

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9697 HISTORY

9697/31

Paper 3 (International History), 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.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	<i>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.</i>
2	18–20	<i>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.</i>
3	16–17	<i>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.</i>
4	14–15	<i>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.</i>
5	11–13	<i>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.</i>
6	8–10	<i>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.</i>
7	0–7	<i>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.</i>

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION A

- 1 Source-based question : THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE VETO POWERS OF THE PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL: *'The San Francisco Conference was justified in approving veto powers to the five permanent members of the Security Council.'* 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 veto powers and/or the San Francisco Conference 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).

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

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 draft proposals for the structure of the UN, which had initially been drawn up at Yalta and subsequently elaborated at Dumbarton Oaks, were submitted to the San Francisco Conference on International Organisation (April – June 1945). Delegates of fifty Allied nations reached agreement on the UN Charter by 26 June 1945. One of the most divisive issues related to the granting of veto rights to the five permanent members of the Security Council, many of the smaller nations believing that this undermined the potential for democratic decisions within the UN. With the exception of France, which was initially prepared to waive its proposed veto rights, the big powers made it clear that they would not join the UN without the ability to protect their own national interests which, they believed, the power of veto provided.

SOURCE A:

Context: Primary source from an Australian newspaper reporting on events surrounding the San Francisco Conference in 1945.

Content (Face Value): The Australian delegate clearly believes that it would be wrong to grant veto rights to the five main powers, claiming that ‘there is no justification for this veto’ and that most of the delegates agree with him (**Hence N**). The USSR delegate disagrees, arguing that the great powers might end up at war with each other if there was no right of veto (**Hence Y**).

Content (Beyond Face Value): The Australian delegate argued that ‘there is no justification’ for the veto and clearly used a press conference to state his case (**Hence N**). However, the source does not explain why he opposes the veto – this is probably because the Australian public (at whom the source is directed) would be well aware of Australia’s objections. Following events in WWII, Australia would feel particularly threatened and would want greater reassurance that the newly formed UN would provide adequate protection. The source gives no evidence to support the claim that the majority of UN delegates shared Evatt’s objections to the veto, although Sources B and D provide some indications that it might be true. (**X-ref with B, which reveals the attitude of the ‘smaller nations’ to the veto and with D, which shows that Roosevelt was well aware of potential opposition to the veto from countries such as Australia**).

In response to Evatt’s views, the Soviet delegate argues that the veto is justified because ‘the most powerful peace-loving nations’ are vital to the preservation of future world-peace; if there was no right of veto, there could be friction between the great powers, leading to war (**Hence Y**). (**X-ref with C – ‘The great powers depicted their interests as indispensable for the maintenance of international peace’ and E, which refers to the ‘primary responsibilities’ of the great powers**).

Source A is balanced in the sense that it reflects both sides of the argument. However, the **Y** argument is explained more explicitly and in greater detail than the **N**.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

SOURCE B:

Context: The views of a Danish political commentator in the year following the San Francisco Conference, by which time the UN was already in existence.

Content (Face Value): The Source clearly opposes the veto because it favours the great powers at the expense of the smaller nations, which do not feel reassured by the existence of the UN. (Hence N).

Content (Beyond Face Value): The views of a political commentator from one of the smaller nations, written in 1946 by which time the UN was already in existence. The writer clearly opposes the great powers' right of veto (*X-Ref with A, which claims that smaller nations oppose the veto and D, which shows that Roosevelt was well aware of potential opposition to the veto from smaller nations even before the San Francisco Conference*). The source argues that the veto effectively makes the UN ineffective in any type of dispute and that, since priority is given to the great powers, it mitigates against the security of smaller nations (*X-Ref with A, in which the Soviet delegate at the San Francisco Conference offers the opposing view, arguing that the veto is essential to ensure great power unanimity*). The writer uses emotional language to state his case (e.g. the reference to the possibility of 'a new Munich, with a small country being sacrificed for the sake of peace'). Being Danish, the writer clearly feels that his own country's security is not adequately protected by the organisation adopted by the UN (Hence N).

SOURCE C:

Context: A commentary by an Austrian academic in 1991, a time when the Cold War had just ended allowing the perfect opportunity for reflection on possible reforms of the UN to address the new world situation.

Content (Face Value): The writer argues that the great powers exploited their powerful position in 1945 in order to gain a privileged position within the UN. The veto enabled them to protect their own interests (Hence N). However, it is clear from the source that the great powers would not have joined the UN without gaining the right of veto; this would suggest that the delegates at San Francisco had no alternative but to agree to the veto (Hence Y).

Content (Beyond Face Value): The source was written by an academic from Austria, a 'smaller nation' which might have felt insecure as a result of the veto rights (*X-Ref with A, B and D*). It was written in 1991, a time when the Cold War came to an end. It is widely acknowledged that the Cold War, together with the veto, effectively gridlocked the UN Security Council throughout the period from 1945–91. The ending of the Cold War provided the perfect opportunity to review the progress of the UN and investigate possible reforms for the future; the veto was a key agenda item in this. The writer argues that the great powers exploited their position in 1945 to protect their own interests, implicitly stating that the veto contradicts the democratic principles of the UN and the wording of the Charter itself. They argued that their interests were indispensable for the maintenance of international peace (*X-Ref with Gromyko's views in A, the USA's views in D and the views expressed in E*), something with which the writer clearly disagrees. (Hence N – the right of veto was granted to protect the selfish interests of the great powers). However, whilst highly critical of the selfish actions of the great powers, the writer is more concerned with the nature of the UN post-1991 than with the San Francisco Conference's decision to ratify the right of veto; this, he feels, was a pragmatic decision since it was clear that the great powers would not have joined the UN without veto rights (*X-Ref with D*); without the presence of the great powers, the UN would have been a non-starter (Hence Y – a pragmatic decision to ensure that the UN was established).

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

SOURCE D:

Context: At the end of WWII, Roosevelt was determined to succeed where Woodrow Wilson had failed – to ensure that the USA did not return to isolationism, playing a leading role in the creation and development of the UN. In order to achieve this, he had to convince both the American Congress and the Allies (including the USSR), none of which shared his enthusiasm for the creation of the UN. The right of veto was vital in order to ensure their support for the venture. However, Roosevelt also realised that smaller and mid-sized nations would object to the idea of granting the veto to the five permanent members of the Security Council. This source demonstrates the arguments which he used in order to justify the veto.

Content (Face Value): The source lists the arguments which the USA used to justify the granting of the veto rights to the five permanent members of the UN. The USA argued that none of the great powers would join the UN without having veto rights; that only the great powers had the weapons and influence to ensure that UN edicts were enforceable; that the great powers would not be able to abuse this special privilege because world opinion would not allow it (**Hence Y**).

Content (Beyond Face Value): The source was written by an American political commentator in 1994, a time when, with the Cold War over, there was considerable interest in reviewing and possibly reforming the structure of the UN. The source lists the arguments which the USA used to justify the granting of the veto rights to the five permanent members of the UN – it is factual rather than opinionated. The source confirms that smaller nations might have feared, and thus objected to, granting veto rights to the major powers (**X-Ref with A, B and E**), arguing that it went against the democratic notion of a body in which all nations were equal. It also confirms that none of the major powers would have joined the UN without the right of veto (**X-Ref with C**). The League of Nations had failed because, in trying to ensure equal rights for all member nations, it lacked the ability to make and enforce decisions effectively – the UN intended to avoid this problem with the creation of a Security Council, containing the most powerful nations (with sufficient ‘weapons and influence’ to ensure compliance with its decisions). The great powers clearly would not allow their ‘weapons and influence’ to be used by the UN without their own compliance. The USA was, therefore, arguing that this implied that the great powers had special responsibilities within the UN over and above those of other nations (**X-Ref with E**), which, in turn, justified their veto rights. The USA argued that the great powers would not be able to abuse their veto rights because world opinion would not allow them to – although it is difficult to see what exactly ‘world opinion’ could have done to prevent this. (**Hence Y – the right of veto was justified because of the special responsibilities held by the great powers and because without it the great powers would not have joined the UN**).

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

SOURCE E:

Context: Extract from a modern book investigating legal aspects of the UN.

Content (Face Value): The source quotes the view expressed at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, arguing that the ‘primary responsibilities’ held by the major powers justified them having the right of veto. (**Hence Y**).

Content (Beyond Face Value): This modern source quotes view expressed at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, arguing that the ‘primary responsibilities’ held by the major powers justified them having the right of veto. The source is factual rather than opinionated, drawing no conclusions from the evidence it provides. The Soviet delegate argued that the major powers would have ‘special responsibilities and duties’ over and above those held by the other nations (**X-Ref with C and D**). The Yugoslav and Cuban delegates agreed with this view. The Soviet delegate concluded that these extra responsibilities justified the veto (**X-Ref with A**) (**Hence Y – the veto rights were justified because of the extra duties and responsibilities which membership of the UN would impose on the great powers**). However, it should be noted that even if a nation accepted that the major powers had special and extra responsibilities, it did not follow that they should have veto rights; the Cuban delegate clearly opposed the veto (**X-Ref with A and B**) (**Hence N**).

CONCLUSION:

The sources reflect the debate which took place at the San Francisco Conference regarding veto rights for the five permanent members of the Security Council. The majority of nations which sent delegates to San Francisco were opposed to granting the right of veto, arguing that this would undermine the notion of equality implicit in the Charter itself. However, the great powers made it clear that they were not prepared to join the UN without the right of veto; a UN without the presence of the great powers would lack credibility and the power to enforce its decisions. Delegates were effectively left with a stark choice – a UN with a structure which most nations felt was unfair or no UN at all. On balance, therefore, they had little alternative but to approve the granting of veto rights, possibly in the hope of reform at some later date.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

SECTION B

2 'The Marshall Plan was simply an American reaction to Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe'. How far do you agree?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the causes of the Cold War in the post WWII period, and to deploy this in order to analyse American motives for initiating the Marshall Plan in 1947.

In support of the hypothesis it could be argued that –

- The Marshall Plan (European Recovery Programme) was designed to facilitate the rebuilding of war-stricken European economies.
- The USA believed that countries with weak economies were more likely to turn to communism and less likely to be able to resist the USSR's expansionist moves in Europe.
- The Plan followed the Truman Doctrine, which promised American support to '*free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure*' – initially, the aim was to prevent Greece and Turkey falling to communism. This was the beginning of containment, and the Marshall Plan was effectively the economic part of this policy.

In challenging the hypothesis it could be argued that –

- The USA was merely trying to assist Europe, which was facing famine and economic crisis. This was in the interests of political stability and a healthy world economy, and would have happened even without Soviet expansionism in Europe.
- The USA's motives were born of self-interest. Determined to avoid isolationism, which both Roosevelt and Truman were convinced had led to the Great Depression, it was essential to develop overseas markets in order to protect the American economy. This required the rebuilding of European economies.
- The USSR claimed that the USA was using the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as means to gain political and economic mastery over Western Europe. This added to Stalin's fears for the security of the USSR, particularly because it involved the regeneration of a strong Germany.
- It could be argued that Truman was able to use claims of Soviet expansionism in Europe in order to justify actions which he intended to take anyway. For example, Stalin had shown no interest in either Greece or Turkey.

3 To what extent was the globalisation of the Cold War from 1950 to 1975 caused by the Soviet Union's determination to spread its communist ideology?

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 evaluate the extent to which the USSR's desire to spread its communist ideology was responsible for it.

Arguments in support of the view that Soviet determination to spread communism was responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War might be evidenced by reference to –

- Stalin's overt statements regarding world communist revolution
- The USA's determination to prevent the spread of communism (e.g. containment, roll back)
- Soviet support for the communist take-over in China
- Soviet involvement in Korea
- Soviet involvement in Cuba
- Soviet involvement in Vietnam
- Soviet involvement in Africa
- Soviet involvement in the Middle East.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

Arguments to challenge the view might include –

- Stalin, well aware of Soviet weaknesses compared to the USA, confined his direct activities to Europe. Khrushchev subsequently dissociated the USSR from the notion of world-wide revolution.
- Unlike the USA, the USSR was not directly involved in the Korean War.
- The USA over-reacted to what it incorrectly perceived as a Soviet attempt to expand its influence; China's fall to communism led the USA to incorrectly perceive a monolithic communist plot for world domination. Hence American policies such as containment were based in flawed logic.
- In seeking to protect its own economic and strategic interests, the USA could be seen as more responsible than the USSR for the globalisation of the Cold War – 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.
- Factors such as decolonisation could be cited as more genuine causes of the globalisation of the Cold War. Both the USA and the USSR were drawn into conflicts which were essentially regional for their own strategic, diplomatic or prestige reasons.

4 'The Cuban missile crisis ended in victory for the USA and defeat for the USSR'. How valid is this view of the crisis?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, and to deploy this in order to analyse the validity of the hypothesis relating to its outcome.

In support of the hypothesis it could be argued that –

- Khrushchev was forced to remove Soviet missiles from Cuba.
- Khrushchev was heavily criticised both by the Peoples' Republic of China and within the Soviet Union for his decision to back down and remove the Soviet missiles. He was replaced as leader of the USSR.
- Kennedy was praised, both within the USA and the international community, for standing up to the USSR.
- Khrushchev's attempt to test the resolve of a new and inexperienced American president had failed.
- Although the USA agreed to remove its Turkish-based missiles, these were scheduled for removal anyway because they had effectively been rendered obsolete by new developments within the American nuclear arsenal.

In challenging the hypothesis it could be argued that –

- The initial cause of the crisis was the USA's determination to maintain its economic control over Cuba by removing Castro from power. It was only after failed American attempts (e.g. Bay of Pigs) that Castro declared himself a communist and sought Soviet assistance. Castro remained in power after the crisis. Cuba was a communist country within the USA's long-established sphere of influence.
- It could be argued that Khrushchev's main aim had been to protect a new and vulnerable communist state; Castro's survival and the USA's promise not to threaten Cuban sovereignty in the future was a major victory for the USSR.
- Another of Khrushchev's aims could have been to establish greater balance in the nuclear arms race, matching American missiles in Turkey with Soviet ones in Cuba. The USA's agreement to remove its missiles from Turkey (albeit a secret clause and albeit scheduled anyway) was at least a partial victory.
- Although Kennedy's actions in the crisis were greatly praised during the 1960s, subsequent historians (with increasing access to a wider range of sources) have often been heavily critical and more willing to acknowledge Soviet successes.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

5 'Mikhail Gorbachev reformed too much; Deng Xiaoping reformed too little'. How far does this explain why both the Soviet Union and China experienced a crisis of communism in the 1980s?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the nature and impact of the reforms carried out by Gorbachev in the USSR and Deng Xiaoping in the PRC, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the validity of the hypothesis.

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

- Gorbachev carried out both economic and political reform (e.g. glasnost, perestroika) which led to splits within the Communist Party and encouraged wider opposition to it. His decision to end the Brezhnev Doctrine encouraged nationalist movements in Eastern Europe and effectively led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union.
- Deng carried out economic reforms but was not prepared to engage in political reform. He instituted 'market socialism', which allowed elements of capitalism in the Chinese economy, but he believed that this was best administered through a one-party state. Deng's economic reforms and the foreign influences to which they exposed China, led certain elements to seek political reform, leading to Tiananmen Square.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that –

- Gorbachev's reforms were attempting to address a crisis which already existed before he came to office – a stagnant economy, the huge costs involved in maintaining the arms race, problems associated with nationalism both within Russia itself and in Eastern Europe, years of ineffective leadership etc. Gorbachev's reforms may have been the catalyst which brought the crisis (and the collapse of the USSR) to a head, but they did not create it.
- Following Mao's death, the Chinese economy was in dire need of reform and Deng was prepared to facilitate major changes. The unwanted outcome of his 'democracy wall' alerted him to the dangers of granting political reform; by maintaining a firm and resolute belief in the one-party state, he prevented the Chinese Communist Party from suffering the same fate as Gorbachev.

6 Did the SALT Treaties achieve anything substantial?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the SALT Treaties, and to deploy this in order to evaluate the achievements of the SALT Treaties.

On the 'yes' side, it could be argued that –

- SALT Treaties marked the high point of detente and established a principle of discussion which subsequently led to more effective treaties such as START.
- The ABM Treaty reduced tension caused by the destabilising impact of defensive systems; it provided a deterrence since an attacker would know that the enemy had the power to retaliate.
- The Interim Treaty placed limits on the number of ICBMs and SLBMs which each side was allowed.
- The Basic Principles Agreement laid down rules for the conduct of nuclear war, both the USA and the USSR agreeing to 'exercise restraint' in international relations, whilst there was a greater willingness to extend trading connections.
- SALT Treaties were indicative of a desire by both sides to move away from confrontation.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

On the ‘no’ side, it could be argued that –

- The long drawn-out nature of discussions leading to SALT I is itself indicative of the problem of reaching agreement (discussions began in 1968, yet SALT I was not agreed until 1972, whilst SALT II was not signed until 1979, by which time relations between the superpowers had deteriorated and, accordingly, it was never ratified by the US Senate).
- There were disagreements over how arms should be limited and, indeed, what types of weapons to include (Soviet and American weapons were not easily comparable, and there were doubts regarding the reliability of information regarding how many weapons each superpower actually had).
- There was a tendency to focus on limiting existing weapons, yet this took no account of the new technologies which both superpowers were developing (for example, the Interim Treaty on Offensive Weapons, part of SALT I but only due to last until 1977, limited ICBMs and SLBMs, but ignored MIRV. Similarly, SALT II set limits on missile launchers and strategic bombers, but ignored Cruise Missiles).
- The USSR only signed SALT I because of its fear of improving relations between the USA and China.
- Both superpowers retained sufficient offensive weapons to destroy each other several times over.
- SALT was a signal of intent rather than achieving anything substantial.

7 To what extent were the major problems which faced the international economy during the 1970s and early 1980s caused by the oil crises of 1973 and 1979?

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the factors which led to major problems within the international economy during the 1970s and early 1980s, and to deploy this in order to analyse the relative significance of the oil crises.

It could be argued that the oil crises were a significant causal factor –

- In 1973, OPEC increased oil prices by 70% and began a phased reduction in output.
- In the short term, demand for oil falls little when prices are raised – as a result, prices rose still higher since demand outstripped supply.
- This led to high inflation and recession lasting into the early 1980s.
- Stock market crash 1973–4.

To create balance, however, it is necessary to show that there were other causal factors –

- The growth of the international economy from 1945 until the 1970s was largely due to US dominance. The US economy was hit by many factors during the early 1970s, which had a significant effect on the international economy.
- 1971 – USA pulled out of Bretton Woods Accord; all industrialised nations followed the USA in ‘floating’ their currencies. Fluctuation of currencies led countries to print money leading to depreciation.
- USA suffering from budget deficits due to high defence costs (Vietnam War, nuclear armaments).
- The oil crises were therefore superimposed onto an international economy that was already facing inflation and recession (e.g. after 1971, oil prices were based on gold standard rather than the dollar).
- The impact of the debt crisis on the developing world adversely affected the international economy.
- Problems of transformation of western economies in the wake of competition from newly industrialised countries such as the Asian Tiger economies.
- Industrialised countries were able to offset the effects of oil crises by finding alternative sources of oil or other forms of power.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9697	31

8 ‘The Brandt Report said much but achieved little’. Discuss.

The question requires candidates to display knowledge and understanding of the Brandt Report and its conclusions relating to the ‘North-South Divide’, 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 –

- The Report was intended to address the North-South Divide, but this has continued to grow.
- It argued that it was vital in all nations’ interests to address a situation in which the North was getting richer while the South was getting poorer. Richer nations, for example, would benefit from helping the South to become more prosperous (e.g. bigger markets).
- It recommended that rich nations should give 0.7% of their national income to poorer nations by 1985 and 1% by 2000. By 1985, only Norway, Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands and France had met target of 0.7% – USA only 0.24% and GB 0.11%.
- Third World countries remained adversely affected by the problems of neo-colonialism, dependence on one-product economies, rising prices of manufactured goods, high rates of interest on loans, activities of multi-national companies, high population growth, political instability, corrupt and inefficient governments.
- Problems were exacerbated by famine in Africa in the mid 1980s.
- Self-interest of the richer nations remains a major problem.

In challenging the statement, it could be argued –

- The Report did raise awareness of the problems associated with the North-South divide.
- Many of the problems (e.g. famine) were beyond the control of the richer nations.

Much effective work has been done in response to the Report’s recommendations – e.g. New World Development Fund, international food programme, campaign to improve farming methods in the South, international response to natural disasters.