

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCE History (6HI03)

Option E

War and Peace: 20th Century

International Relations

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2013

Publications Code US036168

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%) (30 marks)

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
5	14-16	<p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 14 marks</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its</p>

		range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform. High Level 5: 16 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.
--	--	--

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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-9	<p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</p> <p>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</p>

		<p>information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	15-19	<p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</p> <p>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</p>

		The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.
--	--	--

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 how the Dual Alliance (1879) served German and Austro-Hungarian interests in the years up to 1914. Features which suggest that the Dual Alliance served German interests might include: Bismarck entered into the alliance to stabilise Europe by (i) inducing Russia to come to terms with Germany (which it did in 1881 and 1887) and (ii) providing Germany with the means to restrain Habsburg policy in the Balkans; Austria-Hungary proved to be Germany's most reliable ally (e.g. over the Moroccan crisis and the Algeciras conference, 1905-06) but support was not always forthcoming (e.g. Agadir crisis 1911); Germany used the Dual Alliance during the 1914 Balkan crisis to provoke war in order to pursue its expansionist aims and resolve a serious domestic crisis (Fischer thesis). Features which suggest that the Dual Alliance served Austro-Hungarian interests might include: the 1879 alliance rescued Austria-Hungary from a period of diplomatic isolation which dated back to the Crimean War; the German alliance provided an additional guarantee of the Habsburg Empire's stability and great power status; successive Austrian statesmen considered it gave the Empire German support for an active policy in the Balkans e.g. over the Bosnian Crisis of 1908-09; in the July 1914 crisis the Habsburg Monarchy, determined to preserve its multiracial empire, asked for, and received, a 'blank cheque' from Germany to confront Serbia.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements about the Dual Alliance will provide either only implicit argument or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis but the detail may be hazy in places or the answer chronologically skewed. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the German and Austro-Hungarian interests served by the 1879 alliance with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>Candidates should have knowledge of the key disarmament initiatives during this period – the Washington Naval Treaties (1921-22), Locarno (1925), the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) and the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932-33). Features which support the statement in the question might include: economic circumstances played a key role in the Washington Naval Treaties because Britain could not afford a naval race, the USA wanted to reduce armaments and economise, and Japan signed due to its economic difficulties and dependence on US trade; the Depression (1929-33) had a negative impact on the Geneva Disarmament Conference by strengthening economic nationalism in Germany, Italy and Japan (e.g. Japanese seizure of Manchuria (1931) and Mussolini’s plans to invade Abyssinia) and making it more difficult for the three western democracies to act collectively to deter aggression. Features which challenge the statement in the question might include: general war-weariness after 1918 and the ‘never again’ mentality of the early post-war period; US national self-interest as revealed by its policy of isolationism and determination to preserve China against Japanese encroachment in the 1920s; the ideologically-driven expansionist policies of the ‘have not’ powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) in the 1930s which undermined attempts to secure international disarmament.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the disarmament initiatives with either only implicit reference to economic circumstances or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent economic circumstances determined success/failure but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the factors shaping the success/failure of the disarmament initiatives with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of the nuclear arms race in the period 1949-63. Developments which encouraged a lack of restraint might include: Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) which precipitated a spiralling arms race – e.g. hydrogen/lithium bomb (1952-54), intercontinental bombers, ICBM (1957) and SLBM (1960); fears about the nuclear superiority of the other side, e.g. the Gaither Report and the ‘missile gap’ (1957); nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. US doctrine of ‘massive retaliation’ (1950s), Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA’s ‘nuclear option’ during the 1961 Berlin crisis. Developments which encouraged superpower restraint might include: the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons, e.g. US non-intervention in Hungary (1956) and Soviet promotion of ‘peaceful coexistence’; superpower cooperation to regulate the nuclear threat, e.g. removal of missiles from Cuba and Turkey, the Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow ‘hotline’.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the nuclear arms race between 1949 and 1963 with either only implicit reference to the extent it discouraged or promoted superpower restraint, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent the nuclear arms race discouraged/encouraged restraint 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 nuclear arms race and superpower restraint with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of détente in the 1970s. Developments which suggest a lack of superpower commitment might include: Soviet refusal to link détente to further concessions (e.g. over Vietnam and USSR's anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev's adherence to the long-term victory of communism; the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (e.g. Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia); the Helsinki Accords (1975) and Soviet human rights issues; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979); the scrapping of SALT 2. Developments which suggest superpower commitment might include: desire to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; US promotion of the Nixon Doctrine; wider US-Soviet economic and trade considerations (e.g. to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to Western technology); genuine Soviet desire not to be diplomatically isolated by the growing Sino-US rapprochement.</p> <p>At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about US-Soviet relations in the 1970s with either only implicit reference to the extent they were committed to détente or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent the USA and the Soviet Union were committed to détente but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the commitment to détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on 'how far'. At Level 5, 'how far' will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.</p>	30

Section B

E1 The World in Crisis, 1879-1941

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>Source 1 argues that Anglo-French leadership robbed the League of moral authority and imposed a post-war settlement which reflected the interests of the 'satiated' nations. Germany and Russia, as 'have not' powers, were not likely to accept the League and both wanted to overturn the international order established by the Versailles settlement. Source 2 also briefly mentions the threat posed by the 'have not' powers but then focuses on the weaknesses of the League's constitution, particularly over sanctions, the need for unanimity to take action, and the lack of an army. Source 3 refers to Japan and Italy's expansionist ambitions as likely to have a negative impact on the League. It then goes on to emphasise that the League was undermined as an international body by the absence of the USA and Russia, and Anglo-French disagreements concerning the direction of the organisation.</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 challenge of the revisionist or 'have not' powers (Japan, Italy and Germany) in the 1930s, e.g. Manchuria (1931) and Abyssinia (1935); how US rejection of the League weakened it as an international body; the various defects and loopholes in the League's constitution which made concerted action against aggression difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge should be added to the source evidence and will be integrated into that evidence in support of an argument at Levels 4/5. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion about reasons for League weaknesses linked to understanding about its inability to win over or restrain the 'have not' powers 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 the League's failure to combat the 'have not' powers' attitudes and actions. At Level 5, candidates will present a reasoned judgement about the importance of the failure to win over or restrain the 'have not' powers 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 Chiang Kai-shek was responsible for the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937. It maintains that Chiang acted as the aggressor, pursuing a deliberate policy of mounting confrontation with the Japanese in the hope of securing military assistance from the USA or the Soviet Union. Source 5, in contrast, argues that growing public anger at the Japanese presence in China forced Chiang to abandon his cautious policy towards the invader and adopt a more assertive approach. Source 6 explains the war in terms of Japan's determination to preserve the economic and political concessions extracted from China in the face of a resurgent Chinese nationalism and increasing US and British opposition. Japan entered the war to create a new East Asian political and economic order in which China would come to recognise the benefits of Sino-Japanese 'partnership'.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the reasons for the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: Japan's continued encroachment on Chinese sovereignty following the invasion of Manchuria (1931) to secure further political and economic advantages; growing domestic pressure after the army revolt of 1936 to extend Japanese influence throughout eastern Asia; the failure of other major Pacific powers to restrain Japan encouraged its expansionist policies; China's policy of appeasement towards Japan in the 1930s was not undertaken to achieve permanent peace but to buy time in order to prepare for war; domestic pressure on Chiang Kai-shek to resist the Japanese eventually became overwhelming; the impact of the Sian incident (1936) and the formation of the second United Front; Chiang's calculation that Chinese action would bring in other powers (such as the USA or the Soviet Union) against Japan.</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 Chiang Kai-shek's responsibility 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 Chiang's responsibility on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

E2 A World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1944-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>Source 7 argues that the USA had a broad conception of its national security interests and, in responding forcefully to Soviet challenges in these 'vital' areas, America was acting in defence of her perceived security needs. Such a view can be cross-referenced with Source 8 which maintains that both superpowers viewed the other's policies as hostile to their security and took action which, in turn, was regarded as aggressive. Candidates may note that Source 8 indicates that this 'vicious circle' in superpower relations was driven by ideological factors. Source 9 also mentions ideological conflict but stresses that both superpowers were determined to expand their global power and were prepared to act aggressively to achieve this. It contends that the USSR relied more heavily on force and coercion and therefore bears greater responsibility for the development of the Cold War.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of 1945-50 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the 'Stalinisation' of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US 'Open Door' policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism'; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the role of key personalities particularly Stalin, Truman and Roosevelt; the formation of the People's Republic of China (1949); the early impact of the Korean War (1950-53).</p> <p>The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of US-Soviet security needs and superpower aggression on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>Source 10 suggests that Gorbachev's break with 'old style' Soviet thinking on foreign affairs was the crucial development which brought the Cold War to an end. Gorbachev's new thinking ushered in a period of much improved East-West relations and promoted political reform across eastern Europe. This last point could be usefully cross-referenced with Source 12. In contrast, Source 11 presents the Reagan 'victory school' argument by emphasising that, during the 1980s, the USA's military and ideological assertiveness, together with its technological advantages, forced the Soviet Union to abandon the Cold War. Source 12 focuses on the growth of popular discontent with communist rule throughout eastern Europe during the 1980s and suggests that this mounting public opposition was both spontaneous and independent.</p> <p>Candidates' own knowledge of the Cold War in the 1980s should be added to the evidence of the sources and will be integrated into that evidence in support of a sustained argument at Levels 4/5. From the 1980s candidates are likely to know about: 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 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; 'people power' in eastern Europe in the late 1980s e.g. Solidarity in Poland, Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, collapse of the Berlin Wall etc; the mounting economic problems of the Soviet Union in the 1970s and 1980s and the widening East-West gap in living standards.</p> <p>At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources. At Level 3 a clear conclusion on why the Cold War came to an end will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative importance of Gorbachev's rejection of 'old style' Soviet thinking in foreign affairs and other factors (e.g. the role played by Reagan and the USA, and the impact of popular protests in eastern Europe) 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 Gorbachev's rejection of 'old style' Soviet thinking, using precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.</p>	40

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US036168 Summer 2013

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

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

