

---

# A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Mark scheme

---

2041

June 2014

---

Version 1.0 Final

---

---

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](http://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 2014

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

**HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004**

**Question 1**

- 01** 'The USA's policies towards the Soviet Union never changed in the years 1949 to 1985.'  
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 establish the extent to which there was continuity in US policy towards the Soviet Union in the years 1949 to 1985. Equally there is a need to determine the points at which this policy shifted and the extent of the shift.

Students may refer to the following material in support of the view that US policy towards the Soviet Union remained unchanged in the years 1949 to 1985:

- the USA had a consistent agenda based on ensuring its own dominant superpower status. This was established by 1949 and it was maintained throughout the period up to 1985. This may be evidenced by an analysis of the following examples:
- in terms of nuclear dominance the USA was not willing to cooperate with Peaceful Co-existence. There was no compromise on the Cuban missile crisis. The USA was not prepared to accept any Soviet expansion of its nuclear power through missiles on Cuba. Détente collapsed partly due to the view that the USA was giving too much to the Soviet Union in terms of missile and nuclear capability concessions. Reagan was willing to expand the USA's military and nuclear capacity in order to control the USSR
- the fundamental aim of containing the spread of communism and thereby controlling the global power of the USSR remained intact throughout the period. Containment may have assumed different forms, for example with the acceptance of détente, but the basic aim remained in place. The aim never shifted even though the method did
- there was never any compromise on the ideological position of the USA. Communism remained a threat to democracy. This was apparent as late as 1983 when Reagan referred to the USSR as an 'evil empire'
- the USA's commitment to the protection of Western Europe remained intact throughout the period. This is evident in every decade across the period: Berlin 1948–9, Kennedy's speech to Berliners after the Wall is constructed, the Helsinki Accords of 1973–5, and the continued special relationship with Britain – Truman to Reagan.

Nevertheless there are a number of other factors to consider:

- containment was fundamentally undermined by 1969. Nixon came into office determined to get the USA out of Vietnam because military containment had failed. This heralded a new era of international cooperation based on a profound shift in US thinking. The aim of protecting the USA remained intact but there was a clear realisation that this would be achieved by cooperation rather than confrontation
- US policy towards the USSR had to change because the USSR had nuclear parity by 1970
- Reagan's militarism was aimed at ending the Cold War. His apparently aggressive stance was actually a shift from the traditional distancing, and sometimes confrontational position, the USA had adopted towards the USSR. Traditionally, until Reagan, there had not been any US intent to end the Cold War. This was a new approach and it signalled a new policy position in terms of US-Soviet relations.

Furthermore, students may argue that:

- only when the Soviet Union limited its desire to be a dominant global superpower did the USA shift its position. The relationship between the USA and the USSR was determined as much by Soviet actions as by US intent. There are many examples of this such as, the response to peaceful co-existence and détente
- the USA's position shifted when it became clear that the USSR was a state in decline – particularly economic decline but also in terms of its control over Eastern Europe
- there was a shift in the dynamics of international relations once China emerged as a viable superpower. Nixon's use of the so called 'China Card' may be referred to here. This impacted on US-Soviet relations and this could be explored both in terms of accepting the premise of this question or in terms of challenging it.

In conclusion, students may suggest that:

- although there was apparent continuity there were also points of change. These were in response to the changing nature of Soviet power and Soviet international aims
- equally some may argue that there was not a fundamental and deep seated change in US intent. The ultimate goal never changed, only the method.

**Question 2**

- 02** 'It was Ronald Reagan who brought the Cold War to an end.'  
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1985 to 1991. **[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 explain the impact of Ronald Reagan on bringing the Cold War to a complete close by 1991.

Students may refer to the following material in support of the view that Ronald Reagan was crucial in bringing the Cold War to an end:

- Reagan intended to win the Cold War. He regarded détente as a futile prolongation of the Cold War. This determination to win may be seen as a clear contribution towards bringing the Cold War to an end. Reagan's approach was based on a completely different agenda when compared to all previous US Presidents
- he expanded the US military machine and adopted aggressive policies which put increased pressure on the USSR. These included actions such as exploring the SDI programme. This pressure was further increased through the INF talks
- Reagan's commitment to the summit programme was very significant in negotiating an end to the Cold War. Students may examine these summits and consider the role Reagan played. He was clearly willing to engage with Gorbachev but also to promote US interests at a time of Soviet fragility.

Nevertheless there are a number of other factors to consider:

- there was a growing realisation that the communist system was failing. Gorbachev's introduction of Glasnost and Perestroika could be examined in order to establish their relative importance in weakening the Soviet Union's capacity to remain a Cold War protagonist
- just as the Communist Eastern European bloc was under increasing pressure which served to weaken the USSR's capacity to function as a Cold War power, the USA was firmly allied to Western Europe. This reinforced the strength of the USA to function as the dominant Cold War power
- Reagan's successor, George Bush, had his own strategy for ending the Cold War. At the 1989 Malta summit for example, he moved towards closer economic relations with the USSR. Bush was in office when START 1 was finalised.

Furthermore, students may argue that:

- Mikhail Gorbachev was the prime mover in bringing the Cold War to an end. He developed his 'New Thinking' strategy for example. It was Gorbachev who informed the East German government that the Soviet Union would not intervene to halt political opposition in that country in 1989. This stance by Gorbachev undermined the communist bloc and profoundly weakened the communist's capacity to function in the Cold War
- Gorbachev was a key player in the summit programme. He was willing to form a personal relationship with Reagan and to make significant concessions which accelerated the ending
- the collapse of the communist bloc in Eastern Europe was partly initiated by Gorbachev but also through a dynamic of its own. This was particularly evident in Hungary and Poland. The ability of the Warsaw Pact to function was totally undermined. The ultimate collapse of communism in Eastern Europe may be regarded as a highly significant factor in bringing the Cold War to a final conclusion.

In conclusion, students may suggest that:

- Reagan was instrumental in bringing the Cold War to an end. He put a new form of pressure on the Soviet Union at a point when it could least resist
- equally, students may argue that it was Gorbachev who was the key player in bringing the Cold War to an end. It was his changes that activated a process of collapse which made it impossible for the Cold War to continue.

**Question 3**

- 03** 'The end of the Cold War enabled the United Nations to fulfil its role of maintaining international peace and security.'  
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1991 to 2004. **[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 explain the role that the United Nations played in the post-Cold War era. The issue is one of establishing how far the end of the Cold War enabled the United Nations to fulfil its core role of maintaining international peace and security.

Students may refer to the following material in support of the view that the end of the Cold War marked a new era of effectiveness for the United Nations in terms of fulfilling its core role:

- it was the UN that managed the first Gulf War intervention. The majority force was from the USA but the intervention as a peacekeeping action was undertaken under the auspices of the UN. The outcome of the intervention was to restore a significant degree of order and stability in the Middle East. It also served to ensure some degree of security for Israel. Equally, the economic importance of the Middle East oil production was preserved
- in the early 1990s the USA, a powerful member of the UN, was enthusiastic about supporting the UN. It promoted ideas such as the 'new world order' and 'assertive multilateralism'. The USA looked forward to a peace and security regime that included collective security
- the USA was a strong and proactive supporter of the UN in both Somalia and Haiti
- the USA was also proactive in working with the UN in Yugoslavia. Significant humanitarian measures were successfully put in place in Bosnia for example. Significant agreements such as the Dayton Agreement were arrived at
- the UN was successful in Cambodia during a particularly complex peace mission.

Nevertheless there are a number of other factors to consider:

- by the mid-1990s there was an increasing move towards a reliance on regional peacekeeping organisations such as NATO. Peace enforcement was increasingly moving towards regional powers and regional organisations
- the UN experienced some significant failures, such as the failure to prevent and manage the crisis in Rwanda
- the crisis in Yugoslavia was addressed but the outcomes were too little and too late. The ethnic cleansing process was devastating, particularly in Bosnia.

Furthermore, students may argue that:

- 9/11 was a profound turning point for the UN. The USA abandoned all notions of collective security through the UN and undertook unilateral action against both Afghanistan and Iraq.
- The UN effectively returned to a state of dependency upon a state that was not prepared to cooperate with it in order to guarantee its own security. 9/11 fundamentally undermined the ability of the UN to function as an international organisation protecting international peace and security.

In conclusion, students may suggest that:

- for the first half of the 1990s the UN did enjoy a period of enhanced influence as an international peacekeeping organisation. However, that status was changed as the USA

became increasingly less committed to collective security and turned to regional action through regional organisations.

**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](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)