MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper

for the guidance of teachers

9697 HISTORY

9697/33 Paper 3, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

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.

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 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 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 organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little 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.

SECTION A

1 **Source-based question: THE UNITED NATIONS AND COLLECTIVE SECURITY;** *'The adoption of peacekeeping marked the UN's abandonment of the concept of collective security.' How far do Sources A-E support this view?*

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

These answers will write about the UN and collective security and might use the sources. However, candidates will not use the sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. If sources are used, it will be to support an 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.

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 disprove it. However, sources are still used only at face value.

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.

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).

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.

Please note:
Y   supports the hypothesis
N   against the hypothesis
Neutral neither supports nor opposes hypothesis

CONTEXT

At its birth in 1945, the UN adopted the principle of collective security. However, the development of a Security Council was intended as a refinement which would enhance the UN's authority. This was based on the assumption that the Great Powers would share common goals and attitudes. It quickly became apparent that this was not the case. The start of the Cold War, together with the power of veto, meant that the Security Council was effectively gridlocked. Decolonisation rapidly added a further dimension to the UN which had not been envisaged at its creation – many new members and a host of intra-state rivalries which became potential Cold War issues. The UN's powers were severely restricted by the inability of the Security Council to act and the lack of genuine authority residing in the General Assembly. Peacekeeping developed as a method of attempting to cope with these factors, enabling the UN to deal with the changed situation in the world. Men such as Dag Hammarskjold (Secretary-General), Lester Pearson (Canadian Foreign Minister) and Brian Urquhart (Under-Secretary General) were responsible for developing the new concept of peacekeeping. Given the inability of the Security Council and the General Assembly to work effectively, this meant that more power fell to the Secretary-General. This was to cause significant problems. For instance the USSR believed that Dag Hammarskjold was pro-western and anti-Soviet, and did everything it could to have him replaced, having already forced the resignation of his predecessor after disagreements over the UN's role in Korea. Korea was one of only two occasions when the UN acted in the collective security mode as originally intended (the other was the Persian Gulf in 1990), and this was only possible because the USSR was not present in the Security Council and was unable to exercise its right of veto. The concept of peacekeeping is not mentioned in the Charter and has no explicit authorisation. It relies on the consent of the parties involved and the willingness of member nations to provide forces and funding. This is different from the original concept of collective security outlined in Chapter 7 of the Charter, which gave the Security Council powers to compel UN member states to supply forces for any collective measures which it endorsed.

SOURCE A
Context: Speech by the US Permanent Representative to the UN to the US Foreign Affairs Committee in 1993. The speech was made at a time when, with the Cold War recently ended, there were renewed hopes regarding the future effectiveness of the UN. American attitudes towards the UN had fluctuated wildly since 1945, many seeing it as an irrelevance and some as a threat to US interests. With the USSR no more, many Americans now saw the UN as affording the opportunity for the USA to reinforce its place as the world's leading nation.

Content (Face Value): The speaker sees peacekeeping as a form of collective security; '*the idea of collective security was kept alive during the Cold War by the evolution of … UN peacekeeping*'; '*four decades of UN peacekeeping are now guiding us into a new era of collective security.*' (**N – sees peacekeeping as a new form of collective security.**)

Content (Beyond Face Value): Sees peacekeeping as a new form of collective security, with member states working together to maintain international peace and security. (**N**). The original concept of collective security as envisaged in the Charter could not operate because of the Cold War and the failure of the Security Council to reach agreement (*X-Ref with Sources B and D*). Peacekeeping is neither defined nor authorised in the Charter. This is from a speech by a politician who is closely associated with the UN and who is keen to show that it can operate effectively. The tone of the speech suggests that the speaker is trying to convince the audience (senior American politicians), implying that some US politicians were not convinced that the UN still had a role to play in the world. By 1993 the USA had developed other methods of collective security outside the UN (e.g.

NATO). (*X-Ref with Source* B). The date of the speech is significant – the USSR had recently collapsed and the Cold War was effectively over; this gave new hope that the UN could perform the role originally intended for it in terms of ensuring future peace and security for the world. (**N, but the speaker has a vested interest in showing the continued relevance of the UN in the post-Cold War world. She is trying to show that peacekeeping is effective and has a legal basis in that it is implicitly authorised by the Charter's focus on collective security.**)

SOURCE B
Context: The views of a British historian with access to evidence covering 60 years of the UN's activities.

Content (Face Value): The writer claims that collective security was '*destroyed*' by the Cold War and the use of one veto in the Security Council. As a result the Great Powers sought collective security outside the UN (through NATO and the Warsaw Pact). The writer argues that peacekeeping was something entirely new and developed largely because of decolonisation. The original idea of collective security was based on the might of the Great Powers, whereas peacekeeping is dependent on police-type forces provided by non-major powers. (**Y – peacekeeping is totally different from collective security which survived, but only outside the UN.**)

Content (Beyond Face Value): Secondary source from the perspective of a historian with access to evidence from 60 years of UN history. Unlike Source A, which sees peacekeeping as an evolution from the original concept of collective security, Source B sees peacekeeping as entirely different (*X-Ref with Source A*). He claims that collective security survived only outside the UN through NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Instead, the UN concentrated on dealing with the impact of decolonisation; the large number of new nations represented in the UN and the intra-state rivalries which became the focus of the globalisation of the Cold War (e.g. Korea, Vietnam). The original idea of collective security was based on the might of the Great Powers, whereas peacekeeping is dependent on police-type forces provided by non-major powers. (**Y – peacekeeping is totally different from collective security which survived, but only outside the UN.**) Conversely, the hypothesis implies that the UN abandoned collective security when it adopted peacekeeping; Source B does not state this, merely that it became inoperative due to the Cold War and the veto (*X-Ref with A and D*). Nor does it imply that peacekeeping was a replacement for collective security (quite the reverse; it argues that peacekeeping was developed to deal with an entirely new situation caused by decolonisation). (**N – the UN did not adopt peacekeeping because collective security failed, but to address a completely new and unforeseen problem.**)

SOURCE C
Context: Secondary source from an Indian academic, focusing on the UN's role in maintaining peace and security, in 2006.

Content (Face Value): The writer claims that peacekeeping is entirely different from collective security. Peacekeeping relies on the consent of the parties involved, while collective security relies on force. The statement that '*peacekeeping evolved as a second-best substitute for a non-obtainable collective security system*' agrees with the hypothesis. (**Y – the UN devised peacekeeping because collective security did not work.**)

Content (Beyond Face Value): The writer agrees with Source A and disagrees with Source B (*X-Ref with A and B*) in claiming that peacekeeping evolved because collective security could not be employed. The writer quotes a senior UN figure to add weight to the argument. Whereas collective security was based on force (Chapter 7 of the UN Charter gives the Security Council the right to compel UN member states to provide armed forces so that measures could be taken against rogue states), peacekeeping is based on the voluntary consent of the parties involved and those states supplying contingents and financial backing. Urquhart makes it clear that this voluntary element makes peacekeeping successful. (**Y – the UN devised peacekeeping, which is different from the concept of collective security, because collective security did not work.**)

SOURCE D
Context: Secondary source from a Swiss academic in 2008.

Content (Face Value): The writer argues that the Cold War prevented the UN from carrying out the functions originally intended in the Charter because of splits in the Security Council. However, peacekeeping is viewed as '*another collective security instrument*'. (**N – peacekeeping is seen as a type of collective security rather than a replacement for it.**) However, the source also states that some people see peacekeeping as a '*substitute for the deficient collective security system*', implying that it is something different. (**Y – some people believe that peacekeeping was a replacement for an ineffective collective security system.**)

Content (Beyond Face Value): The writer agrees with Sources A and B that the Cold War made it impossible for the Security Council to reach consensus and that the UN was not able to operate in the collective security model originally envisaged (*X-ref with A and B*). In terms of the hypothesis, Source C is at best balanced, at worst contradictory. Initially, it states that peacekeeping was '*another collective security instrument*' (**N**), but subsequently states that some view peacekeeping as a '*substitute for the deficient collective security system*' (**Y**). This apparent contradiction can be explained by the fact that peacekeeping was a '*truly ad-hoc instrument*' with no explicit definition or authorisation in the Charter (*X-ref with A and E*). The writer is more concerned with demonstrating that the UN was able to serve a valid function, despite the problems associated with the Cold War, than with analysing the differences between collective security and peacekeeping. By demonstrating the widespread nature of peacekeeping missions, the source agrees with Source A regarding the effectiveness of peacekeeping in urging UN member states to work collectively in the interests of peace and security (*X-Ref with A*).

SOURCE E
Context: Secondary source published by the Turkish Ministry of Justice in 2008.

Content (Face Value): The source states that '*peacekeeping operations were built up by the UN after the failure of the collective security system.*' (**Y – peacekeeping was a replacement for an inoperable collective security system.**)

Content (Beyond Face Value): The writer states that peacekeeping started when the collective security system failed (**Y**). However, it is written from a legal point of view and focuses on legal issues relating to UN peacekeeping. It states that peacekeeping is neither defined nor authorised in the Charter (*X-ref with Source A*) – peacekeeping goes further than the peaceful resolution discussed in Chapter 6, but not as far as the enforcement power discussed in Chapter 7. The writer claims that, while this causes some problems for peacekeeping operations, it is also an advantage because it gives the UN flexibility to deploy peacekeeping missions in a wide variety of situations (*X-Ref with Source B's views on decolonisation, Source C on the fact that it is the voluntary nature of peacekeeping which enables it to be successful in many instances and Source D to demonstrate its widespread deployment*). The writer also states that some observers believe that peacekeeping is effectively authorised by Article 1 of the Charter, which states that the main purpose of the UN is '*to*

maintain international peace and security, and to take effective **collective security** *measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace*'. Under this definition, peacekeeping is viewed as a form of collective security, albeit different from that envisaged in 1945 (*X-Ref with Sources A and D*). (**N – peacekeeping is simply another form of collective security rather than a replacement of it.**)

CONCLUSION

The concept of collective security as outlined in the UN Charter envisaged a situation in which threats to the peace were dealt with initially under Chapter 6 (with attempts to bring the problem to a peaceful resolution) and, if these measures failed, under Chapter 7 (the use of force; the UN would deploy forces which member states would have to provide). Chapter 7 activities would be orchestrated by the Security Council. The onset of the Cold War and the frequent use of the veto made this system inoperable. It could be argued that peacekeeping evolved as a response to this problem – it gave greater powers to the UN Secretary-General to compensate for a gridlocked Security Council and a weak General Assembly.

However, as Source B suggests, peacekeeping also evolved because of changing circumstances caused by rapid post-war decolonisation. It was not simply a replacement for an inoperable collective security system, but a necessary development to address a new problem. In this sense, peacekeeping is a new form of collective security, since it involves members of the UN working together in an attempt to maintain peace (as shown in Sources A and E).

SECTION B

2   **'The Second World War left the Soviet Union devastated and insecure.' To what extent does this explain the development of the Cold War in Europe between 1945 and 1949?**

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the USSR suffered enormous losses in WWII and had been attacked from the West on previous occasions. Stalin's paranoia about security was perhaps not entirely surprising, and explains his desire to keep Germany weak and his determination to create a 'buffer zone' in Eastern Europe. The USA under Truman misinterpreted Stalin's actions as expansionism, and therefore instituted the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as methods to contain communism.

In challenging the hypothesis, the 'traditional/orthodox' view suggests that the USSR was expansionist, as shown by Stalin's statements regarding world-wide communist revolution and by recently available sources from the USSR (the 'post post-revisionist' view). Confronted with such aggression, Truman had no alternative but to take measures to resist it. Alternatively, it could be argued that the Cold War developed because of Truman's determination to avoid isolationism in the future and his desire to secure and expand US interests (especially economic). Truman's strongly anti-communist policies and actions could be viewed as aggressive and the reason why the Cold War developed.

3 **'That both superpowers had expansionist ambitions is confirmed by the globalisation of the Cold War between 1950 and 1980.' How far do you agree?**

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the USSR had expansionist ambitions, as evidenced by Stalin's statements regarding world revolution (a view shared by Khrushchev), Soviet support for the communist take-over in China and Soviet involvement in Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa and the Middle East. Similarly, American involvement in regional issues could be seen as evidence of the USA's determination to secure and expand her own economic, military, diplomatic and strategic influence. American support for unpopular and undemocratic regimes in many countries, together with illicit CIA activities across the globe, could be cited as further evidence.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that the globalisation of the Cold War occurred because of the USA's over-reaction to what it incorrectly perceived as a Soviet attempt to spread world-wide communist revolution. Such fears were enhanced after the fall of China to communism in 1949; the USA saw the USSR and the PRC as forming a communist bloc which would pose a threat to American interests. The USA adopted containment, NSC-68, roll back, the domino theory and became directly involved in a series of regional conflicts, whose causes were more to do with post-colonial nationalism than communist world domination. Unwelcome American intervention often led such countries to seek help and support from the USSR, thus spreading the Cold War. Therefore, globalisation occurred not because of the expansionist ambitions of the superpowers, but because of fear and the need for the USA and the USSR to maintain their respective political, economic and strategic interests.

4 **'President Johnson's decision to increase American military involvement in Vietnam was a disastrous error of judgement.' How far do you agree?**

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that the US war in Vietnam is often referred to as Johnson's War. Following the Gulf of Tonkin incident and Resolution of 1964, Johnson's decision to send combat troops to Vietnam committed the USA to a war which could not be won. US troop levels in Vietnam rose to 565 000 by 1968 and the USA embarked on bombing raids on North Vietnam which was seen to be supporting the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. Unlike in Korea, where the USA was operating under the auspices of the UN, American actions in Vietnam were widely condemned across the world and by public opinion at home.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that Johnson inherited a 'no-win' situation in Vietnam. He faced a stark choice – either he had to back down (with the inevitable political consequences in the USA and terrible damage to US prestige around the world), or he had to continue the containment policies pursued by Eisenhower and Kennedy (which would mean escalating US involvement in the war). Kennedy's decision to increase the number of military advisers, his covert actions in Laos and the assassination of Diem in November 1963 all added to Johnson's dilemma. At the time, American fears of a world-wide communist plot were genuine, and public opinion remained staunchly anti-communist.

5 'A ruthless leader and an opponent of fundamental reform.' How fair is this assessment of Deng XiaoPing?

In support of the hypothesis it could be argued that Deng's resolute and ruthless leadership enabled the PRC to survive the crisis of communism in the 1980s. He refused political reform, maintaining control of the CCP by balancing the various factions within it. For instance he replaced the reformer Hu Yao Bang with Zhao Zi Yang and later supported the hard-liner Li Peng. He maintained control of the army and was ruthless in using it to disperse demonstrations such as that in Tiananmen Square in 1989. Despite international criticism, he remained steadfastly convinced that one-party control was needed in China.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that, while he was unquestionably ruthless, Deng was not averse to reform, as shown by his reversal of the Cultural Revolution and his move towards 'market socialism'. He granted greater religious freedom, greater freedom for intellectuals and the Democracy Wall. However, whereas Gorbachev believed that it was impossible to have economic reform without political reform, Deng believed that 'market socialism' could only be achieved through one-party control. When it became clear that his 'Four Modernisations' were encouraging calls for greater freedom and democracy, he was ruthless in suppressing them.

6 How fair is the view that no substantial progress had been made in attempts to control nuclear weapons by 1989?

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that, despite various meetings and treaties, there was a constant build up of nuclear arms by both the USA and the USSR, while other countries (UK, France, China) gained nuclear capability. The USSR's development of the atomic bomb in 1949 led the USA to vastly increase its own expenditure on arms (massive retaliation). By 1953, both superpowers had developed hydrogen bombs. Even the move to Mutually Assured Destruction after 1962 failed to impose an effective restriction on the development of nuclear arms, seen in the development of ICBM, SLBM, ABM and MIRV. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963 was limited in its scope and almost impossible to monitor, while the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 was never endorsed by India, Pakistan and Israel. The SALT Treaties were limited in scope and SALT II was never ratified due to Soviet activity in Afghanistan. Real progress was not made until the START Treaties after 1989.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that attempts to control nuclear weapons did have some success. The Test Ban Treaties made it harder for non-nuclear states to develop nuclear capability, while the NNPT limited the proliferation of nuclear weapons, with only a relatively small number of countries failing to honour it. While limited in scope, the SALT Treaties did impose restrictions on certain types of nuclear weapons and could be seen as a vital precursor to more effective treaties (e.g. START). The effectiveness of attempts to control nuclear weapons was clearly enhanced during periods of detente (1970s).

7 Assess the importance of free trade to the international economy between 1945 and 1980.

In showing the importance of free trade, it could be argued that a general liberalisation of trade arrangements after 1945 greatly assisted the development of the international economy. This can be seen in the work of GATT and the WTO. Regional examples of free trade arrangements could include the EU and NAFTA, while preferential trade agreements (such as GSP to assist developing countries) also had an impact.

In contrast, it could be argued that protectionism was also important; examples might include the policies which helped to create the Japanese economic miracle and the EU, which might be regarded as a protectionist bloc. It could also be argued that other factors were far more important to the international economy than free trade, e.g. technological developments, the role of governments, the importance of the US economy.

8 **'From 1964 to 1991, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) achieved a great deal for developing countries.' How far do you agree?**

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that UNCTAD has provided a forum for inter-governmental discussions, undertaken research, policy analysis and data collection and provided technical support to the specific requirements of developing nations. UNCTAD has addressed its aims, which are to 'maximise the trade, investment and development opportunities of developing countries and assist them in their efforts to integrate into the world's economy on an equitable basis'. Arguably, UNCTAD's greatest achievement was the agreement on Generalised System of Preferences (GSP) in 1971. This aided developing countries' exports to the extent of $70 billion through receiving preferential treatment in developed markets. Similarly, UNCTAD was responsible for successfully negotiating the Global System of Trade Preferences in 1989, a scheme of preferential tariffs among developing countries. In 1980, UNCTAD successfully pushed for the adoption of the Set of Multilaterally Agreed Principles for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices. UNCTAD has also negotiated International Commodity Agreements (e.g. for cocoa, sugar, jute).

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that UNCTAD is far too bureaucratic, some even interpreting is as 'Under No Circumstances Take Any Decisions'. Wealthy countries resent UNCTAD's attempts to become a negotiating forum, arguing that in doing so it merely replicates the work of other bodies, such as the WTO. They also resent UNCTAD's criticisms of existing institutions (e.g. GATT, IMF), which UNCTAD feels are not organised to handle the particular problems and needs of developing countries. Rich countries have tried to curb UNCTAD's role and treat it with increasing indifference. UNCTAD's failure is a reflection of the on-going North-South divide.