

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the June 2005 question papers

9697 HISTORY	
9697/03	Paper 3 (International History, 1945-1991), maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Grade thresholds for Syllabus 9697 (History) in the June 2005 examination.

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:		
		A	B	E
Component 3	100	72	66	43

The thresholds (minimum marks) for Grades C and D are normally set by dividing the mark range between the B and the E thresholds into three. For example, if the difference between the B and the E threshold is 24 marks, the C threshold is set 8 marks below the B threshold and the D threshold is set another 8 marks down. If dividing the interval by three results in a fraction of a mark, then the threshold is normally rounded down.

June 2005

GCE AS/A LEVEL

MARK SCHEME
MAXIMUM MARK: 100
SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/03 HISTORY Paper 3 (International History, 1945-1991)

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697	

www.PapaCambridge.com

Marking bands for source-based question

Section A The Role of the Secretary-General in the Suez Crisis November 1956.

1 Source-based question

L1 **Writes about the hypothesis, no valid use of sources** [1–5]

These answers will write about the UN and the end of the Suez crisis in November 1956 and might use the sources. However they will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. If sources are used, it will be to support a more general, essay-style answer to the question.

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.

Either Yes, it is true that the work of the UN Secretary-General was the most important reason why the Suez conflict was brought to an end in November 1956. Source B illustrates this point when it shows the ceasefire following the Secretary-General's submission to Britain and France of the details of the UNEF.

Or No, the Secretary-General's efforts were not the most important reason why the Suez conflict came to an end. You can tell this from Source A, which shows peacemaking moves being 'thrust upon Hammarskjöld'.

L3 **Uses information taken from the 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's efforts were the most important reason why the Suez Crisis came to an end in November 1956. If you think the evidence supports this view, then Source D helps you because it talks about the Secretary-General's 'remarkable feat of management'. However, Source C describes the Suez Crisis as 'the finest hour of the General Assembly' and mentions Hammarskjöld only briefly.

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.

Either I think it is true that Secretary-General's efforts did most to bring the Suez Crisis to an end. When you look at sources, such as Source C, which maintains that credit should go more to the General Assembly, you have to question its argument because it also praises the Secretary-General's staff for miracles of improvisation in organising the UNEF.

Or I don't think that the Secretary-General deserves the most credit. When you look at Source B, you question its argument because it is a biography of the Secretary-General written by one of his staff and cross referencing to Source E questions Source B's account of events on 6-7 November.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697	

www.PapaCambridge.com

L5 By interpreting/evaluating sources in context, finds evidence to challenge and support the hypothesis [17-20]

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, Source E is the only source which concentrates on the attitude of the superpowers, which contextual knowledge confirms is an important element in resolving any international dispute. Source E shows Hammarskjold responding to events but not causing the end of the Crisis. Source D shows that the move towards a UN-based solution was supported by the USA. Contextual knowledge supports this source; the USA would prefer not to be directly involved in taking action against Britain and France, its NATO allies. This suggests that Source E gives a reliable picture of the crisis.

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 Hammarskjold's efforts were an important reason why the Suez conflict came to an end. However, these were not the most important reasons. Three of the five sources make no reference to the role of the superpowers, which limits their reliability. These points can be argued through the different opinions/perceptions shown in the sources or by establishing different criteria for support/contradiction.

SECTION B

2 Which of the following has the best claim to mark the start of the Cold War: Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech, 1946; the Truman Doctrine, 1947; the Berlin Blockade, 1948-49? Explain your answer.

Note that the question asks which event marked the start of the Cold War and not which caused the Cold War. Many will overlook this distinction. Suggest maximum of Band 3 for those who focus wholly on the causes of the Cold War, however well done.

Answers should consider which event marked the end of the pre-war era and the start of the Cold War, which was a kind of boundary marker. The arguments for and against each being the 'turning point' need to be considered. This will involve bringing in other evidence from 1946-49: for example, did the superpowers keep talking after the event in question? And, ideally, some kind of definition of 'Cold War' is desirable in order to provide a framework for analysing the relative importance of the three events.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697	

Also note that candidates can provide an alternative only if they have provided convincing arguments why none of the three events properly mark the start of the Cold War.

3 Who or what was responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War?

The prime suspects will be the leaders of the superpowers, the USA and the USSR – and perhaps China. The USA's responsibility might be evident in NSC-68 (April 1950), which argued the need to counter Soviet 'design for world domination' and 'Soviet efforts ... now directed towards the domination of the Eurasian land mass'. With the North Korean invasion of South Korea occurring two months later, Truman ordered a massive expansion of US military power. Even before then, in 1949, the USA was intervening in South East Asia to contain the spread of communism in states such as Malaya and Indonesia. In the 1950s, the USA used the CIA to overthrow nationalist regimes in Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954) while Eisenhower and Dulles intervened in the settlement of Vietnam and, after the Suez crisis, in the Middle East.

The USSR's responsibility is harder to pinpoint, in part because the documentation is incomplete. Stalin was cautious, as evidence - his reluctance to support North Korea's attack on South Korea. Khrushchev was more reckless but still gained little support from Third World states. Cuba under Castro in 1961 was the first country to welcome Soviet support, thus leading to the Cuban missile crisis. From the mid 1950s, and especially after 1962, the Soviet navy was rapidly expanded in order to provide the USSR with a global reach it had hitherto lacked.

As for China, it tried to establish itself as leader of the Third World, especially after the Sino-Soviet split of 1960, which confirmed US fears about Communist expansionism.

Finally, the regional crises in many parts of the globe helped globalise the Cold War but only in that the USA, in particular, obsessed with the Communist threat, felt bound to intervene, e.g. Korea and Vietnam.

4 Assess the relative contributions of America and the Soviet Union to the outcome of the Vietnam War.

Many candidates will provide a narrative of the war from start to finish. Better answers will focus on the outcome of the war in 1975, on the unification of Vietnam, north and south, following the withdrawal of US military forces. Almost certainly, answers will be imbalanced, the role of the USA receiving much greater coverage.

Contributions are best considered under two main headings, military and political (including diplomacy), as follows:

Military: US: Mistaken strategies, for both land and air war, bombing North Vietnam and extending war to Cambodia and Laos, followed by ineffective policy of Vietnamisation.

USSR: Indirect military role, providing equipment, e.g. tanks.

Political: US: Paris peace process and 'triangular diplomacy' under Nixon.

USSR: Pressure on North Vietnam to come to the negotiating table.

The context of détente as developed by Nixon and Kissinger is important in understanding/explaining the outcome of the Vietnam War in the early and mid-1970s

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697	

www.PapaCambridge.com

5 How important was the West in the collapse of the USSR by 1991?

Note that the question asks about the West and not just the USA. And ‘collapse’ can be gradual, if finally quick. Thus it is possible to include Willi Brandt’s *Ostpolitik* of the 1970s because the consequent thaw in East-West relations undermined Soviet predominance in Eastern Europe, which in turn compounded its economic problems.

However, the main focus will be on the role of the USA and especially on the policies of President Reagan – though Bush Senior also merits consideration. Reagan policy had two distinct elements: initially hardline (until c1983) and then more conciliatory. The second stage encouraged (and was encouraged by) a similar approach by Gorbachev. Bush Senior’s role was to intensify the co-operation with Gorbachev. Some argue that in 1989-91 Gorbachev gave more attention to relations with the West than he did to his domestic situation, which in part explained his fall and the Soviet Union’s collapse.

Most candidates will give more time to the Soviet causes of the Soviet collapse: the deteriorating economy, CPSU division and disarray (e.g. the role of Yeltsin) and the growth of the nationalities problem. The better answers must link their analysis to the collapse of the USSR in 1991; too often they write about perestroika and glasnost as if these policies are a sufficient explanation for the disintegration of the USSR.

6 How successful were attempts to control the nuclear arms race between the superpowers in the period from 1960 to 1980?

The treaties on which all answers will be based are:

- Partial Test Ban Treaty 1963
- Non-Proliferation Treaty 1968 ;
- SALT I 1971 (and SALT II 1979, which though never ratified, was acted on)
- ABM Treaty 1972

Of the two dimensions of the nuclear arms, vertical (between the superpowers) and horizontal (including other great powers), the second is not strictly relevant. The key treaties are those signed in the 1970s.

Neither SALT nor the ABM Treaty stopped the nuclear arms race. They did not really slow it down. There was no limit on the number of missiles either power could build.

However, the treaties did control the race in that they brought to it a degree of order which had not existed before. The technological innovations of Multiple Independently-targeted Return Vehicles (MIRVs) and ABMs made it possible that one side might gain a significant advantage and thus launch a surprise attack on the other. SALT and ABM prevented this, ensured that both remained vulnerable, and thus embedded the doctrine of mutually assured destruction.

7 ‘By the 1980s, the American dominance of the international economy had almost disappeared.’ Discuss.

One point of discussions would be to argue that the USA lost its predominance in the 1970s rather than the 1980s. In 1972, in the Smithsonian Agreement, the USA abandoned fixed exchange rates which had been established by the Bretton Woods Agreement Act 1944. What then had been a dollar shortage had by the 1970s become a dollar surplus, a consequence of growing US trade deficits, the growth of the Eurodollar market and the economic resurgence of Japan and West Germany. The oil crisis of 1973 adversely affected the US economy and increased the relative decline of the US car and steel industries.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697	

Another perspective would be the argument that in the 1980s the USA remained dominant – or was recovering its dominance after a difficult decade or so. It was still the world's largest economy and the dollar remained the world's main trading currency. Through the IMF, it led the international response to the Third World debt crisis of the mid-1980s (though its policies had also part caused the crisis). The response might have done little to help Third World countries but that is marginal to the question. Leadership of the international economy still rested with the USA.

8 Why did Africa experience serious problems of famine in the 1980s?

For a combination of reasons, political and economic, historical and demographic. The famine was worst in sub-Saharan Africa and especially in Ethiopia and Somalia.

Political factors include new, inexperienced governments, often with ambitious plans for national development, which therefore neglected the basic needs of their populations.

Economic factors include the need to repay the international loans which had supported many of the governments' projects. In addition, international terms of trade moved against Third World countries in the early 1980s, as the developed world suffered a recession.

Historical factors include the prolonged, if low-intensity civil wars, caused by longstanding tribal conflicts and exacerbated by the ideological divisions of the Cold War era. This was most apparent in the Horn of Africa where Ethiopia and Somalia fought the Ogaden War at the end of the 1970s followed by the Ethiopian/Eritrean War in the 1980s.

The demographic cause of famine was the very rapid growth in population in preceding decades, which led to too many people who were grossly underemployed but still needed to be fed.

Plenty of factors for candidates to bring together, to analyse and to evaluate.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697

Generic mark bands for essay questions

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, Examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

In bands of 2 marks, Examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
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 very appropriate factual material and ideas. 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 be awarded 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 that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16-17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and 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 descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14-15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and 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 more organised more effectively.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – JUNE 2005	9697

5	11-13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements 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 particular 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.
6	8- 10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that 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.
7	0- 7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

www.PapaCambridge.com