



A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Mark scheme

June 2015

Version 1.0: Final Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Generic Introduction for A2

The A2 History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since a good historian must be able to combine a range of skills and knowledge. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or low Level 2 if some comment is included. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at Level 2 or low Level 3 depending on their synoptic understanding and linkage of ideas. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(b)) and will have access to the higher mark ranges.

To obtain an award of Level 3 or higher, students will need to address the synoptic requirements of A Level. The open-ended essay questions set are, by nature, synoptic and encourage a range of argument. Differentiation between performance at Levels 3, 4, and 5 therefore depends on how a candidate's knowledge and understanding are combined and used to support an argument and the how that argument is communicated.

The mark scheme emphasises features which measure the extent to which a candidate has begun to *'think like a historian'* and show higher order skills. As indicated in the level criteria, students will show their historical understanding by:

- The way the requirements of the question are interpreted
- The quality of the arguments and the range/depth/type of material used in support
- The presentation of the answer (including the level of communication skills)
- The awareness and use of differing historical interpretations
- The degree of independent judgement and conceptual understanding shown

It is expected that A2 students will perform to the highest level possible for them and the requirements for Level 5, which demands the highest level of expertise have therefore been made deliberately challenging in order to identify the most able students.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- Depth and precision in the use of factual information
- Depth and originality in the development of an argument
- The extent of the synoptic links
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- The way the answer is brought together in the conclusion

June 2015

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

HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Question 1

- 01** To what extent was the ideological division between the Soviet Union and the West responsible for the development of the Cold War in the years 1945 to 1956? **[45 marks]**

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed

by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students will need to assess and evaluate the contribution of the ideological division between capitalist USA and communist USSR towards the development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1956.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the ideological division between the USA and the USSR was a highly significant factor in the development of the Cold War:

- the Yalta agreements showed that the ideological divide would be a significant factor in the breakdown of East-West relations. The West pushed for a Declaration on Liberated Europe. This was part of a Western strategy designed to establish capitalist democracies in liberated Europe. The USSR never implemented this agreement because it challenged the concept of a Soviet sphere of influence in Europe based on a one party communist system
- the Kennan Long Telegram clearly defined the aim of the USSR as being one of spreading the influence of communism and ultimately threatening the security of the US democratic system
- containment was a direct response to the perceived threat to democracy as represented through what was seen by the West as being Soviet expansionism into Eastern Europe
- Western European states, especially Britain, put pressure on the USA to protect Western Europe from the threat of expansionist communism. Churchill's Iron Curtain speech underlined this ideological challenge to Western European freedom.

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

- Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe and the breaches of agreements made at Yalta alarmed the USA. The USA already had a perception of Soviet post-war intent before Kennan's Telegram
- the USSR carried out what were perceived as being further expansionist or aggressive actions which intensified the Cold War relationship. The Berlin Blockade is a classic example of this
- the willingness of the USA to globalise containment. This becomes apparent through its intervention in Korea between 1950 and 1953.

Furthermore, students may:

- consider the impact of the USA's nuclear monopoly up to 1949
- consider the narrow diplomatic positions taken by both Truman and Stalin. Under these leaders a Cold War relationship developed rapidly
- suggest that both states introduced policies that were designed to inflame the other. References may be made to Bizonia and a new currency for the Western sector of Germany. The creation of NATO also illustrates the expansion of US interests in Europe

- suggest that the Cold War developed further once the USSR had its own nuclear capability. This triggered a nuclear arms race from 1949 which was well developed by 1956. This may be viewed as being independent of any ideological considerations
- suggest that the USA adopted an aggressive new approach with the introduction of global strategies based on roll back and massive retaliation. These may be presented as separate from any ideological links
- suggest that the Soviet Unions' aggressive crushing of the uprising in Hungary in 1956 and the formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 further exacerbated East-West relations
- suggest that a new phase of co-operation came into existence by 1955. Reference may be made to the Geneva summit of 1955.

In conclusion, students may argue:

- the ideological divide was a significant and driving factor in the development of the Cold War given the profound ideological divide. The Grand Alliance had simply been a marriage of convenience and no longer had a rationale after the end of the war
- some may suggest that the USA had its own post war agenda. This was based upon demonising the USSR in order to enhance the USA's role as the defender of democracy. This would facilitate an expansion of the USA's global strategic and economic power.

Question 2

- 02** To what extent did the USA's commitment to Western Europe affect relations between the USA and the USSR in the years 1958 to 1989? **[45 marks]**

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students will need to assess and evaluate the evidence that supports the premise that Western Europe had a significant influence on East-West relation during the years 1958 to 1989.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that Western Europe did have an influence on East-West relations during the years 1958 to 1989:

- the USSR tried to intimidate the USA into handing over West Berlin by withdrawing and taking the other Western powers with it. This intimidation lasted between 1958 and 1961 and impacted upon both the nuclear arms race and attempts by the USSR to develop a policy of peaceful co-existence in order to neutralise the US strategy of containment. The conflict culminated in the construction of the Berlin Wall and this further heightened the tension between the USA and the USSR. Kennedy made it clear that the USA would protect West Berlin, and by implication the rest of West Germany and the wider democratic states in Western Europe. The USA's reaction to the Wall indicated its commitment to maintain containment and protect Western Europe
- the Cuban Missile Crisis was partly driven by Western Europe. The USSR saw an opportunity to merge West Berlin into a fully united communist East Germany. The USA refused to bargain over Berlin
- the development of Ostpolitik and European détente also impinged on US-Soviet relations. There was pressure on the USA to participate in détente due to the increasingly independent stance taken by Western European states
- Western Europe became the location for missile deployment during the 1980s. The USA placed Cruise missiles in Europe and Thatcher's Britain formed a deeply cooperative relationship with President Reagan, which further linked Western Europe to Cold War Confrontation.

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

- the development of détente may be examined in a wider context and beyond simply US-Western European relations. Détente was a significant shift in US-Soviet relations and not simply a means by which the USA could manage the security of Western Europe. The motivation of both the USA and the USSR underpinning détente could be explored
- the collapse of this apparent co-operation was not directly linked to Western Europe. The immediate causal factor was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan but students may explore the wider range of factors
- the Reagan years also suggest another clear force driving US-Soviet relations. Both Reagan and Gorbachev had their individual agendas and these were not fully driven by a link to Western Europe.

Furthermore, students may also consider:

- the on-going impact of the nuclear arms race
- the development of Europe as a regional power in its own right. This came through the development of the EU and NATO. To some extent the USA was marginalised by these developments.

In conclusion, students may argue:

- Western Europe was a significant factor influencing East-West relations but this diminished over time as the dynamics of the Cold War shifted.

Question 3

- 03** 'The USA's involvement in international affairs in the years 1991 to 2004 was the result of its commitment to the United Nations.'
Assess the validity of this view. **[45 marks]**

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

Generic Mark Scheme for essays at A2

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- L1:** Answers will display a limited understanding of the demands of the question. They may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment but will make few, if any, synoptic links and will have limited accurate and relevant historical support. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be primarily descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain explicit comment but show limited relevant factual support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Historical debate may be described rather than used to illustrate an argument and any synoptic links will be undeveloped. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-15**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, which may, however, lack depth. There will be some synoptic links made between the ideas, arguments and information included although these may not be highly developed. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will be clearly expressed and show reasonable organisation in the presentation of material. **16-25**
- L4:** Answers will show a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be mostly analytical in approach and will show some ability to link ideas/arguments and information and offer some judgement. Answers will show an understanding of different ways of interpreting material and may refer to historical debate. Answers will be well-organised and display good skills of written communication. **26-37**
- L5:** Answers will show a very good understanding of the demands of the question. The ideas, arguments and information included will be wide-ranging, carefully chosen and closely interwoven to produce a sustained and convincing answer with a high level of synopticity. Conceptual depth, independent judgement and a mature historical understanding, informed by a well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate, will be displayed. Answers will be well-structured and fluently written. **38-45**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students will need to assess and evaluate the extent to which the USA's commitment to the United Nations influenced its involvement in international affairs in the years 1991 to 2004.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the USA's commitment to the United Nations influenced its involvement in international affairs:

- the USA supported the UN in its role as a peacemaker and mediator during the crisis in Croatia in 1991. This became part of a wider strategy to solve a crisis in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The USA's involvement in this affair meant that by 1998 the Croatian problem had been finalised
- initially the USA adopted a supportive approach towards the UN and its policies in terms of Bosnia-Herzegovina
- a further example of US cooperation may be seen in the conflict in Kosovo. US intervention facilitated a NATO role which ultimately led to a peace agreement in 1999
- US intervention in the first Gulf War was managed under the influence of the UN.

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

- the Dayton Agreement was reached without the UN. This agreement was seen by the USA as essential in terms of its own interests. The USA had lost some confidence in the UN and was anxious to ensure that US interests were not jeopardised as Europeans turned against them
- the Gulf War, although technically a UN intervention, was largely managed by the USA. Iraq was a crucial player in the Middle East and the global economy and this was what mattered to the USA. It was the USA that organised an international coalition and it was the USA that supplied most of the fighting forces
- the Gulf War also illustrates the primary role the USA took in shaping the future of international relations on both a regional and a global level. President Bush spoke of 'a new world order' which mirrored the US perception of a global democracy and economic freedom
- US intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq (2003) graphically illustrates the unilateralism that came to characterise US actions.

Furthermore, students may:

- explore the view that the end of the Cold War left a power vacuum and the USA had not lost sight of this reality. There was an opportunity to exercise its power status at a time when rivals were relatively weak. International cooperation on the part of the US could be selective
- suggest that the USA was driven by selective cooperation. It was willing to intervene on a collective front to deal with some humanitarian issues, but not the many that emerged in the 1990s
- suggest that international terrorism shifted the USA's priorities. It also opened further opportunities for unilateral US interventionism which in turn strengthened the USA as a global force. Terrorism reduced the need to cooperate.

In conclusion, students may argue that the USA's commitment to the United Nations did impact significantly on its willingness to be involved in international affairs but that this did not characterise the whole post-Cold War period up to 2004. There were clear indications of US unilateralism and the impact of national self-interest underpinning US involvement, or the lack of involvement in international affairs despite the USA's commitment to the United Nations.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion