

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper**  
**for the guidance of teachers**

**9697 HISTORY**

**9697/33**

Paper 3 (International History, 1945–1991),  
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 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

### 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.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Levels of Response</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 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 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. 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

## SECTION A

### 1 Source-based question: THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (UNHCR)

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

These answers will write about the work of UNHCR 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.

*e.g.* – *UNHCR was established to help people who had become refugees at the end of the Second World War, and still looks after refugees today.*

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.* – *Source B clearly shows that UNHCR has adapted effectively to the ever-increasing numbers of refugees, such as Algerians in 1962, Bangladeshis in 1972 and Nicaraguans in 1979.*

**OR** *Source E shows that UNHCR has failed to adapt to the changing nature of refugee crises by demonstrating how it has been unable to keep control of strategies for helping refugees in places such as Pakistan.*

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.

*e.g.* – *Source B shows that UNHCR has adapted effectively by greatly increasing its budget and expanding its operations successfully throughout the world. However, Source C suggests that UNHCR personnel are inadequately trained and resourced to cope with the complicated situations in which they find themselves, thus suggesting that UNHCR has not adapted sufficiently to cope with the changing circumstances of refugees.*

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.* – *Source B clearly shows that UNHCR has enjoyed considerable success in assisting refugees throughout the world, and that this success has been recognised with the award of two Nobel Peace Prizes. However, the Source is from a UN publication, which would clearly highlight only the success of UNHCR and ignore its failings. OR Source C clearly implies that UNHCR has failed to adapt to the needs of modern refugee problems and that it is often out of its depth in dealing with politically sensitive situations. However, it should be noted that UNHCR's actions are limited by its mandate and the need for funding – it cannot operate without the permission of host countries and cannot afford to displease countries contributing to its budget.*

**[NB – no credit should be given at this level for unsupported assertions regarding source provenance: e.g. statements such as *Source D is unreliable because it is biased* – evidence/examples are required to substantiate such points.]**

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

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. – both of the examples in L4.

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.

e.g. – with the exception of Source C, all of the Sources are produced either directly or indirectly by the UN, which has a vested interest in demonstrating the effectiveness of UNHCR. Source C is, therefore, likely to be more objective than the other sources and also has the value of having been written in 2001, allowing it to review 50 years of UNHCR activity.

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. – a revised hypothesis might be that UNHCR has continued to perform its humanitarian mandate despite being confronted with complex political and economic situations, and despite inconsistent support from UN member states, which often put their own interests first.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

### Guidance on specific sources

[Y] supports the hypothesis

[N] does not support the hypothesis

### SOURCE A:

#### Description:

- primary internal UNHCR document, 1973

#### Level 2/3:

- does not address the issue of whether UNHCR has been successful in dealing with the needs of refugees [NEUTRAL]

#### Level 4/5:

- internal memo; not originally intended for public consumption; thus likely to be reliable
- shows that UNHCR had to work with the approval of host countries; this could put UNHCR in a difficult position [N]
- Cross-referencing:
  - with Source C – UNHCR at the mercy of host nations [N]
  - with Source D – UNHCR must not alienate national authorities of countries it is working with [N]
  - with Source E – UNHCR had to allow Pakistan Government to keep control over activities [N]

#### Contextual Knowledge:

- UNHCR had to balance the need to assist refugees with the cardinal rule of keeping out of politics (for fear of exacerbating problems) – need to work in close cooperation with host nations
- UNHCR funding dependent upon the support of rich nations

### SOURCE B:

#### Description:

- 1981 – UN publication
- press release by UN so more likely to praise than to criticise UNHCR activities

#### Level 2/3:

- UNHCR successful in helping large numbers of refugees across the whole world [Y]
- UNHCR achievements recognised by award of 2 Nobel Peace Prizes [Y]

#### Level 4/5:

- Nobel Prizes awarded in 1954 and 1981 – the world's refugee problem had changed greatly in those 30 years, yet UNHCR still successful [Y]
- recognises that UNHCR working in contentious circumstances, yet seen as serving the interests of peace [Y]
- definition of 'refugee' had not changed between 1950 and 1981 – yet the nature of the world's refugee problem had changed greatly; implies UNHCR not adapting [N]
- shows how the numbers of refugees had increased (2.2 – 10 mill) but does not give details of UNHCR budget or number of personnel in 1981 – possibly implies that the budget and staff have not increased in line with the problem [N]
- UN source – bound to highlight successes and ignore failures [N]

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

- UN successful up to 1981, but source cannot comment on later situations, even before 1981 UNHCR was 'struggling to provide' for refugees [N]
- Cross-referencing:
  - contrast with C, D and E which imply that UNHCR is not always as successful as B suggests [Y]

**Contextual Knowledge:**

- changing nature of the refugee problem – originally Cold War refugees from Eastern Europe (willingly accepted by Western countries); now refugees from civil wars due to de-colonialisation etc., not always welcome in other countries therefore UNHCR confronted with the problem of what to do with large numbers of refugees
- refugees had become a world-wide problem

**SOURCE C:**

**Description:**

- 2001 – secondary source from a 'pressure-group' publication
- clearly concerned by the plight of refugees; critical of UNHCR for not being able to deal effectively with the refugee problem

**Level 2/3:**

- UNHCR hindered by its mandate, limits the action it can take in support of refugees [N]
- UNHCR staff ill-trained and ill-equipped to deal with situations they find themselves in [N]

**Level 4/5:**

- attitude of countries is not always supportive of UNHCR – self-interest of host and donor governments - not UNHCR's fault, but perhaps indicative of the need for a change in its mandate [N]
- UNHCR is under-resourced [N]
- despite its cardinal rule, UNHCR is a political body, whose actions are controlled by host and donor governments, not always in the best interests of refugees [N]
- nature of the publication in which the article appears suggests that it has a vested interest in showing how UNHCR is no longer coping with the needs of refugees
- Cross-referencing:
  - with A, D and E to show that UNHCR has to work in cooperation with host countries
  - with D to show that UNHCR cannot afford to upset governments which provide it with funds
  - contrast with B, which implies that UNHCR has adapted successfully in the interests of refugees
  - contrast with D, which suggests that UNHCR has gone beyond its mandate in the interests of refugees

**Contextual Knowledge:**

- UNHCR has been accused of political bias – e.g. pro Western during the Cold War era
- perhaps inevitable, given that most of its resources were provided by Western governments
- UNHCR unable to assist various groups of refugees due to the opposition of major states e.g. USA turning away Haitian and Cuban 'boat people' in 1981 and 1994 respectively without analysing their rights to asylum, breaching the 1951 statute - UNHCR objections to this have been ignored, showing that it lacks authority

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

## SOURCE D:

### Description:

- 2007 – perspective of UNHCR work
- research project funded by UNHCR – might be expected to say positive things only about UNHCR work

### Level 2/3:

- UNHCR has had to face difficult situations but has always tried to help refugees (even going beyond its mandate on occasions) [Y]
- refugee problems can appear suddenly, so UNHCR has to react quickly
- UNHCR's work is complicated by difficult political situations [Y]

### Level 4/5:

- nature of the refugee problem changed in the 1960s – UNHCR now confronted with very complicated situations for which it was not originally set up [N]
- UNHCR has often gone beyond its mandate in order to help refugees [Y]
- UNHCR has to cooperate with host and donor countries – need for a better system of funding and clearer mandate for action on behalf of refugees [N]
- UNHCR actions often exploited by others – e.g. militarisation of refugee camps. It could be argued that this is not UNHCR's fault [Y] or it could be used as a reason why reform of UNHCR mandate and authority is urgently needed [N]
- source talks about the problems which UNHCR has to face, but gives no examples of how UNHCR has handled these and no examples of success [N]
- being a UNHCR-funded source, it might be trying to make excuses for UNHCR failure to provide better assistance to refugees
- Cross-referencing:
  - with A, C and E to show that UNHCR needs to cooperate with host and donor countries
  - with E to show how refugee camps can be exploited by others
  - contrast with B, which shows that UNHCR is successful

### Contextual Knowledge:

- claims that refugee camps are bases for terrorist activities are commonplace – e.g. Rwanda, Pakistan and Palestinian Refugee camps
- UNHCR remains constrained by political, financial and staffing issues

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

## SOURCE E:

### Description:

- 2008 – perspective of UNHCR work
- UNHCR publication – might be expected to say positive things only about UNHCR work

### Level 2/3:

- refugee problem has grown in scale and is now worldwide
- UNHCR has to provide humanitarian aid, without becoming involved in political, economic or military situations
- UNHCR has to allow host countries to control aid to refugees – would imply the need to enhance the authority of UNHCR in refugee situations [N]

### Level 4/5:

- UNHCR established to deal with small numbers of European refugees, now dealing with vast numbers of refugees worldwide – there is no evidence that it has adapted in order to cater for this [N]
- UNHCR is clearly failing to keep politics etc out of its actions – e.g. its refugee camps are being used by terrorists [N]
- government officials are using UNHCR as a cover for supporting freedom fighters – e.g. by saying that the presence of UNHCR proves that the freedom fighters are bona fide refugees – UNHCR is being exploited [Y] or UNHCR needs to adapt in order to ensure that this cannot happen [N]
- UNHCR source but gives no examples of UNHCR success in dealing with refugees; merely refers to the problems which it faces [N]
- Cross-referencing:
  - with B and D to show the growth in refugee problem
  - with A, C and D to show that UNHCR needs to cooperate with host and donor countries
  - with D to show how refugee camps can be exploited by others
  - contrast with B, which shows that UNHCR is successful

### Contextual Knowledge:

- with the increasing scale and complexity of refugee issues, many people believe that UNHCR needs a revised and updated mandate
- in this sense, UNHCR faces similar situation to that facing the UN in general



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

### Section B

#### 2 Consider the view that the USA was more responsible than the USSR for the outbreak and development of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949.

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes and early development of the Cold War in Europe, and to deploy this in order to address the validity of the hypothesis.

Candidates may refer to the historical debate regarding the causes of the Cold War, the hypothesis representing the 'revisionist' viewpoint.

- Arguments in support of the hypothesis might include:
  - the strongly anti-communist attitude of new President Truman
  - his deployment of the atomic bomb on Japan without prior consultation with the USSR
  - the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, 'dollar imperialism' etc.
- In order to achieve balance, candidates may discuss:
  - the 'traditional' viewpoint that Stalin's actions (e.g. the breaking of Potsdam promises, actions in Eastern Europe, Berlin Blockade) were the primary causes of the Cold War
- The 'post-revisionist' view that the Cold War was caused by misunderstandings between the super powers (e.g. USA failing to understand USSR's need for security from Western Europe; USSR's failure to understand USA's motives in wanting to secure a strong Germany) may also be mentioned.

#### 3 'The globalisation of the Cold War in the period between 1950 and 1975 was caused by the expansionist ambitions of the USSR.' How far do you agree?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the globalisation of the Cold War between 1950 and 1975, and to deploy this in order to address the validity of the hypothesis.

- Arguments in support of the hypothesis might include:
  - Stalin's overt statements regarding world revolution
  - Soviet support for the communist take-over in China
  - Soviet involvement in Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa and the Middle East
- In order to achieve balance:
  - candidates may argue that the Cold War was globalised because of the USA's over-reaction to what it incorrectly perceived as a Soviet attempt to encourage world-wide revolution
  - this led to containment, roll back and the domino theory
  - USA's actions in Korea, Vietnam, South East Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East could be cited as evidence to substantiate this point

It could be argued that the USA and the USSR share equal responsibility for becoming involved in essentially regional conflicts for their own strategic, diplomatic or prestige reasons.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>33</b>

#### **4 Why did the USA become directly involved in the Korean War when the USSR did not?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the Korean War, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the reasons for the different levels of involvement of the USA and USSR respectively.

Candidates may argue:

- The USA
  - that the USA became directly involved in the Korean War as part of its containment policy (although Korea was not in Acheson's original defensive perimeter)
  - Truman was convinced that the USSR was behind the North Korean attack on South Korea, and was afraid of repeating the error of appeasing Hitler
  - Truman was facing domestic anti-communist public pressure made worse by the fall of China to communism
  - Truman also wanted to support the United Nations
  
- The USSR
  - did not want to come into direct confrontation with the USA, not averse to using the Korean situation for political advantage and to strengthen its own position in the Pacific
  - USSR supplied weapons and military advisers to North Korea
  - Stalin gave permission to Kim Il Sung to mount the attack on South Korea
  - Stalin was quick to distance himself from this attack once the USA became involved

Candidates may also mention the significance of China's involvement.

#### **5 To what extent did the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 make the collapse of the USSR unavoidable?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the collapse of the USSR, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the relative significance of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe.

- In support of the view that the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe made the collapse of the USSR inevitable, candidates may mention:
  - the speed with which changes occurred throughout Eastern Europe following the success of Solidarity in Poland in 1988
  - communist governments were quickly removed in Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania
  - nationalist uprisings soon followed within the Soviet Union itself (e.g. Nagorno-Karabach, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia)
  
- However, it could be argued that events in Eastern Europe were a symptom rather than a cause of the collapse of the USSR:
  - Gorbachev's abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine meant that uprisings went unchallenged
  - his glasnost and perestroika reforms failed to solve the massive economic problems facing the USSR and encouraged nationalism and anti-communist sentiments internally
  - external pressures from the USA (with SDI etc) added to the insurmountable problems facing the USSR

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

**6 Which did more to control the growth of nuclear weapons – the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 or the SALT Treaties of the 1970s?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of attempts to control the growth of nuclear weapons in the 1960s and 1970s, and to deploy this in order to engage in comparative analysis in order to evaluate the impact of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the SALT Treaties respectively.

- The Non-Proliferation Treaty:
  - aimed to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons outside those countries already in possession of them
  - nuclear states would assist non-nuclear states in the development of civilian nuclear power and agreed to make their best efforts to agree on measures of nuclear disarmament
  - largely effective, but France refused to sign the Treaty, and by 1991 both Israel and South Africa had developed nuclear weapons, whilst India and Pakistan were developing capacity for them
  - (more recently, North Korea has withdrawn from the Treaty and Iran (a signatory) has made progress on its nuclear programme)
- SALT Treaties:
  - limited the development of ABMs
  - did not halt the nuclear arms race (e.g. USSR – SS20; USA – Pershing II and Cruise)
  - SALT II never ratified by USA because of USSR's involvement in Afghanistan
  - since USA and USSR had the largest nuclear weapon arsenals, SALT Treaties did limit the number of nuclear weapons more than NPT
  - SALT Treaties can be seen as a vital precursor of subsequent START talks

**7 'Japan's 'economic miracle' was primarily a consequence of favourable domestic policies and practices.' How far do you agree?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the major economic growth of Japan, especially during the 1970s and 1980s, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the relative significance of internal causal factors.

- Arguments in support of the hypothesis might include:
  - the fact that the Liberal Democratic Party provided stable government throughout the period from 1952 to 1993
  - conservative in nature, it encouraged business practice, reformed land ownership and encouraged investment in industry
  - government initiatives included a scheme in 1960 aimed at doubling incomes within ten years
- Arguments which challenge the hypothesis are likely to concentrate on favourable external factors;
  - for example – support from the USA, which saw Japan as a bulwark against communism in South East Asia
  - favourable trading arrangements with USA; with USA providing security, Japan could concentrate on industrial investment
  - Korean War provided enhanced markets for Japanese products
  - the fact that much of Japan's industry had been destroyed in WWII meant that it could rebuild with modern, high-tech equipment

Page 12	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2011	9697	33

## 8 Account for the rise and decline of OPEC in the 1970s and 1980s.

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding regarding OPEC, and to deploy this in order to explain why OPEC's fortunes fluctuated during the 1970s and 1980s.

- OPEC:
  - founded at the Baghdad Conference in 1960
  - a cartel aiming to limit oil supplies in the hope of keeping prices high
  - 1960s, OPEC was not able to achieve this because it had only 28% of the world's oil output, oil reserves belonged to multi-national companies, there was an oil glut and there were political divisions within the Arab world
  
- Rise in the 1970s:
  - was due to the fact that rising demand for oil began to outstrip supply
  - OPEC members reached new agreements with multi-national companies, which led to rise in oil prices
  - Arab states used oil as a political weapon during the 1970s war between Egypt and Israel
  - this increased the prices of oil still further
  - prices rose from \$3 a barrel to \$11.65
  - led to deep recession in world economy
  - Second Oil Shock followed the Iranian Revolution and the Iran-Iraq war; by 1980s prices had risen to \$36 a barrel
  
- Decline:
  - impact of the Second Oil Shock was short-lived
  - production by non-OPEC countries (e.g. Mexico, Britain, Norway) continued to increase
  - OPEC's share of world output fell by 27%
  - OPEC's largest producer, Saudi Arabia, saw its oil revenues drop from \$113.2 billion in 1981 to \$20 billion in 1986
  - OPEC had a stark choice – cut prices to regain markets or cut production to maintain price
  - OPEC did not want to cut prices for fear that this would undermine their whole pricing structure and destroy the economic and political gains they had made
  - However members did not show a united front – e.g. Saudi Arabia chose to reduce prices to regain market share