

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **9697 HISTORY**

**9697/31**

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 2013 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 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>31</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, a fair attempt to provide an argument and the 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	31

## Section A

### 1 How far do Sources A–E support the view that the Uniting for Peace Resolution was inconsistent with the UN Charter?

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

These answers will write about Resolution 377 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]

**(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.

**(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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	31

**Please note:**

**Y** supports the hypothesis

**N** against the hypothesis

**Neutral** neither supports nor opposes hypothesis

**Context:**

In order to avoid the weaknesses which had beset the League of Nations, the UN Charter gave primacy over all matters relating to peace and security to the Security Council rather than the General Assembly. However, the right of veto paralysed the Security Council in the early Cold War years, with the USSR regularly using the veto to block the actions of a UN which it increasingly saw as pro-Western. When North Korea attacked South Korea in 1950, the Security Council was able to take immediate action, but only because the USSR was boycotting its meetings because of UN refusal to admit the PRC. When the USSR returned to meetings after 1 August 1950, the Security Council was again paralysed as the Soviets made it clear that they would veto all future UN action over Korea. Resolution 377 was a product of the situation in the Korean War. However, it was also part of a general shift in emphasis away from the Security Council (e.g. the establishment in 1947 of an 'Interim Committee' of the General Assembly). Resolution 377, which became known as 'uniting for peace', was originally suggested by the USA (under Secretary of State Dean Acheson), and the USSR saw it as an American ploy to increase the power of the General Assembly where the USA held a decisive influence over the majority of member states. Only the Soviet delegates voted against the Resolution.

**Source A:**

**Context:** The opening section of Resolution 377 as adopted by the General Assembly on 3 November 1950. The Security Council was paralysed by Soviet use of the veto following the return of its delegates after the boycott. This was hindering UN action in the Korean War.

**Content (Face Value):** The General Assembly reaffirms that primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the Security Council, but states that the General Assembly also has rights and responsibilities under the Charter with regard to any threat to world peace. Resolution 377 states that the General Assembly should be able to consider and make appropriate recommendations to UN member states regarding action to deal with any threat to world peace. **(N – Resolution 377 accepts that the Security Council has primary responsibility for dealing with the maintenance of international peace and security as stated in the Charter. If the Security Council is unable to act because of lack of unanimity, the General Assembly has the right and the responsibility to take appropriate action. Since these rights and responsibilities are established by the Charter, the Resolution is consistent with the intentions of those who drafted the Charter).**

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The wording of the Resolution implies that the General Assembly has the right and the responsibility to take appropriate action in the event of the Security Council's inability to reach unanimity **(N – the Resolution is in line with the intentions of the Charter. X-Ref with Sources B and E)**. The UN was established to maintain international peace and security. To avoid the problems which had beset the League of Nations, primary responsibility for this was given to the Security Council. However, on the insistence of both the USA and the USSR, the Charter had given the right of veto to the permanent members of the Security Council. The drafters of the Charter could not have predicted the problems which would result from this. The onset of the Cold War led to frequent use of the veto by the USSR, which felt increasingly isolated within the UN. Technically, the Charter affords the General Assembly the right to consider issues relating to international peace and security, but its recommendations should then go back to the Security Council rather than to the UN member states within the General Assembly. **(Y – under the terms of the Charter, the General Assembly does not have the right to make recommendations to member states on issues relating to international peace and security. In particular, the Charter does not give the General Assembly the right to recommend the use of armed force. X-Ref with Sources C and D)**. Given

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	31

that the UN was established to maintain peace and security, it is understandable that member states would have been frustrated by the UN's inability to take appropriate action because of the paralysis of the Security Council (**X-Ref with Sources B and E**). It could be argued that the drafters of the Charter did not intend for the UN to take no action in the event of a threat to peace. Thus, it could be argued that Resolution 377 is in line with the spirit of the Charter, even if not with the constitution it created (**N – the Resolution is in line with the intentions of the drafters of the Charter. X-Ref with Sources B and E**). However, the Resolution was proposed by the USA, which was the prime mover in UN action in the Korean War. The USSR would inevitably view the Resolution as an American attempt to undermine the power of the Security Council and to increase the power of an American-dominated General Assembly (**X-Ref with Sources B and D**). If the Charter had given the General Assembly the right to take the kind of action envisaged in this Resolution it would not have been necessary. Resolution 377 can be seen as one example of the General Assembly seeking to gain powers originally invested in the Security Council (**Y – Resolution 377 is not consistent with the constitution created by the Charter**).

#### Source B:

**Context:** The American view of Resolution 377 as expressed by US delegate John Foster Dulles in the debate on the draft resolution prior to its adoption by the General Assembly.

**Content (Face Value):** The speaker claims that the Resolution is not intended to take power away from the Security Council, but to ensure that the General Assembly can make appropriate recommendations on issues relating to international peace and security when the Security Council is unable to do so. The speaker claims that the General Assembly's right to do this stems 'from the broad powers of the General Assembly under the Charter' and that the Resolution is not an attempt to change or contradict the Charter but to 'make it work'. (**N – the Resolution reinforces rather than contradicts the intentions of the drafters of the Charter**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The speaker argues that the Resolution is not intended to remove the 'primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security' from the Security Council, but to ensure that the UN is able to take effective action. This, he argues, is in line with the intentions of the drafters of the Charter (**X-Ref with Source E**). He stresses that the Charter affords the Security Council 'primary responsibility' rather than 'exclusive responsibility'. (**N**). However, the speaker is an American and it was the USA which advocated Resolution 377. He is addressing an audience which is supportive, yet seems a little defensive in his justification of the Resolution. He states that the Resolution has been attacked on legal and constitutional grounds (**X-Ref with Source C**), yet does not provide a satisfactory response to these attacks. If the Charter had given the General Assembly such broad powers, the Resolution would not have been required. His main argument is that the Resolution is not an attempt by the General Assembly to take over the powers of the Security Council, and that it is consistent with the spirit of the Charter if not its actual wording (**Y – the source provides no legal or constitutional justification for the Resolution. X-Ref with Source E**).

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	31

**Source C:**

**Context:** The Soviet view of Resolution 377 as expressed by USSR delegate Andrey Vyshinsky in the debate on the draft resolution.

**Content (Face Value):** The speaker claims that the Resolution is unconstitutional in that it contradicts the terms of the Charter. He states that the Charter gives the General Assembly the right to ‘consider’ issues relating to peace and security but not to ‘make recommendations’ on any matter which is already being considered by the Security Council. He argues that under no circumstances can the General Assembly recommend ‘enforcement action’ and so Resolution 377 is a contravention of the Charter (Y).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The speaker sets out the legal and constitutional arguments against the Resolution which Source B mentioned but did not address adequately. His key arguments are

- that the General Assembly has no right to make recommendations if a situation is being considered by the Security Council
- that, under no circumstances, can the General Assembly make recommendations regarding the use of ‘enforcement action’ (**X-Ref with Source A – Resolution 377 states that the General Assembly can make recommendations for collective measures ‘including the use of armed force’**).

(**Y – Resolution 377 contravenes the wording of the Charter. X-Ref with Source D**). However, the speaker is a representative of the Soviet Union who would inevitably oppose any attempt to give the General Assembly more power. He argues that the Resolution is an attempt by the USA to do exactly this – the USA would have greater control over votes within the General Assembly and the USSR would have no right of veto to block pro-American actions (**Y – technically, the Resolution involved a significant change to the legal and constitutional wording of the Charter. X-Ref with Source E**).

**Source D:**

**Context:** Extract from an American journal, with a focus on issues relating to international law, six years after the adoption of Resolution 377.

**Content (Face Value):** While stating that the aim of Resolution 377 was to improve the machinery and effectiveness of the UN in maintaining peace and security (**N – the Resolution aimed to improve rather than change**), the author concentrates on the arguments put forward by the opponents of the Resolution. The main principle of the Charter was the maintenance of peace through the Security Council. Resolution 377 changed this by granting powers (including the power to recommend enforcement actions), which effectively made the General Assembly more powerful than the Security Council (**Y – the Resolution was inconsistent with the wording of the Charter**).

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The author shows how opponents of the Resolution claimed that it involved a fundamental change in the constitution of the UN, thereby enhancing the power of the General Assembly at the expense of the Security Council (**Y. X-Ref with Source C**). However, the source is explaining the arguments used by the opponents of the Resolution and these arguments do not necessarily represent the considered views of the author. An American journal, published only six years after the adoption of the Resolution at a time when the Cold War was still rife, might be expected to support the Resolution. This is evident in the first two sentences of the source, which explain that the Resolution aimed to ‘improve’ the workings of the UN on issues relating to international peace and security in cases where the Security Council ‘fails to exercise its responsibilities’ (Y).

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9697	31

**Source E:**

**Context:** A recent academic evaluation of Resolution 377.

**Content (Face Value):** The author states that the Charter afforded the Security Council 'primary responsibility' over issues relating to peace and security, but that this does not imply 'exclusive responsibility'. The General Assembly had the right to take control in situations where the Security Council was unable to act due to the paralysing effect of the veto. Since the fundamental objective of the Charter was the maintenance of peace, Resolution 377 was consistent with the original intentions of its drafters **(N)**.

**Content (Beyond Face Value):** The author is writing from a modern, post-Cold War perspective, with the ability to judge how the General Assembly and the Security Council have worked together over the 57 years since the adoption of Resolution 377. He is right to argue that the drafters of the Charter would not have intended for the Security Council and the General Assembly to be in competition with each other, and that their intention was for the two bodies to work in a mutually supportive way. Nevertheless, the statement that 'the Assembly gained the confidence to take over the role of the Security Council' implies that this involved a significant constitutional change for the UN **(Y – while justifiable in the interests of international peace and security, Resolution 377 did involve a fundamental change in the terms of the Charter)**.

**Conclusion:**

In constitutional terms, the hypothesis is supported. While vague, the Charter gives no power to the General Assembly to make recommendations regarding issues which are already being considered by the Security Council and denies the General Assembly the right to make recommendations regarding enforcement actions. The Soviet delegation was legally correct. However, it could be argued that the framers of the Charter would not have wanted a situation whereby the UN was paralysed due to excessive use of the veto caused by Cold War rivalry. Resolution 377 could be seen as consistent with the intentions of the drafters of the Charter.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>31</b>

## Section B

### 2 How far was the development of the Cold War from 1945 to 1949 the result of the Soviet obsession with security?

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that its own security had long been a Russian concern and that it was likely that Stalin would take this to extremes. Stalin's priority in 1945 was to rebuild a Soviet Union decimated by WWII and to prevent another invasion from the West. The post-war situation in Europe provided Stalin with the opportunity to create a 'buffer zone' of Soviet-controlled states in Eastern Europe. The USSR also wanted to ensure that Germany could never again be strong enough to attack eastwards and to receive adequate compensation for its war losses which would be used to aid the rebuilding process – Soviet actions in the Berlin Blockade could be seen as an example. The USA failed to understand the USSR's need for security and assumed that these actions comprised Soviet expansionism for ideological reasons. Truman (inspired by the Long Telegram, which emphasised the aggressive nature of Soviet actions) took measures such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that Stalin was a communist who openly professed world revolution. Soviet actions in Eastern Europe were brutal and in direct contravention of the post-war agreements between the 'Big Three'. Stalin was trying to extend Soviet influence and the USA had no alternative but to take active measures against this (the traditional viewpoint). Conversely, it could be argued that the Cold War developed because of the inflammatory and expansionist actions of the USA – Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb in Japan without informing Stalin and American attempts to gain political and economic supremacy in Europe through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan (which the Soviets dubbed 'dollar imperialism') might be cited as examples (the revisionist viewpoint). It could also be argued that both the USA and the USSR were primarily concerned with security, but also with their prestige given the power vacuum that remained after WWII.

### 3 To what extent was the USSR more responsible than the USA for ending the period of détente in the 1970s?

In support of the view that the USSR was more responsible, it could be argued that the USSR violated human rights agreements made at Helsinki. Brezhnev's failing health did little to enhance US-Soviet relations, while the Soviet military was arguing in favour of arms increases within the USSR. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was viewed by the West as evidence of the continuation of the expansionist attitude of the USSR. The USA withdrew from the SALT II Treaty and the period of détente, stemming from the post-Cuban crisis situation, was over. US President Carter was unwilling to allow the USSR to get away with another intervention in the affairs of a foreign country – he cut off trade links with Moscow, encouraged a boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980 and increased US spending on arms. Despite this, Carter was seen as weak against communism and lost the 1980 election to Ronald Reagan, whose hatred of communism was well-known.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the period of détente was effectively over before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The development of renewed superpower hostility can be seen as early as 1976. Conservatism was regaining strength in the USA, and it viewed the increasing influence of the USSR in the Third World as further evidence of Soviet expansionism (e.g. Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia). Carter supplied US arms to anti-communist groups (e.g. El Salvador, Nicaragua) in an attempt to prevent the spread of Soviet influence. The US Senate was opposed to SALT II before the invasion of Afghanistan, and it already seemed unlikely that the USA would sign. When Islamic militants occupied the US embassy in Teheran (1979), American conservatives viewed this as evidence of the USA's impotence in world affairs and argued that this needed to be addressed.

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>31</b>

A balanced view might argue that détente was no longer seen as beneficial to either side and that both were equally responsible for the onset of the Second Cold War. Therefore, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was the event which started the Second Cold War rather than its cause.

**4 ‘The Korean War highlighted fundamental dilemmas in US policy towards the spread of communism.’ How far do you agree?**

In support of the hypothesis, it could be argued that, in 1950, many Americans believed that they were losing the Cold War. NSC-68 displays American insecurities about the spread of communism, arguing for a change from containment to roll-back as part of a stronger attack. This resulted in confusion over the USA’s involvement in the Korean War. What began as a successful attempt to protect South Korea from an invasion by North Korea (containment) led to a thrust north beyond the 38th parallel (roll back). This had not been the original intention; however, the success of the US-dominated UN forces in pushing back the North Koreans presented the USA with an opportunity to weaken communism in Asia. However, the incursion across the border into North Korea led to the involvement of China, which caused the Americans to re-think policy yet again. Despite MacArthur’s arguments in favour of using nuclear weapons, US policy again became the preservation of South Korea at the 38th parallel. The war dragged on until 1953, ending in stalemate and a treaty signed by all participants except South Korea, who had little alternative but to accept the situation.

In challenging the hypothesis, it could be argued that the basic thrust of American foreign policy was consistently to prevent the spread of communism, especially in strategically important areas (e.g. SE Asia). The USA managed to enlist the support of the UN for its campaign in the Korean War and was successful in resisting the invasion of South Korea by North Korean forces. The policy of containment had not only been successfully implemented but had also been supported by the majority of member states of the UN. Moreover, the USSR had not become directly involved in the war, thereby enhancing US prestige.

**5 Why did the ‘crisis of communism’ have a more devastating impact on the USSR than on China?**

It could be argued that there were many similarities between the problems facing the USSR and those facing the PRC during the crisis of communism, and in the manner in which they attempted to address them. Both were suffering from major social, economic and political problems. Deng Xiaoping in the PRC and Gorbachev in the USSR, were prepared to reform in order to address these problems (market socialism in China, glasnost and perestroika in USSR).

However, it is the differences between them which are more significant in terms of this question. Deng carried out economic reforms (including joining the IMF and World Bank) and initially allowed greater freedoms (e.g. in religion, literature, the arts, Democracy Wall). However, when demands for greater political reforms grew, Deng was quick to clamp down. By maintaining a hard line, control over the army and a resolute leadership style, Deng was able to keep a balance between rival factions within the Communist Party and to survive Tiananmen Square. Conversely, Gorbachev attempted to bring in economic and political reforms at the same time. This destroyed the privileged position of the Communist Party and meant that Gorbachev was unable to control rival factions within it. The USSR’s problems were made worse by economic hardship caused by the need to maintain the arms race and the political threat posed by nationalism, within the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>31</b>

**6 Assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the conduct of the Cold War from 1949 to 1963.**

The dangers inherent in the use of nuclear weapons had an impact on the nature of military strategy. The fear of initiating nuclear war restrained both the USA and the USSR from engaging in direct armed confrontation (as demonstrated by the Cuban missile crisis in 1962). Other strategies had to be used. This led to the notion of 'limited war' i.e. keeping wars localised and avoiding escalation, a key factor in the globalisation of the Cold War. Prior to 1962, American nuclear strategy consisted of massive retaliation. It was assumed this would act as a deterrent at a time when the USA still had nuclear supremacy. This led to the kind of brinkmanship displayed by Kennedy over the Cuban crisis. After 1962, MAD (mutually assured destruction) led to the development of smaller, targeted nuclear weapons and to an increase in the development of conventional weapons. This provided an alternative to nuclear war, a strategy which Kennedy dubbed 'flexible response'. While nuclear weapons were not used during the Cold War, they formed a significant part of the conflict. The arms race was an integral part of the struggle for supremacy, a measure of technological superiority which both sides saw as central to highlighting the pre-eminence of their political and economic systems. Subsequent attempts to control the proliferation and development of nuclear weapons had limited success, but could be seen as vital in bringing the USA and the USSR together.

**7 How significant was Japan's political stability to its economic recovery after World War Two?**

It could be argued that political stability was the crucial factor in encouraging agricultural and industrial investment and growth. The dominant party was the LDP, which was conservative and pro-business in character. With the left-wing fragmented, the LDP was in power from 1952 to 1993. Successive governments provided vital support for the revival of Japan's agricultural and industrial sectors – e.g. the institution of a land reform plan to move Japan from a semi-feudal system including government subsidies and regulations which enabled farming to develop more effectively. Government initiatives also helped to increase wages which enhanced the domestic market for goods.

However, while political stability was significant for economic recovery, there were other factors which were also important. It could be argued that American help was vital in the early years of Japanese recovery. The USA believed that Japan was key in stopping the spread of communism in Southeast Asia. The USA supplied aid and new equipment, and allowed Japanese goods into American markets on favourable terms. The Korean War gave an enormous boost to Japan's 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. With the USA taking care of Japan's security, Japan was able to invest in industry without having to fund defence and armaments. Since much of Japan's industry had been destroyed during WW2, new plant was built using the latest technology. Japan was able to concentrate on high-technology goods for both the home and export market. Japanese products gained a reputation for high quality and reliability, and were highly competitive in the world market.

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>31</b>

**8 Using specific examples, explain why, in the period from 1960 to 1991, some Third World countries experienced rapid economic growth while most remained poor.**

It could be argued that most Third World countries remained economically dependent on the industrial North, and found it difficult to break away from one-product economies, lacking the money necessary for diversification (e.g. Ghana – cocoa; Zambia – copper). World economic problems in the 1970s led to a dramatic fall in the price of many such products. Meanwhile, the price of manufactured goods from the industrial world continued to rise. Financial aid from the North to the South was usually on a business basis, with high interest rates leading to the Third World Debt Crisis. In many Third World countries, population continued to rise very quickly. Political instability caused many countries to suffer from wars or civil wars (e.g. Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Lebanon, Congo, Sudan, Angola). Adverse weather conditions caused famines (e.g. Nigeria). The Brandt Report was full of good intentions, but did little to close the gap between North and South.

Nevertheless, some Third World countries were able to become more prosperous during the period, often because of the exploitation of natural resources such as oil or because of industrialisation. Some countries were able to make huge profits from oil (e.g. Nigeria, Libya). Such prosperity was not always shared with the whole population, but, in Libya for example, it could be used to finance agricultural and industrial development. Some countries began rapid industrialisation – e.g. the Tiger economies (Singapore, Taiwan, South Korea and Hong Kong), Thailand, Malaysia, Brazil and Mexico. They were often able to attract firms from the North, wishing to take advantage of lower production costs.