise how the USSR played ball with the USA. Personally I would say that Mao was an idealist a very old style Marxist when compared to Khrushchev who understood the importance of a relationship with the West in order

to avoid confrontation that could lead to nuclear war. The relationships became confrontational because Khrushchev had accepted there were other roads to socialism unlike as Mao had not. Khrushchev began to see Mao as unpredictable and was aware that his actions in Taiwan, where he repeatedly shelled the Island could result in US nuclear retaliation so Sino-Soviet relations mainly broke down due to the divergence in perception of what such a large communist power like the USSR was capable of achieving.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response illustrates three typical weaknesses of low-scoring essays:

- (1) it relies heavily on general statements about Sino-Soviet relations rather than relevant detailed analysis
- (2) it tends to focus on the 1950s rather than the time frame stated in the question (the 1960s)
- (3) it is rather short for a c.50 minute answer.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were firmly focused on the extent to which the need for better quality great power commitment accounted for the failure of the League of Nations. This was, of course, linked to the other factors raised in the sources.

Higher scoring responses also offered some balance in examining the debate and were likely to recognise the interaction of factors. For instance, the absence of the USA highlighted and shaped the limited Anglo-French commitment to the League.

Low scoring responses tended to (1) generalise about the failure of the League of Nations without offering specific development on the need for 'better quality ... Great Power commitment'; (2) simply describe the evidence of failure presented in the extracts, or not integrate information from the sources with own knowledge.

How far do you agree with that the League of Nations failed in the inter-war period because it needed a "better quality of Great Power commitment than was forthcoming?"

The League of Nations set up in 1919, was a failed to act as a world organisation for peace. The "Great Power commitment" (Source 1) will be interpreted as the Great Powers in the League, notably Britain and France. As a package, the sources argue strongly for lack of commitment of the Great Powers and the absence of powers such as the USA and Russia for causing the failure of the League in the interwar years. Sources 1 and 3 argue that the nations of the Great Powers, who were "failed to live up to their League obligations" (Source 1) led to the failure of the League. Sources 2 and 3 argue that the absence of key powers, such as "the absence of the United States" (Source 2) led to the failure of the League. Source 3 also suggests that economic circumstances led to the failure of the League.

especially after the First World War.
~~It would be discussing a 4th factor of conditions that~~
~~affects a war.~~ Overall, the economic circumstances
were the most important reason for the failure
of the League, since events such as the
Great Depression meant that the Great Powers
and the USA were less ~~less~~ ~~willing~~ ~~to~~
participate in a league towards aggressors, and
without it the machinations of the Great Powers and
US isolationism would not have been as extreme.

Great Power inaction was a key factor in
the failure of the League of Nations, leading
to "collective security" ~~not~~ (source 1) not being
"properly applied when it most needed to be" (source
1) This is corroborated by source 3, which
states how the League "was not strong enough
to ~~provide peace across the globe~~" ~~and due to~~
the League was not able to function as a result of
members "fatally divided in their views",
therefore not being able to achieve collective
security. They focused on their national interests,
supported by how the League's "engine was in
practise powered from Europe" (source 3),
~~and~~ strengthened by source 1, which states
that their "narrow national interests"

dictated the course of the League of Nations. For example, in the Manchurian Crisis (1931-33), no economic sanction or military action was taken against Japan. This was largely due to their national self-interest, since they feared that Japan would attack their colonies, such as ~~the~~ Singapore for Britain & ~~the~~ Indo-China for France, and therefore, did not want to aggravate her. Furthermore, Britain had felt sympathy for Japan and in 1927, China had boycotted British goods and in 1931, China boycotted Japanese goods. Also, ~~Britain~~ China made up only 2.5% of British exports, and so she did not feel that China was worth protecting. Therefore due to the lack of great power commitment and their focus on national interests, over Manchuria "sanctions were not considered seriously" (Source 1). * In addition, they were "far from divided in their views" (Source 3), with Britain they "failed to live up to their League obligations" (Source 1), since for example they had contradictory ideas on ^{an international} peacekeeping force. France suggested this in 1924 in the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the 1924-25 Geneva Protocol,

but Britain vetoed this initiative, ~~thus~~ since she did not want to have to be dragged into unnecessary war, which shows her lack of "commitment" (Source 1). Therefore, a coalition against aggressors could not be taken, due to a combination of ~~the~~ Anglo-French divisions and lack of commitment. Overall, the lack of Great Power commitment ~~meant that~~ and their focus on national interests instead, meant that they were not willing to stand up to aggressors and lead the other members to fight for peace. However, the economic circumstances were more important, as it fueled this national interest, since they ~~did not~~ were not economically strong enough to stand up to aggressors and risk war, and wanted to focus on domestic matters.

The ^{absence} ~~presence~~ of key powers was a significant factor in the failure of the League, notably the USA. This meant that the "very states which should have been leading it (the League)" (Source 1), ^{such as} ~~including~~ increasingly Britain and France, did not, or were less willing to, due to the lack of international

power. In the League, due to the absence of these powers, USA was actually also a power which "should have been leading it" (Source 1) due to Wilson chairing the setup of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and if they joined they would have "transformed European affairs" (Source 2). The USA after the First World War dominated foreign markets, and their trade prospered as they supplied arms, food and raw materials to countries at war. Therefore, the addition of the economic power would have increased the ability of the League to take action against aggressors. Furthermore, Russia was not allowed until 1934 either, and with the Russia and the USA's military power, firm military action could have been taken against aggressors, which would have changed the outcome of the actions of the League. The absence of the League of Germany also led to the failure of the League, since they ended up "ruining self-righteously" (Source 2), and many ^{20s} began associating the League with the

Treaty of Versailles, which they hated, leading to Germans feeling bitter towards it, ^{and the west} which in the future did contribute to the popularity of extremism, leading to Germany leaving the League and taking ^{an} aggressive stance. Overall, the absence of key powers in the League, such as the USA, Russia and Germany, led to a lack of authority, military ~~power~~ ^{power} and economic ~~power~~ ^{power} in the League, and also heightened German bitterness towards the West, which eventually ~~made~~ led to aggressive foreign policy. However, economic circumstances were more significant, since it fuelled US isolationism, since she suffered ~~the~~ ^{a lot} ~~great~~ with many banks closing and wanted to focus on domestic matters, and it also heightened this German extremism due to a severe reduction in the living standards and unemployment reaching 6 million. ~~Therefore,~~ ~~it~~ ~~also~~ led to the feeling of lack of Great Power commitment, since if they could not themselves stand up to aggressors, so although the absence of key powers was

more important than the lack of Great Power commitment, the economic circumstances were most significant.

The economic circumstances, especially after the First World War and Great Depression, led most significantly to the failures of the League, and this "level of political and economic turbulence was bound to ^{to} undermine the League's effectiveness" (Source 3). The First World War destroyed the Allies' economies, with Britain spending \$34 billion on the war, and funding ^{2/3 of} war expenditure from taxation. France also suffered ^{economically} losing 2 million hectares of land and having to spend $\frac{1}{3}$ of war expenditure from taxation. This meant that the lack of commitment in the League by the Great Powers was increased, severely, as they were not economically ^{strong} enough to face aggressors and fight wars. ~~It also~~ ^{also} strengthened ~~us~~ ^{isolation}. The Great Depression On top of this, which led to unemployment in Britain reaching 3 million,

Further intensified this, US isolationism was strengthened by the Great Depression as unemployment reached 13 million, numerous banks collapsed and she was needed to focus on domestic matters rather than global. ~~After the first world war, there were also~~ 25 ~~isolationist~~ ^{agreements} across the country, which also led to her ~~isolationism~~ isolationism. Lastly, economic circumstances fuelled extremism, such as in Japan, Germany and Italy. ~~After~~ ^{For example,} the Wall Street crash in October 1929, Japan's heavy industries decreased by 50%, and her silk industry, which was her biggest one, suffered a lot. Therefore, it led to the increase in power of army officers in the government, leading to them taking more aggressive action, such as in the Mukden Crisis.

In Germany it led to the rise of Hitler as ^{the} standards fell, and hyperinflation hit the country in 1923. ^{Therefore,} ~~therefore,~~ ^{the} ~~economic~~ ^{circumstances} largely caused the failure of the League in the interwar years, and was more significant than the lack of commitment of the Great Powers, since it increased their ~~inaction~~ ^{inaction}.

severely, as well as increasing US isolationism and increasing the extremism which the League had to face to protect peace.

To conclude, the League of Nations failed ~~in the~~ the inter-war period due to a number of factors. However, it was not largely due to the lack of commitment of the Great Powers, Britain and France, but the economic circumstances which faced the world at the time, ^{which} meant the insignificance of Great Power inaction, USA isolation and the increased extremism. Therefore overall, economic circumstances was the most important.

*, which meant that their 'economic strength and political dominance' (Source 3) was weakened.

*² This led to aggressive German and Italian the reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1937.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This high Level 4 response integrates source material and the candidate's own knowledge to good effect. The key interpretations in the sources are identified, examined and extended (with own knowledge) to develop the argument regarding the failure of the League of Nations. The conclusion also makes a clear judgement about the relative importance of the lack of Great Power commitment.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When planning your answer, read through the sources carefully and list all the support and challenge points you can. This will help you to cross reference effectively in your essay.

Question 6

On Question 6, stronger responses identified and developed arguments for and against the proposition from the sources, and considered to what extent Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union was based on ideological considerations. Higher scoring responses weighed this against other motives such as to secure economic resources, to compel Britain to negotiate a peace deal and encourage Japanese expansionism in the Far East to distract the USA from Europe, integrating relevant own knowledge.

Weaker responses were likely to: (1) adopt a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else include little or no own knowledge in support of their argument; (2) uncritically accept the ideological viewpoint and fail to consider properly the other arguments (e.g. the economic and strategic advantages of defeating the USSR) set out in the sources (3) provide narrative accounts of the lead-up to the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union.

~~The German~~ Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 - known as 'Operation Barbarossa' - can be explained by the "Nazi political ideology" (S4), which "had fixed Jews and communists as their ultimate enemies" (S4), as stipulated by Source 4. This clearly identifies Hitler's reasoning for the attack as being ideological differences, yet the source also highlights his need to "seize ~~the~~ resources" (S4). This resonates with the argument in Source 5, as it can be considered "a way of securing complete mastery of Europe." Nonetheless, the sources indicate that Operation Barbarossa was to act as "a springboard" (S5) which would "hasten peace with Britain" (S6). Hence, ~~it is clear that~~ the main reasoning behind the German invasion of USSR can be ~~seen~~ considered Hitler's desire to defeat Britain, alongside the opportunity present to fulfil his ideological "fantasy" (S4).

Source 4 highlights that ideology was the driving force behind the decision to invade USSR in 1941, as "Jewish Bolshevism" was regarded as one of Germany's "ultimate enemies". Hitler's desire to challenge communism and eradicate ~~from~~ the Jewish was made clear in his book, *Mein Kampf*, which highlighted

his ardent desire to tackle these ~~two~~ ^{two} "evils". Hitler waged war "against communism and its alleged Jewish allies" since 1933,

indicating that this was one of his long-term aims, which acted as a ~~base~~ basis of the 1941 attack on Russia. This decision ^{can}, however, ~~can~~ be seen as a congregation of factors, as source 4 indicates that the USSR invasion was part of the Nazi "geo-political dreams" as it allowed them "to seize the resources of the USSR". This indicates that economy had a role to play in determining ~~the~~ whether Germany was to ~~invade~~ invade the Soviet Union. Germany had been reliant on USSR for resources; in 1942, USSR provided Germany with 3.5 billion tonnes of grain, as well as 1M tonnes of oil. This shows that the ~~increased~~ dependency on the Soviets may have pushed Hitler into invading USSR in 1941, as he ~~was~~ wanted to make Germany great and independent. Nonetheless, his aims for Germany are encompassed in his ideology, thus ideology was a ~~more~~ ^{more important} ~~factor~~ factor, whereas economic needs were an underlying reason for invading the Soviet Union. Regardless of this, Hitler wanted "to avoid a two-front war" (56), suggesting that ideology and economic needs ~~were~~ ^{may not} have been enough to push Hitler into invading USSR. Hence, it is clear that ~~in~~ in 1941, Hitler was provided with ~~the~~ ^{the} opportunity to fulfil his ideological "dreams" (54) as France ~~is~~ was defeated in 1940 and Britain was weakened. Hitler believed that "the Soviets ... would come on [Britain's] side" ⁽¹⁶⁾, thus

posing a huge threat on ~~the~~ Germany. ~~Since the~~ Arguably, in a desire to defeat Britain in order to "harshen peace" (S6), Hitler invaded the USSR, as ~~the~~ the defeat of the Soviets would put them

in a favorable position which would also deter the USA from entering ^{the year}. Hence, it is clear that ~~although~~ ideology was important in determining whether Germany invaded USSR in 1941. ~~Other~~ ^{however, it was not the basis of the invasion} factors such as ~~the~~ defeating Britain and the opportunity provided by the events of the war is what ultimately pushed Hitler into invading the Soviet Union in 1941.

In Source 2, Orey highlights that Hitler's "fantastic ambitions" to complete a "revolutionary war ... against communism" (S5) was "behind" all other reasons for invading USSR. This indicates that Hitler's desire to fulfill his aims of "crush[ing] the home of Bolshevism" (S6) was ~~the~~ ^{acted} as a basis for Operation Barbarossa. This ~~indicates~~ ^{suggests} that Hitler's 'alliance' ~~with~~ USSR from 1939 was ~~not~~ ^{miniscule} ~~important~~ ~~not~~, as he breached the agreement of benevolent neutrality. Hence, it can be argued that Hitler had always wanted to "turn east" towards Russia, as indicated by Mein Kampf, ~~so~~ therefore his long-term ~~for~~ ideology is what led to the invasion of USSR in 1941.

Nonetheless, we must acknowledge that ~~the~~ the vast "Soviet raw materials, oil and foodstuffs" ^(S5) alongside other military resources acted as a threat ~~to~~ towards Germany during the war, as the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 was weak, ~~and~~

Therefore the Soviets were ~~inclined~~ inclined to aid Britain, as clearly highlighted by Source 6. This indicates that the need to defeat "the British Empire" (S) was ~~great~~ ^{grand}, hence the ~~French defeat of 1940 and the USSR~~. Arguably, the defeat of the

French in 1940, as well as having the element of surprise due to the Nazi-Soviet Pact, ~~but what caused~~ acted as the basis of Hitler's ~~reasons of~~ caused Hitler to believe that he could defeat the USSR in a short period of time. Considering that the USSR "crept stealthily closer to central Europe" (S), ~~Stalin's expansionism~~ Germany had a reason to feel threatened. This corroborates the idea that the grand manpower of ^{the} USSR pushed Hitler into believing that he had to defeat the Soviets in order to "hasten peace with Britain" (S). Hence, it is clear that ~~despite~~ although Hitler's ideology provided him with a goal which would only be achieved by invading the USSR, his decision cannot be considered to be based purely on ideological considerations, as ~~the~~ defeating Britain became a priority and the opportunity was provided to him by the defeat of France, and ~~the~~ by the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 which provided Germany with the element of surprise in the attack.

Unlike sources 4 and 5, Source 6 stresses the grand importance of Hitler's determination to "defeat... the British" (S). Hitler believed that the USSR was inclined to aiding the Allies, due to their war experience, ~~and their~~ ~~as well as due to~~ but also because the West was "resource-rich" (S). Thus

indicates that although "~~crushing~~ 'crush[ing]' the house of the 'Jewish Bolshevism' ^(SS) would be a ~~grand~~ ~~but~~ great fulfillment of the Nazi ideology, it couldn't have acted as the basis of ~~the~~ Operation Barbarossa. Considering

that Soviet encroachments also created 'Japanese worries' (S) Hitler was ~~also~~ ^{further} encouraged to invade the USSR, due to the alliance between Japan and Germany. Nonetheless, this commitment was overshadowed by the importance of deterring the USA from entering the war. Hitler believed that if the USSR was defeated, "Britain's last hope would be ~~shattered~~ shattered", as he clearly stated in one of his speeches. If the Nazis took control of Moscow, the USA would have been less inclined to enter the war in the aid of Britain. ~~due~~ ^{due} to vast military power possessed by the Soviets, which would have been in Nazi control, had ~~the~~ ^{the} operation been successful. This would have enabled Germany to defeat Britain, thus indicating ~~the~~ Operation Barbarossa was to act as "a springboard" against not only "Jewish - Bolshevism" (S) but also Britain and "perhaps the ~~USA~~ United States" (SS). This therefore suggests that Hitler's decision to invade the USSR in June 1941 was not purely based on ideological considerations, as the defeat of Britain ~~was~~ ~~that~~ can be considered Hitler's primary drive, which led him to ~~the~~ attack the USSR.

Hence, it is clear that although Hitler's ideology regarding communism did play a great role in ~~the~~ making Germany 'turn east' towards Russia, the desire to defeat Britain and deter USA from joining the war was what acted as the basis of his decision-making in pushing forward Operation Barbarossa. Considering that the political climate at the ~~time~~ ^{time}

was imbued with a boost of German morale due to the defeat of France, the desire to ~~defeat~~ defeat Britain was further exacerbated, this opportunism ~~and~~ also played a great ^{role} in the ~~reason~~ reasoning behind Operation Barbarossa. Overall, ~~the~~ ~~desire~~ opportunism and the desire to defeat Britain is what acted as the basis of the invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Here, the candidate has produced a borderline Level 3/4 answer by taking the main interpretations from the sources and integrating a reasonable amount of own knowledge to develop the argument. There is scope here to offer more of both, and to cross reference the sources in a more systematic way, in order to achieve a secure Level 4.

Question 7

On Question 7, stronger responses demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy and assessed the source arguments confidently. Candidates' own knowledge was often detailed and wide-ranging in higher scoring answers, but this was not a definite requirement. More importantly, own knowledge was tied firmly to addressing the debate within the sources (Truman's and Stalin's attitudes and actions, Soviet security needs/expansionism, superpower misjudgements). Weaker responses tended to offer (1) limited coverage of the role of Truman's actions and/or the other factors covered in the sources; (2) a memorised 'perspectives' response (covering the orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interpretations of the onset of the Cold War) which was inadequately linked to the sources provided.

Plan

+7 Truman doctrine

+7 Marshall plan

Soviet responsible

- Iran crisis 45

- Berlin crisis/Blockade 48-9

↓ (west berlin truman
requiring
vigilant treatment)
lead to

- Korean war 50-55

- Stalin's Speech 57

The development of the cold war is ~~responsible for~~ held by factors such as USSR ~~aggression~~ aggression, ideological differences, not only the actions of President Truman.

The responsibility of the development of the cold war lies with factors such as USSR aggression and ideological differences as well as USSR USA's fault (Truman). These factors will be expanded on in this essay alongside the sources.

Source 7 goes far to blame the development of the cold war on President Truman which is a revisionist school of thought. Ferrell states that the Truman doctrine was focused on the 'need to oppose the Soviet Union' so a large appropriation for Greece and Turkey could be achieved. After the second world war as the USSR were liberating countries from the Nazi control, they kept troops in ~~that~~ countries such as Austria, Hungary and Poland. They took reparations directly from countries in the form of dismantling factories in Eastern Europe and rebuilding them in the USSR during 1945. This ~~expressed~~ caused legitimate concern for the USA and Britain as they feared Eastern European countries would be left economically dependent on the USSR. The Marshall plan was therefore created in 1945 1947 to give aid to countries and help them resist communism. Ferrell fails to state the Soviet Union's actions in Europe which results in the Truman doctrine

and Marshall Plan being created. Source 8 agrees that the USA had fears over the USSR influencing Greece ^{potentially} but it would create a Soviet naval presence in the Med + Mediterranean. It does not ~~criticise~~ ~~criticise~~ ~~criticise~~ Truman for being exaggerative which is why I agree with source 8 more than I do with 37.

Source 9

Source 9 blames developments of the cold war on Stalin and his 'misconceptions' - 'misperceptions'. Stalin was a naive, untrusting and unpredictable character. He ~~was at~~ held blame over the development of the cold war due to the Berlin Crisis of 1948-9. ~~Stalin blocked all access routes into~~ ~~Berlin~~ Stalin blockaded access routes into Berlin in an attempt to get the western powers to unify Berlin or hand over their territories to the USSR. The US flew in supplies by air which Britain soon followed. The US also sent over bombs to Britain including in an attempt to scare the Soviets. Stalin lifted the blockade and admitted its failure. This was significant to the developments of the cold war as it showed the west's attempts in containing and resisting communism succeeded.

Ideological differences were also a cause for the development of the cold war. The USA and USSR have always had conflicting interests and ideologies but put it aside during the second world war as they had to fight common enemy Nazi Germany.

Ultimately, it is too far to state that Truman was primarily responsible for the development of the cold war. ~~The USSR is equally to blame~~ ^{holds} The USSR holds equal blame due to their actions in Berlin and their involvement in the Korean war. In 1950 Stalin agreed to help Kim Il Sung in the Korean war as he ~~was~~ had just made an agreement with communist ~~to~~ china. Both countries were to blame with the developments with ideological differences and personality conflicts also.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response has three major weaknesses. First, the candidate simply extracts some points from the sources but does not really develop or cross-reference them effectively. Second, there is only limited supporting evidence drawn from the candidate's own knowledge (e.g. the section on ideological differences). Third, it is rather short for a c.50 minute answer.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

During the planning stage, after you have identified the key issues raised by the sources, add your own knowledge to these points. That way you'll find it easier to integrate the two elements in the actual essay.

Question 8

On Question 8, stronger responses had a good understanding of the controversy and assessed the source arguments ('people power' in eastern Europe, Soviet economic and technological inferiority, Reagan's hard-line policies and Gorbachev's 'New Thinking'). In some high scoring answers, candidates offered impressively detailed knowledge but this is not a definite requirement. More importantly, own knowledge was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources. Weaker responses tended to be (1) a memorised 'end of Cold war' essay (sketchily surveying the triumphalist, ideationist etc. perspectives) which was inadequately linked to the sources provided; (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach regarding 'dissatisfaction with dictatorship'; (3) a generalised narrative account of the end of the Cold War.

The ending of the cold war in the late 80's was brought about by a combination of complex factors - culminating in the dismantling of the eastern bloc. One factor was the people power and demonstrations. Another was economic and technological factors - built up by Reagan. Lastly the response of Gorbachev also played a role. It can be said that ultimately it was indeed the pressure of people's dissatisfaction that brought about the end of the war.

People power and widespread demonstrations played a key role in the ending of the cold war. In source 10, Zinn writes of how the Berlin wall was "dismantled in the presence of wildly excited citizens" implying the sheer force of protesters forced the hand of the authority. He is perhaps alluding to the confusion of why the wall was actually to come down, arguably the mass of dissatisfaction caused the blurring of the reason of the fall of the wall. Border guards alike were perplexed by the numbers - still technically with order to shoot, they let people freely pass. He goes on to reference "Poland, Hungary, and Hungary" by listing the nations he is explaining how widespread the

dissatisfaction was, it was continent wide. 'Solidarity' in Poland coordinated protests, amplifying the strength whilst the uprisings in Czechoslovakia became known as 'the velvet revolution' due to its peaceful means. This idea is picked up later when we explain the uprisings "took place without a civil war". Sources 11 and 12 corroborate in the view that the dissatisfaction stemmed from the Soviet union failing. Kofefer writes "a corrupt disheartening stagnation set in" whilst source 12 agrees "the Soviet union had ceased to exist" evidence to back these claims up are the sharp rises in suicides and alcoholism within the eastern bloc. Living standards had declined and many houses were cold and damp with no heating or gas. The people of eastern Europe had had enough and eventually ~~the~~ "long suppressed dissatisfaction" would have to "erupt". On the other hand there are some criticisms to this claim. Riots, protests and uprisings had happened before in East Germany, Hungary ¹⁹⁵⁶ and ~~elsewhere~~ ^{elsewhere}. It may have simply been the leaders - Gorbachev's reaction to such protests that made the difference. "he surrendered communist rule" according to source 12 and 13, which ~~emphasises~~ emphasises "all of this took place without a civil war" both the sources imply the response to the protests was more pivotal than to protest themselves. Overall it seems that the long suppressed dissatisfaction did bring

about the end of the cold war. The widespread nature of the protests meant Gorbachev could not have intervened even if he wanted to. Demonstrations on this level had never been seen before. The Helsinki accords had exposed the Soviet Union and the people of the Eastern bloc capitalised on their chance of escape - there was nothing they could stop them.

Gorbachev himself ^{a further} ~~the~~ ~~factor~~ factor with his response, or lack of response, in light of the protests. His 'new doctrine' - rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine allowed eastern european countries the freedom to leave ^{communism} ~~communism~~ if they should so wish. Source 12 writes how he "made the move in ending the arms race" this particularly evident in light of source 11 which explains how Brezhnev had "built up his military". The new era of Soviet rule was taken by Gorbachev, this liberal approach was then exploited by the disgruntled people of eastern Europe. Source 10 and 12 agree that Gorbachev saw the big issue was with the dictators in the Soviet bloc. Source 12 explains how "he introduced multi party rule" for example in Poland. Whilst source 10 understands the "dissatisfaction with dictatorship" a frightening example ^{of this} ~~of this~~ is the brutal overthrow of Ceausescu in Romania - on Christmas day.

Gorbachev allowed the "wildly excited citizens" of Berlin to bring down the wall and made sure it was peaceful - explicitly ordering that force should not be used. Source 12 concludes that "he played a major role", implying that other communist leaders would not have followed the same course - this idea is backed up by Brezhnev and his doctrine of maintaining comms. However there are some key criticisms to the idea. Khrushchev was the driving factor in the end of the cold war. Both sources 10 and 11 agree that arguably Gorbachev's hands were tied - he had no option but to sit back and watch. Source 11 highlights how "production fell off for several oil prices fell" this having a huge impact on the already stagnant Soviet economy. Source 10 also picks up on the ~~idea of the~~ ^{idea of the} "mass demonstrations" illustrating the size and the force, left Gorbachev with little option but to allow them to occur. Perhaps Gorbachev didn't have the muscle or the economy to crush the uprisings - just as previous leaders had done in ~~Poland~~ ^{Czechoslovakia}, Germany and Hungary. In summary it seems unlikely that Gorbachev did the whole in the ending of the cold war but his role cannot be overstated. It seems that his relaxed response and 'sinatra doctrine' may have been adopted through economic necessity rather than choice. To this end it seems that the

"long suppression dissatisfaction" that eroded across the bloc remains the key reason for the end of the cold war. ⊕ He simply did not have the resources to intervene.

Furthermore, another theory is that the economic and technological lead by the US, as intended by Reagan, made the cold war come to an end. ~~But~~ All three sources agree that Reagan's economic superiority exposed the USSR, bringing about its demise in the process. Source 11 comments "dismantling Stagnation" of Soviet economy whilst Source 10 agrees "Reagan's increase in military expenditure" played a role, furthermore Source 12 also concurs that "United States had won the cold war". This triumphalist view is backed up by the evidence of Reagan's 63% military budget increase as well as his relentless pursuit of SDI - Soviets knew they could not compete. In America there were 30 million personal computers compared with just 50,000 in the whole of the Soviet union. basket 2 of the Helsinki accords allowed for more openness of trade and trade, highlighting the deficiencies of Soviet production. Source 11 "increasingly inferior consumer goods" were made in "Poland and Czechoslovakia". Gorbachev understood the arms race could not be maintained but this may simply have been due to the inevitable victory to the Americas. Unemployment rose in the Soviet nations as further shortfalls were exposed.

after Hungary opened its borders to allow free travel to the west. The disparity in life and consumer quality was made clear. Up to 10,000 a day were fleeing through the Hungarian borders in light of the fact of economic announcement reminiscent of the brain drain previously seen in Berlin. However there are of course criticisms of the theory. Economic factors that played a part for decades since fascist times, the leak had got used to conventional housing and suchlike. Moreover it may have been Khrushchev's "major role" to implement glasnost which worked against him, illuminating the superior capitalist systems. Gorbachev's comments of "a common victory" implying the mass of demonstrators brought about the end of the cold war. Economic shortages had plagued the Soviet Union since 1917. It was the people's response to it that forced change. "In response to popular, overwhelming demand" in January, economic and technological shortages did contribute to the demise of the Soviet Union but only as a contributory role. To fuel the 'long suppressed dissatisfaction' sparking the fire of protest, something that spiralled out of Gorbachev's control. Reagan's pressure on Gorbachev did contribute as a contributory factor but only to feed public dissatisfaction. To this end public protest remains the key factor.

In conclusion it remains true that unrelenting protests of eastern Europe ultimately brought down the Soviet Union. Gorbachev's responses to the protests were telling. Perestroika and constitutional reforms were evidence of bowing to the pressure of widespread discontent. His reaction was important due to the reaction of previous Soviet leaders but it has to be considered that widespread and coordinated protests on this scale had not been seen before economic and technological deficiencies of the Soviet Union also were largely yet as a contributory role. The knowledge of the western ideology spurred the pursuit of "freedom and democracy". Yet it remains the sheer scale and size of the widespread protest that brought an end to the cold war. Economy freedom the protests, which grew to a size Gorbachev simply couldn't do anything about. "The Soviet people like Thatcher" to the point that "the long suppressed dissatisfaction erupted" and with it the end of the cold war was achieved.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several strengths. The candidate makes extensive use of the sources provided, together with detailed own knowledge, to assess the relative importance of a range of factors – popular discontent in the Eastern bloc, Soviet economic problems and technological backwardness, and Gorbachev's radically different policies. This integrated and evaluative approach is then rounded off with a clear judgement on popular 'dissatisfaction with dictatorship' in the conclusion.

Paper Summary

The following recommendations are divided into two parts:

In Depth Study question

Candidates must provide more factual details. Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.

Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.

More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.

In order to address the question more effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis not provide a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers which were focused and developed appropriately.

Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.

Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

Associated Historical Controversy question

It is suggested that the students who perform best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off possible areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.

Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.

Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.

Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.

That said, there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.

There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question, prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their arguments.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.