

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9697 HISTORY**

**9697/32**

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 should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</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.

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.

<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.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Levels of Response</b>
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 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	32

## Section A

**1 Source-based question : THE DEATH OF UN SECRETARY-GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD: *How far do Sources A – E support the allegation that Britain was responsible for the death of UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld?***

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

These answers will write about the death of Dag Hammarskjöld 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.

**CONTEXT:** The Belgian Congo achieved independence in June 1960. Violence erupted almost immediately and the mineral-rich province of Katanga under Moïse Tshombe announced its independence from the Congolese government of Patrice Lumumba. The Belgians sent in troops to restore order, as if the Congo were still its colony. Lumumba asked the UN, and subsequently the USSR, for assistance in removing the Belgians and restoring Katanga to the Congo. Hammarskjöld

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	32

sent a UN peacekeeping force with the aim of restoring order and bringing Katanga back into the Congo. Hammarskjöld's pro-active approach was the first time that a UN Secretary-General had taken this kind of action and he was heavily criticised by the big powers. The USSR attacked him for not giving enough support to Lumumba (who was subsequently killed, with CIA involvement). The USA was concerned that communism was gaining too much power in Africa and supported Katangan independence. Britain and Belgium both had vested economic interests in Katanga, and were keen for it to remain independent. Hammarskjöld's determination to prevent further bloodshed led him to agree to meet Tshombe in Ndola (British Northern Rhodesia, now Zambia). Tshombe had refused to meet Hammarskjöld in the Congo and, allegedly, chose Ndola because the Rhodesians were sympathetic to the cause of Katangan independence. The plane carrying Hammarskjöld to Ndola crashed during the night of 17/18 September 1961. The initial Rhodesian inquiry blamed pilot error. Subsequent inquiries largely agreed with this assessment, but did not rule out the possibility of foul play. There have been countless conspiracy theories regarding the plane crash which killed Hammarskjöld, aided by the confusion which surrounds the available evidence. In the immediate aftermath of his death there was considerable criticism of Britain by the leaders of recently decolonised nations, many of whom openly alleged that Britain was responsible for it. However, no verifiable evidence has been found to prove that the plane crash was anything other than a tragic accident.

**SOURCE A:**

**Context:** Report by an American newspaper the day after the plane crash in which Hammarskjöld died.

**Content (Face Value):** Although the source claims that 'British diplomatic officials' had prompted the proposed meeting between Hammarskjöld and Tshombe, there is no suggestion that Britain held any responsibility for the plane crash which Killed Hammarskjöld. If the plane crash was the result of foul play, the source implies that Tshombe, who opposed the UN's attempt to restore Katanga to the control of the Congolese central government, might have been responsible. (**Hence N**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** This report was written in the immediate aftermath of the plane crash in which Hammarskjöld died and before there had been any inquiry into its cause. It is primarily informative rather than opinionated. There would have been considerable confusion at the time, as reflected in the statement that 'much concerning the crash remains inexplicable'. The source states that the Swedish owners of the plane were investigating the possibility that it was shot down by a Katangan jet. Tshombe clearly had a vested interest in opposing Hammarskjöld's attempt to restore Katanga to the Congo. However, no evidence is provided to support the view that the plane was shot down. The Swedish owners of the plane would clearly want to avoid claims that the crash was caused by a fault with their airliner or an error by their crew. Although the source does imply a degree of hypocrisy on Tshombe's part (regretting Hammarskjöld's death whilst earlier attacking his policies), its tone seems to dismiss the possibility that a Katangan jet was responsible (e.g. referring to the Katangan air force as 'tiny' and stating '**however** the crash apparently took place in darkness'. Although the source claims that 'British diplomatic officials' had prompted the proposed meeting between Hammarskjöld and Tshombe, there is no suggestion that Britain held any responsibility for the plane crash which Killed Hammarskjöld. (**Hence N**). The source does, however, confirm that, from the very beginning, there was speculation that the crash was not simply a tragic accident.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	32

### SOURCE B:

**Context:** Extract from an article in a British newspaper three days after the plane crash in which Hammarskjöld died. Many African and Indian newspapers made similar allegations regarding Britain's complicity in the death of Hammarskjöld. Such allegations were also made at this time by many African and Indian leaders.

**Content (Face Value):** The source quotes a Ghanaian newspaper which clearly believed that Britain was responsible for Hammarskjöld's death. The paper states that Britain arranged the meeting between Hammarskjöld and Tshombe in a place which suited the British 'murder plot'. (**Hence Y**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The source is from a British newspaper, three days after the plane crash which killed Hammarskjöld and before there had been any formal inquiry into its cause. It is clear that the initial reaction of many people to Hammarskjöld's death was that Britain was responsible for it – this is clear from the use of the word 'still' in the opening sentence. The Ghanaian Times was evidently not alone in making these allegations. Britain is seen as conspiring with Katanga and Rhodesia (still a British colony) to prevent Hammarskjöld from restoring Katanga to the Congo, a move which would have been detrimental for Britain's plan for decolonisation and her vested interests in Katanga (**X-Ref with D**). The Ghanaian Times accuses Britain of 'luring' Hammarskjöld to a meeting in Ndola, a location which Britain selected because it was the ideal place to carry out such an assassination. (**Hence Y**).

However, it should be noted that the article in the Ghanaian Times

- appeared very soon after Hammarskjöld's death and before there had been any inquiry into the causes of the crash
- provides no evidence to substantiate its claims
- gives two possible ways in which Hammarskjöld's plane was brought down – both are vague and unsubstantiated despite the use of the words 'must have'
- claims that Britain selected Ndola as the location for the meeting (**X-Ref with A, which suggests that Tshombe chose this location**)
- was written at a time when Britain's colonial policy was resented by many of the newly independent African states, which claimed that Britain was continuing to exploit Africa
- was written at a time of great emotion – Hammarskjöld was seen as the protector of the newly decolonised states against big power interference and his death was viewed as a great blow to them.

(**Hence N – the evidence is unreliable and unsubstantiated**).

The British newspaper makes no comment regarding the allegations made in the Ghanaian Times, other than quoting Britain's strong protest against these 'disgraceful allegations'. The fact that Britain protested could be seen as a sign of innocence. However, Britain would have had to protest even if the allegations were true – failure to do so would effectively be an admission of guilt.

### SOURCE C:

**Context:** From a British newspaper in 1998 following the discovery of potential new evidence.

**Content (Face Value):** Newly discovered evidence suggests that Hammarskjöld died as a result of a plot hatched by agents of the USA, Britain and South Africa. (**Hence Y – Britain had a direct involvement in arranging Hammarskjöld's death**). A retired senior UN official claimed that it would have been impossible for such a plot to sabotage Hammarskjöld's plane and the British Foreign Office denied involvement (**Hence N**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The allegation that Britain was directly involved in the death of Hammarskjöld (**X-Ref with B**) is given some substance by the discovery of letters in 1998. Archbishop Tutu, a highly respected statesman, clearly sees some importance in these letters which outline a plot to kill Hammarskjöld, orchestrated by the USA, Britain and South Africa. As shown in

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	32

Source D (**X-ref with D**), both the USA and Britain had a vested interest in preventing Hammarskjöld from returning Katanga to the Congo; hence, they had a motive to kill him which makes the evidence seem plausible (**Hence Y – evidence has been found linking Britain with a plot to kill Hammarskjöld. Both Britain and the USA had a motive for doing so**).

However –

- the newly discovered evidence may not be genuine. Archbishop Tutu himself admitted that their ‘veracity had not been proven’. [British officials subsequently claimed that the letters were forgeries, disinformation planted by the Soviet Union during the Cold War]
- why would it have taken so long for these letters to be discovered?
- the British Foreign Office clearly did not take the evidence seriously, as indicated by its rather flippant comment
- having a motive is no guarantee of guilt
- a very senior UN official (now retired, but someone who would be expected to have inside information) states that such a conspiracy was highly unlikely and, anyway, would not have had the opportunity to tamper with the plane on which Hammarskjöld travelled because of a last-minute change of plan.

(**Hence N – the newly discovered evidence is untrustworthy**).

#### SOURCE D:

**Context:** From an article in an Irish newspaper in 2011.

**Content (Face Value):** The source clearly shows that both the USA and Britain had a clear motive for preventing Hammarskjöld from continuing with his policies in the Congo. The implication is that Britain had a vested interest in killing Hammarskjöld. Even though this seems unlikely, ‘suspicions remain’ (**Hence Y**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** Even fifty years after Hammarskjöld’s death, there are still doubts about whether it was the result of a tragic accident or something more sinister. The source provides background information to explain why Hammarskjöld was meeting with Tshombe, and explains why both the USA and Britain were displeased with the policies which the UN was following under Hammarskjöld’s leadership. Both the USA and Britain are portrayed as exploiting the UN for their own ends and, therefore, resisting Hammarskjöld’s attempts to declare the UN’s independence. The source does not commit itself in the final sentence, stating that suggestions of a plot to kill Hammarskjöld ‘may seem far-fetched now but suspicions remain’. The source establishes a motive but provides no evidence to show how any such assassination might have been carried out. It is interesting that no mention is made of the ‘evidence’ described in Source C (**X-Ref with C**) (**Hence balanced – motive established; opportunity and method not established**).

#### SOURCE E:

**Context:** Letter to a periodical in 2011 from someone whose father was directly involved in the initial inquiry into the cause of the plane crash in which Hammarskjöld died.

**Content (Face Value):** The writer argues that the Rhodesian investigation into the cause of the plane crash was right to conclude that pilot error and not sabotage was to blame (**Hence N**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The outcome of a Rhodesian investigation into the causes of the plane crash might well be greeted with scepticism (**X-Ref with B, which implicates Rhodesia along with Britain and Katanga in Hammarskjöld’s death**). However, the writer’s father had been a UN observer at the Rhodesian investigation and, as such, might be expected to have been impartial. He clearly shared the investigation’s opinion that the crash was due to pilot error based on the evidence of landing gear being down, shallow descent and the problems of making a night-time landing. (**Hence N – an accident not sabotage**).

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

However, the writer

- would clearly want to protect her father's good name by justifying his views on the cause of the accident
- claims that 'conspiracy theorists' are responsible for the fact that doubts about the cause of Hammarskjöld's death remain even fifty years on. While this may be true, it would imply that there must be some confusion over the available evidence as a result of which such theorists can make their claims.

**(Hence N, but the evidence needs to be treated with some degree of scepticism).**

### **CONCLUSION:**

Hammarskjöld's death occurred at a highly volatile time; the Cold War, decolonisation, changes to the composition and power of the General Assembly relative to the Security Council within the UN, the role of the UN Secretary-General were all highly divisive issues. There was no shortage of powerful opponents to the direction in which Hammarskjöld was leading the UN. It is perhaps inevitable, therefore, that there was considerable speculation in 1961 about the real cause of the plane crash in which Hammarskjöld died. Even fifty years later researchers are still producing books and articles arguing that his death was the result of sabotage. However, no verifiable evidence has ever been forthcoming to prove categorically that the plane crash was anything other than a tragic accident. The initial Rhodesian investigation stated that the crash was the result of pilot error. Subsequent inquiries (by Swedish and UN teams) largely agreed with this conclusion, although stated, rather vaguely, that they could not rule out foul play. While Britain clearly had a motive to kill Hammarskjöld, the allegations are based on conjecture and speculation. However, as the Irish Times concluded – 'suspicions remain'.



Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	32

## Section B

- 2 **‘The main cause of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949 was Stalin’s determination that Germany would never again become a threat to the security of the Soviet Union.’ How far do you agree?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1949, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the validity of the hypothesis.

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that –

- The hypothesis reflects the revisionist interpretation of the causes of the Cold War.
- The initial post-war settlement divided Germany temporarily into four zones – this was always likely to become a divisive issue.
- Stalin was paranoid about the security of the Soviet Union and was desperate to ensure that it was never again attacked from the West.
- Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe, which the USA interpreted as aggressive and designed to ensure the spread of Soviet communist ideology, could be seen as defensive – developing a shield of satellite states to protect the USSR.
- Stalin was distrustful of American attempts to rebuild European economies; he viewed this as ‘dollar imperialism’ and feared the resurgence of European nations, particularly Germany.
- Stalin viewed the attempt to create a single currency in Western Germany as evidence of the USA’s determination to rebuild Germany; hence the Berlin Blockade.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that –

- The traditional interpretation argues that Stalin’s actions were aggressive rather than defensive.
- The USA interpreted Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe as evidence of a Soviet intention to spread its influence throughout Europe.
- The USA under Truman resisted Soviet expansionism through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan – this required the rebuilding of European economies. By this interpretation, the USA’s attempt to rebuild Germany was the result of rather than the reason for Stalin’s actions in Eastern Europe.
- The Berlin Blockade was at least partly prompted by Soviet embarrassment that the Western zones had far better living standards than the Eastern zone (due largely to Marshall aid).
- The post-revisionist interpretation suggests that the Cold War was the result of the USA and the USSR misunderstanding/misinterpreting each other’s motives.

- 3 **To what extent was the globalisation of the Cold War from 1950 to 1985 caused by the USA’s determination to protect its own economic interests?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the globalisation of the Cold War from 1950 and 1985, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the extent to which the USA’s determination to protect its own economic interests was the primary causal factor.

In support of the view expressed, it could be argued that –

- USA was determined to avoid a repetition of the Great Depression – this required an end to isolationism and the development/protection of overseas markets.
- The USA viewed its capitalist ideology as threatened by communism which must, therefore, be resisted at all costs.
- The fall of China to communism in 1949 led the USA to perceive a monolithic communist plot for world domination. This was perceived as not only a political threat, but also an economic one.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

- Japan was a key trading partner of the USA – US involvement in SE Asia could be seen as a means of protecting American economic interests in the area.
- US intervention in Cuba began before Soviet involvement – Castro was seen as a threat to US economic interests in Cuba.
- Oil was a key factor in the USA's involvement in the Middle East.
- US involvement in Africa owed much to its requirement for markets, raw materials and mineral wealth.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that –

- Soviet expansionism was the main cause of the globalisation of the Cold War, as evidenced by Stalin's statements regarding a world-wide communist revolution, together with Soviet involvement in China, Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Africa and the Middle East.
- American involvement was primarily the result of political, strategic and diplomatic factors rather than economic ones. The USA saw itself as the defender of the 'free world' from communist infiltration.
- Decolonisation was a major factor in the causes of the globalisation of the Cold War, as evidenced by events in Korea, Vietnam and Africa. Statesmen in newly independent nations were prepared to exploit Cold War rivalries for their own ends.

**4 'A clear victory for the policy of containment.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the USA's involvement in the Korean War?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of American involvement in the Korean War, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the validity of the statement in the question.

In support of the statement, it could be argued that –

- Senior American politicians and military leaders claimed exactly this in their formal statements about the Korean War.
- The USA succeeded in preventing South Korea from becoming communist. The main purpose of the containment policy was to prevent the spread of communism.
- The USA had managed to secure the support of the United Nations, giving some legitimacy to its actions in Korea.
- South Korea remains non-communist.

In challenging the statement, it could be argued that –

- Concerned by China's fall to communism in 1949, the USA assumed that the invasion of South Korea from the north was part of a monolithic communist plot. The USA misinterpreted the causes of the War, which was really about independence and unification.
- The USA took little account of the wishes of the Koreans themselves, supporting undemocratic governments in the name of democracy.
- The USSR played only a minor role in the Korean War – Stalin wanted to concentrate on Europe. Thus, the USA's perception was wrong – in reality, what they thought they were containing didn't exist.
- The USA's policy in the Korean War was confused. As a result of NSC68, the Americans went beyond containment. It was the attempt to roll back communism which led to the intervention of China. Roll back failed in the Korean War.
- While American politicians were able to claim that the USA had been successful in containing communism, in reality this was to hide the failure of their wider policies.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

## **5 How valid are the criticisms of those who blame Gorbachev for the collapse of the USSR?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the collapse of the USSR, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the relative significance of Gorbachev's policies.

In challenging the view that Gorbachev was to blame, it could be argued that the disintegration of the Soviet Union was inevitable even before Gorbachev came to power. Evidence to support this might include –

- Many years of poor leadership
- The long-term decline of the Soviet economy
- High costs of maintaining the arms race, a problem which was enhanced by Reagan's hard-line nuclear policies (e.g. SDI)
- The ever-increasing problem of nationalism, both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself
- The inability of the communist economy to match the effectiveness of the capitalist economy, a problem which was becoming increasingly evident in Eastern Europe
- Gorbachev's reforms could be seen as a desperate attempt to maintain the Soviet Union by addressing these problems. They came too late to save the USSR.

In agreeing that Gorbachev was to blame, it could be argued that –

- The Soviet Union could have survived, but Gorbachev tried to reform too much too quickly.
- With glasnost and perestroika, Gorbachev attempted both political and economic reform. Chinese communism survived because it only attempted to reform the economy, maintaining one-party political control.
- Gorbachev's reforms split the communist party.
- By ending the Brezhnev Doctrine, Gorbachev effectively allowed nationalist movements to gain control in Eastern Europe and encouraged others to thrive within the Soviet Union itself.

## **6 Why, despite many attempts to control it, did the nuclear arms race continue throughout the period from 1963 to the 1980s?**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the nuclear arms race and attempts to control it, and to deploy this in order to analyse why it continued throughout the period.

Arguments to explain why the arms race continued throughout the period might include –

- The arms race was a product of international tension – both superpowers were concerned about each other's nuclear capacity and were convinced that gaining nuclear superiority was the only way to guarantee security and gain concessions.
- The superpowers viewed the arms race as a way to enhance their international prestige. This became more important with decolonisation, as both the USA and the USSR sought to increase their influence in the Third World.
- Public opinion in the USA pressured politicians into increasing arms spending, fuelled by Soviet (unwarranted) boasting of their nuclear superiority.
- Arms manufacturers and developers wielded enormous political power.
- In the USSR, the armed forces were able to exert influence over politicians.
- Other countries developed nuclear capability in order to maintain international prestige or address particular threats to their security.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

In order to ensure balance, it is necessary to show why the ‘many attempts to control’ the arms race failed to do so. Evidence might include –

- Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963 was limited in scope and almost impossible to monitor effectively.
- The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 failed to prevent the spread of nuclear capability to other countries, and was derided by the Non-Aligned Movement which believed that non-proliferation could not be sustained without tangible progress in disarmament.
- The Salt Treaties were limited in scope and failed to prevent the development of new nuclear technologies, while SALT II was never ratified by the USA following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

## **7 ‘Japan’s economic miracle was a result of the Cold War.’ Discuss.**

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the reasons why Japan was able to secure an ‘economic miracle’ in the post-war period, and to deploy this in order to evaluate how far it was due to the Cold War.

In support of the view, it could be argued that –

- The USA saw Japan as a vital bulwark against the spread of communism in SE Asia.
- The USA supplied Japan with aid and new equipment, and allowed Japanese goods into American markets on favourable terms.
- With the USA effectively taking care of Japan’s security, Japan was able to invest in industry without having to fund defence and armaments.
- The Korean War gave a major boost to Japan’s economic recovery – it provided a base for the UN mission in Korea and Japanese manufacturers were used to provide a wide range of materials and supplies.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Japan’s economic recovery was due to internal factors, such as –

- Political stability – the LDP was consistently in power from 1952 to 1993.
- Japanese governments provided vital support for the revival of Japan’s agricultural and industrial sectors.
- MITI played a major role in securing economic advancement.
- The availability of an effective work-force.
- The destruction of Japan’s industry in WWII enabled new plants to be built using the latest technology – this enabled Japan to concentrate on high-technology goods both for the home and export markets.
- The booming export market provided a demand for ship construction.
- Japanese products gained a reputation for high quality and reliability, and were highly competitive in world markets.
- Japan’s economic boom continued after the USA removed its support.

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>32</b>

## 8 What, if anything, had the Non-Aligned Movement achieved by 1991?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the Non-Aligned Movement, and to deploy this in order to evaluate its achievements by 1991.

The NAM's basic aims were enshrined in the five principles adopted at the Bandung Conference in 1955 – mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; mutual non-aggression; mutual non-interference in domestic affairs; equality and mutual benefit; peaceful co-existence.

In line with these aims, it could be argued that the NAM has achieved much –

- Represents over half of the world's population.
- While membership consists of many governments with vastly different ideologies, it has been unified by its commitment to world peace and security based on the Havana Declaration of 1979 which outlined its purpose as ensuring 'the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of non-aligned countries' in their struggle against 'imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and all forms of foreign aggression'. In 1983, NAM described itself as 'history's biggest peace movement'.
- Has promoted economic and cultural cooperation between member states.
- Enabled developing countries to provide technical assistance to each other in order to reduce dependency on the major industrial nations.
- Enabled developing nations to work together to overcome the legacies of colonialism.
- Has provided a mutual support organisation and pressure group for developing countries. In this, it has had some success – e.g. in strongly opposing apartheid in South Africa.

In contrast, it could be argued that –

- Although the NAM was intended to be a close alliance (such as NATO or the Warsaw Pact), it demonstrated little cohesion.
- There have been conflicts between members states – e.g. India and Pakistan, Iran and Iraq).
- NAM placed a strong emphasis on disarmament, yet had little or no impact on the arms race. Indeed, both India and Pakistan are members of the NAM but also nuclear states.
- One of the aims of the NAM was for member states to abstain from the big power military alliances – i.e. keeping out of the Cold War. In this, the NAM has displayed little cohesion. Many of its members were quite closely aligned with one or other of the great powers – e.g. when USSR invaded Afghanistan in 1979, members of NAM who were allies of the Soviet Union supported the invasion, while others (especially Muslim states) opposed it.