

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

GCE History (6HI03/E)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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

Summer 2014

Publications Code UA039104

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently</p>

		<p>display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it, with some evaluation of argument. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and – as appropriate – interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does</p>

		<p>not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>
--	--	---

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

Section B

Target: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

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

AO1a and AO1b (16 marks)

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

		<p>High Level 2: 6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	7-10	<p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 7 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 3: 10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	11-13	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and – as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 11 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 12 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>High Level 4: 13 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the</p>

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

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

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

AO2b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question. When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	10-14	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully</p>

		<p>developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	20-24	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>

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

Unit 3 Assessment Grid

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

Section A

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the defensive and offensive aspects of the system of European alliances from 1879 to 1914. Arguments which support the 'defensive' viewpoint might include: the primary purpose of the alliances was defensive (e.g. the 1879 Dual Alliance and the 1894 Franco-Russian alliance) rather than offensive and, in themselves, could not lead to war; the alliance systems helped to prevent a general war until 1914; the actual outbreak of war in 1914 bore little relation to the European powers' treaty obligations (e.g. Russia had no formal obligation to assist Serbia, Germany had no formal obligation to give Austria-Hungary a 'blank cheque' etc.). Arguments which support an 'offensive' interpretation might include: the system of alliances (Triple Alliance and Triple Entente) was responsible for creating two rival power blocs; the alliance system linked 'peripheral' crises in areas such as north Africa and the Balkans directly to the European powers themselves; the alliances also had a direct bearing on the accelerating arms race after 1900 and the development of military schedules which included the planning of offensives and rapid mobilisations, e.g. the Schlieffen Plan.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements about the European alliance systems (1879-1914) will provide either only implicit argument or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide a broadly analytical response but the detail may be hazy in places or the answer chronologically skewed. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the 'defensive in theory/offensive in practice' view of the European alliance systems with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the aims of the victorious powers and the extent to which these aims were reflected in the peace treaties of 1919-23. Features of the peace treaties which reflected the general and specific aims of the victorious powers might include: responsibility for the conflict was placed on Germany and her allies via 'war guilt'; German disarmament; Allied acceptance that, in principle, Wilson's 14 Points should form the basis of the post-war settlement (e.g. creation of the League of Nations, the International Labour Organisation and a mandatory system of government for former German colonies; return of Alsace-Lorraine to France; the restoration of Belgium; the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires; the creation of an independent Poland with access to the sea; national self-determination led to the establishment of two new states – Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; the use of plebiscites to foster self-determination in disputed areas e.g. Allenstein); the Allies' selective use of the 14 Points (e.g. national self-determination did not apply to Germany and Austria) when it suited their interests; British and French insistence on German reparations which reflected their economic and/or security concerns; Britain, the Dominions and France generally obtained the mandated territories they wanted; Japan retained the former German leasehold territory of Kiaochow in China; Italy secured South Tyrol, the Trentino and Istria which had been promised in the 1915 Treaty of London. Features of the peace treaties which did not reflect the general and specific aims of the victorious powers might include: the ethnic complexity of the Balkans and eastern and central Europe made it impossible to apply the principle of national self-determination fully; France initially demanded permanent German disarmament and a Rhineland Republic for security reasons but was forced to accept a demilitarised zone; similarly, French economic claims to the Saarland and other areas were modified under British and US pressure; China (who had declared war on Germany in 1917) failed to secure Germany's former Chinese territorial rights; Italy expected other territorial acquisitions (e.g. Fiume, Dalmatia and former German colonies) but the major Allies refused to concede them; Kemal's nationalist government in Turkey effectively prevented the implementation of the Treaty of Sevres (1920).</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will offer simple or more developed statements about the peace settlements with either only implicit reference to the extent they reflected the victorious powers' aims, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide a broadly analytical response related to the extent to which the treaties reflected the victors' aims but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the victors' aims in the peace treaties with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'to what extent'. At Level 5, 'to what extent' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	30

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>This question requires candidates to account for the failure of peaceful coexistence to end the Cold War in the years 1953-61. Reasons for this failure may include: US-Soviet ideological hostility continued e.g. Khrushchev rejected the notion of ideological peaceful coexistence, declaration of Domino Theory (1954) and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957); the accelerating arms race (e.g. development of the hydrogen bomb, ICBMs and SLBMs), which was conducted in secret, promoted fear and suspicion on both sides; decolonisation and the 'end of empire' opened up new areas for superpower competition and conflict e.g. the Middle East and South-East Asia which saw the formation of the anti-communist CENTO (1959) and SEATO (1954) alliances; China's criticism of the Soviet pursuit of peaceful coexistence put pressure on Khrushchev to adopt a harder line with the West e.g. the Paris Summit and the U-2 incident (1960); US-Soviet failure to resolve specific divisive issues e.g. the future of Germany.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will provide simple or more developed statements about peaceful coexistence with either only implicit reference to the reasons for its failure to end the Cold War, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide a broadly analytical response related to why peaceful coexistence failed to end the Cold War but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis about peaceful coexistence and the reasons it failed to end the Cold War with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'why'. At Level 5, 'why' will be central to the answer which will also be well informed and relevant. Well selected and precise information will sustain the evaluation, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of how conflicting national interests contributed to deteriorating Sino-Soviet relations between 1958 and 1969 (e.g. Sino-Soviet rivalry over Mongolia; Soviet requests in 1958 for (1) a long-wave radio station in China to control a future USSR Pacific submarine fleet and (2) a joint Sino-Soviet submarine fleet angered Mao who regarded these initiatives as a new form of imperial domination; Sino-Soviet border disputes such as Damansky/Chenbao (1969); China's reaction to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968); China's developing nuclear programme (1964 – atomic bomb, 1967- hydrogen bomb)). This question also requires candidates to consider other factors which help to explain the growing Sino-Soviet rift such as ideological conflict (e.g. competing Soviet and Chinese claims to the leadership of international communism; China's negative response to Soviet de-Stalinisation; Soviet 'peaceful coexistence' versus Mao's commitment to 'continuing revolution' at a time when China was confronting the USA; Soviet criticism of the Great Leap Forward) and personal rivalries (e.g. the legacy of Mao's poor relationship with Stalin and Mao's rivalry and disagreements with Khrushchev and Brezhnev).</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide only implicit reference to reasons for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide a broadly analytical response regarding the reasons for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations but the detail may be undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of conflicting national interests with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	30

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 provides support for the statement in the question by maintaining that the League was associated with defeat and disillusionment. It contends that the incorporation of the Covenant into the Treaty of Versailles and the denial of membership to the defeated states brought about the failure of the League. In contrast, Source 2 focuses on the impact of the economic downturn of the late 1920s and early 1930s which undermined collective international action. It also considers the destructive influence of Hitler and Mussolini on the League. Candidates might link the latter with the 'defeat' argument developed in Source 1. Source 3 notes how the initial idealism surrounding the League foundered on hard political realities, particularly US and Soviet non-involvement and the aggression of the revisionist states. Again candidates might link these themes to the arguments put forward in the other two sources.</p> <p>Candidates own knowledge of the League's weaknesses and failings should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the 'victors' club' image of the League and the prominent role played by Britain and France in its affairs in the 1920s and 1930s; the various defects and loopholes in the League's constitution which made concerted action against aggression difficult to achieve; how US rejection of the League helped to facilitate the challenge of the revisionist powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) in the 1930s e.g. Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1935).</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge should be added to the source evidence and will be integrated into that evidence in support of an argument at Levels 4/5. It is acceptable to enter riders about the apparent League successes, especially in the 1920s, but the focus of good answers should be on reasons for failure. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion about reasons for the League's failure, linked to an understanding of the institution's association with defeat and disillusionment, will be offered, and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of defeat and disillusionment in the failure of the League. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of defeat and disillusionment in explaining League weaknesses and the answer will be informed by precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>Source 4 gives candidates material to support the view that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 was due to ideological differences between the western liberal democracies and Nazi Germany. Candidates should note however that Source 4 also argues that national rivalry and great power status played an important role. Here, candidates can use their own knowledge to extend the analysis by examining the outbreak of the war from a more international perspective. Source 5 examines how Britain and France did little to restrain Hitler before 1939 and how Nazi Germany exploited the Versailles Treaty to increase its power in Europe prior to war. Candidates are likely to use their own knowledge to support or challenge this interpretation with specific reference to Czechoslovakia (1938-39), Poland and the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact (August 1939). Source 6 offers a different viewpoint by focusing on Hitler's mistaken conviction that war against Poland could be localised – a view which disregarded Britain's military commitment and the reservations of sections of the German elite. Candidates might cross reference the sources to show how British and French resistance (ideological or otherwise) to Nazi expansionism solidified in 1939 over the issue of Poland and how Hitler's aggression accelerated in the late 1930s. Similarly, Source 6, with its reference to a 'National Socialist' war, can be used to support the ideological argument put forward in Source 4.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 responses are likely to sift the evidence with some cross-referencing, and at Level 2 link to own knowledge for valid statements. Level 3 answers will reach a conclusion probably recognising that the argument is not all about ideological differences and clearly recognising that the sources give different interpretations. Sources will be used with some confidence. For Level 4, look for sustained argument on the relative merits of the various arguments. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of ideological differences on the basis of precisely selected evidence (from both sources and own knowledge), leading to an overall judgement. They might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could debate the extent to which ideological considerations rather than national interests led to conflict (Source 4).</p>	40

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 argues that Stalin's errors were central to the development of the Cold War between 1945 and 1949. His uncompromising policy on Germany, in particular, hardened east-west differences and divided Europe. Stronger candidates may pick up on the reference to Stalin's 'uncompromising rigidity and confrontational tactics' and offer relevant own knowledge to support or challenge this view. In contrast, Source 8 offers an 'interactionist' perspective. According to this extract, important influences within the Soviet Union and the USA (such as the Soviet search for security and the USA's economically-driven sense of its own power) made superpower confrontation inevitable. Here, candidates might link the reference to Stalin's personality with the general argument of Source 7. Source 9 emphasises the role played by the US 'open door' policy in undermining superpower relations between 1945 and 1949. It maintains that expanding US economic and (by extension) political influence in Europe, which was resisted by the USSR, brought about the Cold War. Candidates might link this view with elements of the interactionist argument relating to the USA in Source 8.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-49 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the role of Stalin and other key personalities, particularly Truman and Roosevelt; the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US 'Open Door' policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism'; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO.</p> <p>The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of Stalin's errors on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 supports the statement in the question by suggesting that during the 1980s the Soviet bloc faced major economic problems and was technologically far behind the West. Most of the satellite states had accumulated large debts and the USSR was ill-equipped to meet the demands of the 'information age'. This view is partly endorsed by Source 11 which maintains that hard-line US policies (including the deployment of superior technology) effectively ended the Cold War. From this perspective, Soviet fear of SDI (and other factors) played a major role in undermining the Eastern bloc. In contrast, Source 12 challenges this interpretation by arguing that Gorbachev played the most significant part in ending East-West tension. Gorbachev, according to this view, was the first Cold War leader to seek meaningful political accommodation with the other side. Candidates might also note Source 12 suggests that Gorbachev was motivated by the failure of the Soviet system.</p> <p>Candidates' relevant own knowledge of the Cold War should be added to the evidence of the sources and will be integrated into that evidence in support of a sustained argument at Levels 4/5. Candidates are likely to know about: the mounting economic problems and relative technological backwardness of the Soviet Union in the 1970s/1980s and the widening East-West gap in living standards; the policies pursued by Reagan (e.g. SDI, neutron bomb, MX missiles, hard-line 'evil empire' rhetoric, and, later, growing rapport with Gorbachev) and their impact; Gorbachev's rejection of 'old style' Soviet diplomacy and the Brezhnev era (<i>perestroika, glasnost</i>); the impact of the INF Treaty (1987), the Moscow Summit (1988) and Gorbachev's address to the UN (1988); the role of 'people power' in eastern Europe in the late 1980s e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall etc.</p> <p>At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion on why the Cold War came to an end will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Soviet economic and technological inferiority and other factors (e.g. the role of Gorbachev) on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will offer a sustained discussion of the relative importance of key factors with some concentration on Soviet economic and technological inferiority. Here, precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge will be used, leading to an overall judgement.</p>	40

