

---

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

[Note: generic mark bands will be used in addition to this marking scheme.]

SECTION A

1. Source-based question : The Changing Position of the UN Secretary-General

*L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID USE OF SOURCES* [1-5]

These answers will be about the position of the Secretary-General, but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Include in this level answers which use information taken from the sources, but only in supporting an account of the Secretary-General's changing position, rather than for testing the hypothesis.

*L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS* [6-8]

These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.

e.g. 'Yes, it is true that the UN Secretary-General never possessed independent power because Source E shows that Secretary-Generals faced opposition from the superpowers' OR 'No, the Secretary-General did have independent power. You can tell this from Source D.'

*L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS* [9-13]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disconfirm it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

e.g. 'There is evidence both for and against the view that the Secretary-General has never had independent power. If you think the evidence supports this view then Source B helps you because it shows how the Secretary General needs the support of many powers and groups within the UN. But Source C gives a different impression because it states that Dag Hammarskjöld did exercise independent power.'

*L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS* [14-16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at their face value.

e.g. 'I think it is true that the Secretary-General exercised no independent power When you look at Source D you have to question its argument because it talks of the Secretary-General only in relation to other UN bodies and not outside states'. OR 'I think that the Secretary-General did exercise independent power. The evidence provided by Source E is second-hand, and simplistically subjective in its language as well as saying nothing about the exercise of power by the various Secretary-Generals.'

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

**L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS**

[17-21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level).

*e.g. (second L4 example PLUS the following) However, some of the sources do suggest that the Secretary-General lacked independent power. Though Source A uses the evidence of the Soviet Foreign Minister to show how the superpowers encouraged the Secretary-General to be Independent, this was in 1946, before the Cold War was really underway. Once the Cold War Was established, then the USSR discouraged Secretarys-General from being independent. This can be seen when Source A is cross-referenced with Source C.*

**L6 AS L5, PLUS EITHER (a) EXPLAINS WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, OR (b) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED**

[22-25]

For (a) the argument must be that the evidence for agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it, e.g. argues that although all Secretarys-General in the period 1945-1991 had to work within the political constraints of the Cold War, some did have some autonomy, especially before 1961. This conclusion should be based on an overall assessment of the different opinions/perceptions shown in the sources or by establishing different criteria for support/contradiction.

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

SECTION B

2. **How far has the historical debate about the origins of the Cold War changed since the collapse of the USSR in 1991?**

The main point here is the (partial) opening of the Soviet archives. The US archives were open long before the 1980s, which would have distorted the study of the topic. Western analysis of Soviet policies had to be based on a few, limited sources plus a large amount of (expert) supposition; Soviet analysis would have been of an orthodox Marxist kind, dissidents excepted. Since the late 1980s there will be more opportunities for Western historians to study the archives and to interview survivors of the postwar era while Russian historians can take a less ideological stance.

These new opportunities need to be set in the context of the three historical schools: traditional (or orthodox), revisionist and post-revisionist, all of which existed *before* 1991. There are two approaches to this question.

The first and probably the most common is an assessment of the impact of new information on the old theories, about which opinions vary. Some identify a fourth perspective, the post-post-revisionist school, which bears a close resemblance to the traditional interpretation.

The second involves an attempt to use the causes of the collapse of the USSR to reflect upon the causes of the Cold War. Thus the subsequent impact of the loss of the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe in 1989 shows the importance to the USSR of the region and thus might support part of the revisionist case. And the economic weakness of the USSR, as revealed by the 1980s, could be taken to undermine post-revisionist arguments in that the Cold War was not the result of superpower misunderstandings. The USSR could not afford to let go of Eastern Europe. This again helps strengthen the traditional school of thought.

3. **'The globalisation of the Cold War in the 1950s and 1960s is clear evidence that both the USA and the USSR had expansionist ambitions.' Discuss.**

There is plenty of material available, including all the usual suspects, from the Korean and Vietnam Wars to the Middle East crisis and several crises in Latin America. The line that most candidates will probably take is that the USSR was expansionist, the USA defensive. This approach, supported with a range of examples, can reach Band 3. However, it could be that the USA was equally expansionist, especially when it came to supporting the economic interests of American capitalism; American intervention in Vietnam could be given this interpretation, as could the formation of supposedly-defensive organisations such as CENTO and SEATO. Another possibility is that neither superpower had expansionist aims, that both were acting to defend either their interests or those of their allies; the Soviet decision to place missiles in Cuba was possibly a defensive move.

Ideally, 'expansionist' needs defining; it could mean gaining territory, it could mean gaining influence. Thus as well as much material to analyse, there is also plenty to argue about. For Bands 1 and 2, a range of different interpretations must be considered.

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

4. **Analyse the impact of the Cuban revolution on American policy towards Cuba in the period to 1962.**

The two great examples of American policy towards Cuba during this time were the Bay of Pigs crisis (1961) and the Cuban missile crisis (1962), with which candidates should be familiar. The first was more obviously anti-Cuban, the missile crisis being more anti-Soviet. If candidates highlight the differences between the situations which led to the two crises as well as the subsequent American policies, candidates will merit Band 3 marks or, for an impressive contrast, Band 2.

However there were other policies which focused on Cuba rather than the USSR. The most important were economic sanctions, introduced by Eisenhower in 1960 and extended by Kennedy in 1962. The continuity of policy between the two presidencies is worth mentioning as is the changing situation of Cuba. Castro and Cuba turned Communist only in 1960, partly in response to increasing American hostility.

Some might refer to the opening of both US and Soviet archives in recent years, which has given a better understanding of the subject.

5. **Compare and contrast the crisis experienced by China in the late 1980s with that experienced by the USSR under Gorbachev.**

The China crisis was mainly political, though following official moves for economic liberalisation. A few protestors continued to call for the so-called 'Fifth Modernisation' of democratic rights, first advocated at the time of the Democracy Wall in 1978. Further demonstrations followed in 1985-6 and then again in 1989, following the death of the liberal Communist leader Hu Yao-bang. The latter protests led to the Tiananmen Square massacre in June 1989.

The Soviet crisis was initially economic and soon political as well. In order to address growing economic problems, the leadership introduced both economic and political reforms. They soon undermined the legitimacy of the Soviet state. The nationalities issue soon became a very significant factor. Rather than repress, the Soviet leadership continued to reform, even to the extent of accepting the demise of the USSR.

The external situation of the two states is also relevant. The USSR was burdened with its east European empire and with the burden of a cold war arms race. China had neither.

Thus some nice contrasts can be made. Award candidates according to breadth and depth of analysis plus ability to arrange and organise the material. Allowance should be made for having to compare events in two states, which is always demanding.

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

**6. Account for the evolution of American nuclear deterrence strategy from massive retaliation (1954) to assured destruction (1964) and flexible response (agreed by NATO in 1967).**

Massive retaliation was the response of the new Eisenhower administration to (a) the lessons of the Korean War and (b) the increasing number and types of nuclear weapons. Containment was essentially a reactive policy, one which gave the initiative to the communists. It meant that the USA could not use its superiority in nuclear weapons. Dulles, the Secretary of State, felt it necessary to threaten the USSR and China with the possibility of an all-out attack by American nuclear forces. This was the only way of effectively containing Communism. It was also cheaper than maintaining huge conventional forces.

Assured destruction was the response of the new Kennedy administration to the expansion of both US and Soviet strategic nuclear weapons in the late 1950s and early 1960s. It refined the strategy of deterrence by saying that the destruction of the USSR would occur, should it launch a nuclear attack on the USA. It was a strategy aimed at preventing nuclear war rather than fighting one. The doctrine later became labelled as mutually assured destruction (MAD) because the USA accepted the idea of some kind of nuclear parity with the USSR. It was no longer felt necessary to win the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union.

Flexible response was first developed in the early 1960s by the Kennedy government, which wanted a strategy which was more sophisticated than that of massive retaliation. Hence the idea of a gradual response, using first conventional and then tactical nuclear weapons before moving to strategic weapons. Allies in NATO were very suspicious of US nuclear strategy and on two counts. One was the problem of extended deterrence: would America be willing to risk the destruction of the USA in order to defend Western Europe against a Soviet attack? The other was the possibility that an all-out nuclear war would result in the immediate destruction of Europe. Eventually, in 1967, at the height of the Vietnam war, the USA persuaded its NATO allies of the benefits of flexible response (of which MAD was a part). The allies never accepted the implications of such a strategy, namely the need to expand their conventional forces.

Thus candidates need to distinguish both the differences between the three doctrines and, more importantly, the changing context of US defence policy.

**7. Assess the contribution of the US to the development of the international economy in the period 1945-80.**

The main US contribution was provided by its economy, especially in the immediate postwar era, when it was by far the largest national economy in the world in the immediate postwar era. It provided a great stimulus to the growth of the international economy through schemes such as the Marshall Plan and through its leadership of an international infrastructure, i.e. the World Bank, the IMF and GATT.

However there are two qualifications to this analysis. Firstly, the US economy became less central to international economic growth. From the mid-1960s, the US economy was starting to experience problems of its own, especially given the impact of the Vietnam war. Secondly, there were other reasons for the growth of the world economy, such as the transport revolution caused by containerisation.

FINAL MARK SCHEME : NOVEMBER 2002

---

**8. How far do you agree that, in the vast majority of cases, decolonisation gave the appearance but not the reality of independence?**

Ex-colonies could remain dependent upon the former ex-imperial power. They could become dependent upon other developed states, whether capitalist or communist, or on multilateral agencies such as the IMF. The latter could also include the (British) Commonwealth and the Francophone community.

Ex-colonies could be dependent on First World states for their material wellbeing, i.e. economic and financial support, for their political development and for their defence.

Many Asian states, from Singapore to India, were able to establish their independence. Most African states could not – and they became more dependent as their debts grew in the 1970s and 1980s.

Thus there is plenty to write about. However, candidates should be careful to concentrate on newly independent countries in particular rather than Third World states in general.

oo000oo

## 9697 HISTORY

---

### GENERIC MARKING BANDS FOR SOURCE-BASED QUESTIONS

<b>LEVEL 1</b>	<b>Writes about the hypothesis, no valid use of sources</b>	<b>[1-5]</b>
	[Use of source involves identification of a source by its letter or a direct quote in order to test the hypothesis. Using sources to write an essay on the topic is not source use.]	
<b>LEVEL 2</b>	<b>Uses information taken from the sources to challenge OR support the hypothesis</b>	<b>[6-8]</b>
<b>LEVEL 3</b>	<b>Uses information taken from the sources to challenge AND support the hypothesis</b>	<b>[9-13]</b>
<b>LEVEL 4</b>	<b>By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to challenge OR support the hypothesis</b>	<b>[14-16]</b>
<b>LEVEL 5</b>	<b>By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to challenge AND support the hypothesis</b>	<b>[17-21]</b>
<b>LEVEL 6</b>	<b>As L5 PLUS:</b>	<b>[22-25]</b>
	<i>Either</i> explains why evidence to challenge or to support the hypothesis is better/preferred (i.e. a comparative judgement on why some evidence is better and other evidence is worse);	
	<i>Or</i> reconciles explains problems in the evidence to show that neither challenge nor support is to be preferred.	

---

**NOTE:**

In Levels 2-5 the mark awarded will reflect the number of sources used at that level.

Attempts at evaluation which rely on comments about source type and make no use of source content will not achieve Levels 4-6.

---

**GENERIC MARKING BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS**

Examiners will assess which marking band best reflects the quality of the answer. They should not expect answers to show all the qualities included within the band description. The choice of mark within the band will depend on the quality of the analysis and the amount of supporting information. Essays in bands 1-3 will clearly be question-focused, whereas answers in lower bands will show a primary concern with the topic rather than with the question asked. However a question focus is not sufficient in itself to place an essay in bands 1-3; this must also be accompanied by sufficient accurate, relevant supporting material.

<b>BAND</b>	<b>MARKS</b>	<b>QUALITY OF THE ANSWER</b>
1	21-25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must achieve 25 marks.
2	18-20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided. The writing will be mostly accurate.
3	16-17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and constitute a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily narrative or descriptive passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance or depth of factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing will be generally accurate.
4	14-15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly, though often only implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions or conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing will usually be accurate.
5	11-13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the demands of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced. The writing may show some accuracy but there will also be frequent errors.
6	8-10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries which lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question. The writing will show significant weaknesses.
7	0-7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or by arguments which do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. The writing will show very insignificant weakness. Marks at the bottom of the band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.