



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

A2 History 2041

HIS3N

Unit 3N

Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS 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 historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. 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 Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

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 student 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 student 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 2013

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

HIS3N: Aspects of International Relations, 1945–2004

Question 1

- 01** 'The policy of containment was pursued by the USA with the sole purpose of protecting democracy.'
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1945 to 1949. (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 identify and explain the motives and the short and medium term objectives underpinning the introduction of containment and balance these against alternative interpretations and explanations of these motives and objectives.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the primary aim of containment was to protect democracy:

- from 1945 the Soviet Union had been developing the creation of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The USA saw Communism as a form of political dictatorship which threatened democratic freedom. Containment was a way of ensuring that the spread of Communism was controlled
- Germany was seen by the USA as the focal point confrontation between itself and the Soviet Union. The USSR's actions in Germany for between 1945 and 1949 may be explored in order to establish a link between the introduction of containment and the preservation of democracy within and beyond Germany. References may be made to reparations, the promotion of pro-Communist political groups in Germany and the Berlin Blockade. The latter confirms the relevancy of containment as a strategy to defend democracy
- the expansion of Communism beyond Europe is seen through the conflict in Korea. Students may suggest that the primary reason for US intervention in Korea between 1950 and 1953 was to protect democracy from what was becoming the fulfilment of Marxist ideology towards the globalisation of Communism.

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

- containment was founded on an economic strategy, the Marshall Plan. The USA wanted to establish itself as an unassailable global economic power. It was this so called economic imperialism that suggested that the primary aim behind containment was to create US global economic power through the preservation of pro-American democracies
- containment may be viewed in the context of the USA's nuclear monopoly up to 1949. As such containment may be seen as the means through which the USA could apply this strategic power. By appearing to protect democracy through containment, the USA could use nuclear diplomacy to ensure the USSR remained a second rate superpower
- Truman wanted influence in Western Europe. Europe was the springboard for US global power. Not only did the USA wish to be a global power in economic terms but also in strategic terms.

Furthermore, students may:

- examine the view that a power vacuum existed from 1945. Had the USA not intervened through containment there may well have followed a period of gross instability. In this sense containment went beyond protecting democracy as a strategy to enhance US power. It was primarily an essential component of effective post-war recovery. Failure to develop such a strategy may have led to long-term conflict and political and economic instability which would have impacted on millions of Europeans

- the influence of European states is significant. Britain was determined to ensure the USA became part of its security strategy in the face of Soviet expansionism. To this extent students may suggest that containment did have elements of protecting democracy in it but also it was driven by pressure from relatively vulnerable European states
- explore the significance of NATO and the USA's support for it and their role within it.

In conclusion, students may:

- adopt one of the classic interpretations based on the orthodox, revisionist or post-revisionist views
- by examining the events in the period in the question they may seek to conclude that the USA was driven by a sense of altruism i.e. the USA was the only state able to protect democracy and it was willing to commit its resources to do that
- alternatively the focus may be on the wider context and the USA's willingness to withdraw from its traditional isolationism.

Question 2

- 02** 'The Soviet Union's policies towards the USA were aimed at relaxing the tensions between them.'
Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1956 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 evaluate the contribution made by the Soviet Union towards the continuance of the Cold War from 1956. The premise in the question suggests that the Soviet Union consistently sought to minimise the tension even if it did not necessarily seek to end it entirely. Balanced this against view is the idea that the Soviet role in maintaining the tension was significant and at times intentional.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the Soviet Union sought to relax international tension in the years 1956 to 1991:

- Khrushchev's attempts to develop peaceful co-existence as the basis for international relations from 1956
- the Soviet Union had a much more positive approach towards détente than did the USA. The Soviets were keen to preserve détente as the basis of international relations and willingly participated in the SALT talks
- the Cold War came to an end due to the cooperation of Gorbachev. He was pivotal in its conclusion and he made the ultimate contribution towards the relaxation of tension.

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

- peaceful co-existence was a strategy designed to strengthen the Soviet Union's position both globally and in terms of its control of Eastern Europe. It was not a means to relieve international tension
- détente was not about the relaxation of tension for the Soviet Union. Primarily it was a means of establishing Soviet parity as a superpower and that implied the Soviet Union could then develop its global power with less US interference. This may be apparent in Angola. Soviet expansionism into Third World states could only intensify tension rather than minimise it
- cooperation by Gorbachev was an attempt to rescue the Soviet Union's power base, particularly in Eastern Europe. Reagan's militarism left Gorbachev with few alternatives in terms of international relations, particularly in the context of the Soviet Union's weakened strategic and economic condition.

Furthermore, students may:

- explore the view that the Cuban Missile crisis, although a source of great international tension, was a Soviet strategy to heighten the nuclear issue and move towards some strategy for nuclear arms controls and therefore international peace
- that Soviet cooperation in international relations was more apparent than real throughout the period. It was consistently driven by the motive of reinforcing the Soviets' position rather than by a genuine desire to defuse international tension.

In conclusion, students may:

- suggest that although there may have been ulterior motives underpinning Soviet actions the real aim was to minimise tension. The Soviets were frequently in a weaker position than the USA, both economically and in terms of nuclear capability. The only viable strategy was one of controlled cooperation. This was often rejected by the USA

- equally, students may conclude that the Soviet Union was driven by a desire for global power in terms of strategic power and ideological expansion. Any attempts at cooperation were merely cynical tactics designed to achieve these objectives.

Question 3

- 03** To what extent was the USA's response to international aggression based solely on protecting its own national interests in 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 evaluate the United States' response to international aggression in the years 1991 to 2004. This assessment will be balanced in terms of the extent to which the responses were driven by a determination to protect the state's national interests against any other motivational factors that transcended solely national interests.

Students may refer to some of the following material in support of the view that the US response was focused upon protecting US national interests:

- the Cold War had come to an end by 1991 and the USA needed to preserve its position as a global superpower. This was essential to guaranteeing US national interests were secure. This approach had always been present in US foreign policy and international relations thinking throughout the Cold War and it remained an imperative for US policy after 1991
- the USA frequently acted outside the auspices of the United Nations. This is apparent in its intervention in Iraq in 2003. The US was not firmly committed to cooperating with the United Nations because it needed to act independently in order to ensure its own interests were secured. The intervention in Iraq was very much a response to international aggression
- a similar reasoning may be applied to the USA's decision to intervene directly in Afghanistan. As in Iraq, the USA used its political alliance with Britain to further promote its own campaign against international terrorism
- the US response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 also illustrates a determination to act solely in US interests. The US needed to protect its Middle East ally, Israel. It also needed stability in the Middle East because of that region's importance in economic and strategic terms. The USA's economy was the priority rather than removing a dictatorial regime in Iraq in the interests of the Iraqi people.

Nevertheless there are a number of other factors to consider:

- the USA did cooperate with the United Nations in 1990 by participating in the economic sanctions strategy developed by the UN to put pressure on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait
- the USA's willingness to allow the regime of Saddam Hussein to continue after Iraq had been defeated in the Gulf War suggests that the USA was prepared to limit its direct intervention in the Middle East. There is no indication of any protracted US presence but rather a willingness to enable the sovereign state of Iraq to return to whatever system or regime it wanted
- the US response to the Gulf War was presented by Bush as part of a 'new world order'. This does not suggest a US plan to manipulate events solely in terms of US interests.

Furthermore, students may:

- explore the emergence of international terrorism and its direct impact of US policy making, particularly in terms of 9/11
- consider the commitment to democracy in both Iraq and Afghanistan and the huge costs to the USA in terms of economic and human resources. This may imply a more altruistic level of thinking that explains the US response.

In conclusion, students may argue that on balance the US response to international aggression shifted with 9/11. There was a major perceived threat to US national interests and this had to be reflected in their response to further international aggression.