

Examiners' Report

June 2013

GCSE History 5HA01 01

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2013

Publications Code UG036170

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

Once again, examiners reported that candidates coped well with the demands of the paper and that the overall standard of responses was most pleasing. The vast majority of candidates finished in the prescribed time indicating as in previous series that the allotted duration is adequate.

As in January 2013, it is pleasing to note that the issue of volume in the (a) questions has been settled. The recommendation of previous reports that one or two sentences is suffice to gain a Level Two mark has been acted upon. Again, examiners noted not only a more measured approach to these questions but also more focused responses.

This is welcomed and it is hoped that responses continue to improve in the coming series.

The approach to individual sub-questions is considered in the reports on each separate item, and examples are provided. Please note that on occasions, part answers are given as exemplification. A general summary of areas for improvement in the approach to some of the question types (which are common across the six options) may prove of benefit to centres. It is important for teachers to look at responses for all options in this report in order to consider the paper as a whole. Complete essays are included to indicate what can be achieved in this paper.

In Question (b), candidates need to discuss **TWO** points ONLY to move to the top of Level Two. This change in the Mark Scheme was mentioned in the last two reports and operated in January 2013. There were some candidates who still set out the response to include three developed statements and had achieved maximum marks at the end of the second, thus time was wasted. It is to be hoped that all Centres will respond to this change for June 2014.

As has been pointed out in all previous series' reports, candidates should be aware that Question (c) will always be centred on causation. Therefore, key causal words should figure in any response. Candidates still drift too readily into a narrative and thus do not focus sharply on the demands of the question. Importantly, candidates must be careful to focus on the key question words and apply knowledge accordingly. In 4(c) and 6(c), candidates often produced responses on what they had anticipated, not what the question actually demanded. Please see comments later in the report.

The point made in previous reports about Question (c) still applies, namely that to reach Level Three, candidates need to prioritise and/or link causes. There continues to be improvement in this area but many candidates still assert links and prioritisation. Many of those who met the criteria for Level Three did so with some sophistication.

If dates and names are given in a question, they are there for guidance and should act as a trigger for recall. Some candidates ignored the dates/confused names and wasted time including irrelevant material. As was pointed out in January, it is dispiriting to see the now constant confusion with Nagy-Dubcek, Khrushchev-Gorbachev, Berlin in all its temporal appearances, the ubiquity of Stalin as the eternal leader of the USSR and the poor chronology around events concerning Cuba.

Question 1 (a)

There was some confusion among candidates in attempting this question. The answer requires quite a specific focus on the relationship between the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary. This specific knowledge polarised responses to be either non-rewarded or accurate and focused. Most candidates who achieved two marks did so in a focused and concise manner and mentioned the fear of a resurgent Turkey due to the Young Turk Revolution.

Many more students went on to mention the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina. Whilst this did occur in 1908 a significant proportion mentioned the annexation in the wrong context. Candidates commonly labelled the annexation as a response to pressure from Serbia, or demands for an independent Bosnia. This was not the reason for the annexation and as such was unrewarded. However, some candidates mentioned the annexation by Austria-Hungary then, went on to discuss the consequences ie Serbian nationalism, Russian frustration, Ottoman anger and German involvement.

A large number of candidates were somewhat off the mark discussing other Great Powers such as Italy.

Question 1

Answer Part (a).

(a) Describe **one** reason why there was a crisis over Bosnia in 1908.

(2)

The Bosnian Crisis happened because Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia-Herzegovina in September 1908. This was because the Young Turks were reforming the Ottoman Empire and A-H were worried they would take back Bosnia-Herzegovina, which A-H were administering for the Ottoman Empire.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a clear answer to the question. It is only two sentences long but is replete with sharp detail. This was awarded a Level Two mark.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When expanding answers be clear and do not repeat what has gone before.

Question 1

Answer Part (a).

(a) Describe **one** reason why there was a crisis over Bosnia in 1908.

(2)

Bosnia was being administered by Austria-Hungary during 1908, when there was trouble within the Ottoman Empire (to which Bosnia belonged). For this reason, Austria annexed Bosnia and it joined the Austrian empire, which nationalist serbs disliked.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response has good recall and is clearly focused. This was awarded a Level Two mark.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to use accurate vocabulary as this answer does.

Question 1 (b)

Q1b(i) As always, candidates tackling this topic seemed to know it well and could discern valid features amid the complexities of Balkan interrelationships. Occasionally, responses became confused with events of 1908 but generally, features such as the expulsion of Turkey from Europe, Serbian expansion and the subsequent fears of Austria-Hungary were described with confidence. However, it should be noted that several less able candidates strayed into discussion of imperialism and colonialism which suggested some misunderstanding of these areas; and makes one wonder why this appeared a common error.

Q1 b(ii) This question was answered well with excellent knowledge displayed often to the exact dates when various countries went to war. It was wide ranging in scope so responses varied from quite detailed features as to what happened in the Balkans to the German predicament of having to fight a war on varied fronts. The real concern was the number of detailed narratives about the actual assassination – although not all of these were accurate. Occasionally, less able candidates got World War One and Two mixed up and strayed into discussions about the onset of the Cold War.

Chosen Question Number:

Part (b)(i)

Part (b)(ii)

Serbia grew stronger after gaining land from the Ottoman empire after the first Balkan war in 1912, where the Turks were pushed back to Constantinople, and also after the 2nd Balkan war, with the Treaty of Bucharest which took land from Bulgaria. Serbia's population grew from 2.9 million to 4.5 million, and were more determined to unite with other ~~slavs~~ slavs. This alarmed Austria who wanted to crush Serbia before the spread of Nationalism.

Also Austria were more aware of Serbia's growing power and they had to be restrained several times by Germany to stop war. The result of the Balkan wars showed Germany were now fully committed

to Austria and their aims to control the Balkans, as they backed them during the disputes and even more so now even if it led to war. These two reasons created tension in Europe.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This b(i) response looks carefully at the results and is clear in its development. Two points are made and the recall was good enough to move the mark to the top of Level Two.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Two developed statements are required to reach the top of Level Two - this stands as a good example.

Chosen Question Number:

Part (b)(i)

Part (b)(ii)

Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated on a state visit to Sarajevo on June 28th 1914. Him and his wife Sophie were shot by a member of the black hand terrorist organisation Gavrilo Princip.

Austria-Hungary were furious about this and determined to seek revenge. On July 23rd, they sent 10 demands to the Serbian Government which virtually ended Serbian independence - Surprisingly Serbia accepted all but one, however determined for revenge, Austria-Hungary declared war on July 28th. In response to this, on July 30th, Russia began mobilising its military power to defend its ally and ignored a warning from Germany to stop, this led to

Germany declaring war on Russia on August 1st. This same day, Germany warned France to remain neutral while Italy declared that it would do so.

// Answer on August 2nd, France began mobilising its forces to mount an attack on Germany. So on August 3rd, Germany declared war on France.

As a result of its close relations with France, Britain was joining war. They declared war on Germany on August 4th after they invaded Belgium through the Schlieffen plan. Tensions had been unbearable in the years leading up to the war and was constantly increasing. The Alliance system was the important factor that turned a dispute between 2 countries into a general European war. The German support gave Austria - Hungary the confidence to declare war, the assassination was just the spark that began it.

* The Alliance system was coming into play and had a huge impact on the dispute - This was a culmination of all the tensions over colonies and crises boiling over into war.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response shows what a candidate can produce for such a question. It has coverage and analysis with a sharp focus. It was awarded top Level Two.

Question 1 (c)

Candidates tackling this question generally answered it well with excellent knowledge about the naval race, events in Morocco, and Germany's quest for empire, which were expected - but also Britain's fears about German expansion. Some could even give figures to show how Germany's industrial growth overtook that of Britain. The vast majority kept within the date parameters. Weaker responses tended to be more generalised and so lacked development in relation to the specific case. Many candidates could discern links and priorities so moved in to Level 3.

Answer Part (c).

(c) Explain why relations between Britain and Germany worsened in the years

1900-11.

Maroccan
Crisis

CASO
Crisis

(12)

The relations between Britain and Germany worsened because of numerous reasons. Firstly, Britain and Germany competed over a lot of things. For example, resources was competed against. Germany overtook Britain in trading of coal and steel. Furthermore, they lead the way in the new industries such as chemicals and the car industry. This created a lot of tension between the countries. Countries as they were both Britain witnessed how strong Germany was becoming and noticed him as a real threat. In addition, Britain and Germany competed over the navy. Britain had the biggest navy but Germany were catching up. This created tension as once again, Britain saw how much of a threat Germany was.

Secondly, the Maroccan crisis in 1905 led to their relationship worsening. This is because Germany was trying to split up the ~~last~~ alliance between France and Britain. When Britain backed France all the way, Germany stepped down. This led to them feeling humiliated and it also increased tension as the Germans built

more ships which links back to competition between the countries -

Because Germany felt humiliated, they wanted to get revenge and have another attempt to split the empire - colonial. Therefore, in 1911, Germany sent a gunship to Agadir. (a port in Morocco). Britain was scared that Germany would be setting up a naval base and demanded Germany to retreat with the threat of war. ^{Germany} ~~Britain~~ did back down in the end which led to them feeling humiliated again. Also, the fact that Britain threatened with war increased tension as they were now prepared to fight each other: Germany would want revenge for this humiliation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This question looked at three areas and offered a discussion. There was some linking between the second and third paragraphs and so the response was awarded a Level Three mark.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Try to ensure that the connection between events is made obvious.

Answer Part (c).

(c) Explain why relations between Britain and Germany worsened in the years 1900-11.

(12)

Plan : Naval arms race, ^{1.} place in the sun, ^{2.} 1st + 2nd ~~WW~~ Moroccan Crises ^{3.}

The main reason that the relations between Britain and Germany worsened in the years 1900-11 was the Naval arms race, in the context of Germany's desire for an empire and the Moroccan Crises. The German desire for an empire increased tensions between Britain and Germany as Germany had a desire for 'a place in the sun'. Germany had ~~previously~~ not been involved in the 'scramble for Africa', and had gained the least desirable areas of Africa. However, after 1900 Germany developed 'Weltpolitik'; an aggressive Foreign policy which resulted in border tensions in Africa between Britain and Germany. Moreover, Germany had prevented the British building of a railway line from Cairo to the Cape, thus increasing tensions and worsening the relations between the two countries. A further reason for the increase in tensions was the German plan to build a railway line from Berlin to Baghdad, which suggested to Britain that Germany was threatening British supremacy in the Middle East. This resulted in their relationship worsening.

A further reason that relations between Britain and

Germany worsened in the years 1900-1911 was as a result of the Moroccan crises. In 1905 at the First Moroccan crisis Kaiser Wilhelm II made a speech in favour of an 'open-door' policy in Africa, suggesting Germany wanted to force its way into Morocco, which was under French influence. This caused the Entente Cordiale to be tested between Britain and France, and resulted in the two growing closer. Due to this, relations between ~~the~~ Britain and Germany worsened.

The second Moroccan crisis caused relations to worsen when the gunboat Panther was sent to Agadir. This ~~seem~~ seemed like a direct threat to Britain, as it appeared Germany were seeking an Atlantic Naval Base from which to challenge British Sea Power and the British Naval Base at Gibraltar. Furthermore, David Lloyd George made the British Chancellor of the Exchequer made a speech accusing the Germans of stirring up trouble, and threatened retaliation, thus increasing the tensions between the two countries a huge amount, causing worsening relations.

The main reason relations between Britain and Germany worsened in the years 1900-17 was due to the Naval Arms race. In 1900 Germany proposed the plan to build 38 battleships in the First German Naval Law, ~~that~~ which was seen as a threat to Britain's supreme naval power, which resulted in ~~over~~ worsened

relations between the two countries. Moreover, when Britain developed the Dreadnought, a battleship that made all others obsolete, Germany also began a programme of Dreadnought construction, leading to a naval arms race which ~~led~~ caused worsened relations between Britain and Germany, as it seemed Germany was threatening Britain.

Overall relations worsened between Britain and Germany in the years 1900-11 due to the German desire for an empire, the 1st and 2nd Moroccan Crises, and the Naval arms race between the countries. As a result, tensions rose and relations worsened.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This essay was awarded a Level Three mark - it has excellent recall, sharp focus and attempts to link and prioritise throughout. It is a very articulate response which shows sound understanding.

Question 2 (a)

This response quite commonly yielded one mark as simple statements related to the loss of land, or the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. However, a number of developed statements effectively obtained 2 marks for justifying the demilitarisation of the Rhineland as a buffer zone to protect France against future attack. Another common, effective development was to explain how the creation of the Polish Corridor provided Poland access to the sea and divided Germany in two by isolating East Prussia.

A large sample mentioned that Alsace and Lorraine went to France and many were able to amplify this decision.

A minority, but a significant number nonetheless, discussed non-territorial outcomes eg military restrictions, or reparations. Fewer, but still a notable number, discussed the post-1945 division into 4 zones of occupation.

Question 2

Answer Part (a).

(a) Describe **one** decision which was made about Germany's territory in the Treaty of Versailles. (2)

They would lose Alsace - Lorraine.
This was because they should be punished for the war and France deserved compensation in the form of the return of Alsace and Lorraine to their country.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A standard response about Alsace-Lorraine but the candidate mentions compensation and also the return of the area to France. Hence, this was awarded a Level Two mark.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This is the typical point/amplify approach.

Question 2

Answer Part (a).

(a) Describe **one** decision which was made about Germany's territory in the Treaty of Versailles.

(2)

They decided that German ~~territory~~^{area} ~~the~~^{was} the Coalfield was to be under the control of France + the League, so that all the material made there would go to the Allies as part of reparation payment, this would be under their control for 15 years.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A sound response -one which gives the area and then amplifies the decision. Hence this was awarded a Level Two mark.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Remember to have a point of recall and then have additional information to expand on the point.

Question 2 (b)

Q2b(i) The Treaty of Versailles is very well known and the vast majority of candidates realised the question was about the military terms not the others. Most answered the question very well, with reductions in the military and demilitarisation of the Rhineland featuring heavily. However some candidates made lists without developing the terms, for example in terms of their purpose or impact and so penalised themselves because pure recall alone cannot get into Level 2. Some even just wrote a list of bullet points without comment.

Q2b(ii) Examiners reported that hardly any candidates attempted this question and those that were seen had scant understanding of the work of either ICJ or ILO. Comments tended to be imprecise or vague.

The Permanent Court of Justice was based in at Hague in the Netherlands. Here 15 judges from representative countries met annually and decided settled international disputes. This court, however, had very little power as only the Assembly could decide what the final decision would be.

The International Labour Organisation was met annually and each representative country sent 2 government ministers, 1 employer and 1 worker. Together they would discuss working conditions and persuade countries to make improvements.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is sufficient development in each paragraph to place this answer in Level Two.

There were several military terms encompassed by the Treaty of Versailles that reduced Germany's military capacity.

The first feature was that their army was limited to 100,000 men. This greatly reduced their armed forces and ensured they posed no further threat to other countries, especially France. The Germans saw this as humiliating because their army was a symbol of national pride.

A second feature was that they were not allowed an air force ~~and~~, tanks or submarines. This again weakened their power and ensured that new states such as Czechoslovakia but also France, Britain and Belgium were safe from attack - It restored Britain

as the naval super power and ensured Germany posed no threat to peace in Europe.

A third key feature was that their navy was limited to 6 battleships and 30 smaller ships. This was so they could still protect themselves but they couldn't mount an attack. It meant Britain remained the naval super power and couldn't be touched. This also reduced Germany's interests abroad & gave them no hope of building an Empire.

Overall these terms were set to severely weaken Germany as a military force but also ensure peace could be maintained in Europe. (It is ironic to note that Germany had imposed a much harsher Treaty on Russia in 1918. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk took almost one third of Russia's land area from them.)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate wrote more than was required. There are three delineated features and any two would have secured the top mark in Level Two. The Mark Scheme now specifies that only two developed features are needed. Thus, the candidate wasted time discussing three.

Question 2 (c)

Most candidates attempting this question understood the factors very well with knowledge about the Dawes Plan being particularly impressive and clarity about how the signing of the Locarno Treaties paved the way for membership of the League of Nations. The role of Stresemann was well understood, although few mentioned that he still wanted the terms of the Treaty reconsidered. Sometimes the Locarno treaties were confused with the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Less able candidates almost inevitably wrote about Hitler with varying degrees of accuracy. The best candidates were able to prioritise well, showing for example how the Dawes Plan not only placed the German economy on a sounder footing but also showed the impact of the USA appearing to trust Germany with others following by example.

Finally, the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1929 sealed international relations between Germany and other countries. This was caused by the Locarno Pact, as the powers wanted to extend a pact of peace to other countries, to try and remove the threat of war. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was signed by 62 countries, including Germany and the USA. The pact was not done through the League of Nations, therefore the USA had great influence. It agreed to stop using war to settle disputes. This improved relations as war did not seem so real, and Germany was seen to want peace as much as the other powers.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is part of a response which was awarded a Level Three mark. Here the candidate discussed at length the Kellogg-Briand Pact in detail, showing how much depth can be included in a response.

Question 3 (a)

Overall, this question yielded a degree of success for candidates, be it 1 mark or 2 marks. The most commonly rewarded responses discussed Mussolini's desire for land, empire and sometimes to emulate the glory of ancient Rome.

A good range showed an awareness of Mussolini's existing African empire and how it made sense to obtain one of the few, available independent countries in Africa.

A significant number of students also mentioned the Wal Wal incident of December 1934 and the excuse it provided.

Virtually all responses that alluded to Mussolini's desire to distract Italians from the failure of domestic policies during the Depression demonstrated development and achieved 2 marks. Likewise, candidates who outlined events in Manchuria often went on effectively to link events to the Abyssinian invasion and the anticipated response of the League.

A common response that was not rewarded was the desire to invade Abyssinia for resources, coal, iron, oil, etc. Some also spoke about population issues in Italy. These candidates were confused with events in 1931.

(a) Describe **one** reason why Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935.

(2)

Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 due to a border clash in which 30 Italian Soldiers were killed. They took this as a reason to invade the country and take over.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear response which offers the immediate cause with detail and further support. A Level Two mark was awarded.

(a) Describe **one** reason why Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935.

(2)

Italy invaded Abyssinia in 1935 because Mussolini wanted to build an Italian empire in Africa. Italy had already invaded countries such as Somaliland, and saw Abyssinia as a further chance to extend Italian influence across Africa.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A sound response focusing on Mussolini's wish to enlarge his African Empire - an initial statement is made which is then supported.

Question 3 (b)

Q3b(i) Britain's agreement with Poland was a difficult topic for many candidates with much confusion including some mentioning Polish migration as a factor. Few realised there were in fact two agreements, with that of 25th August specifying German aggression as a trigger for bringing the terms into play, and Polish commentators at the time widely regarded the treaties as useless. However, most understood the nature of the British guarantees and their limitations. Some confused these agreements with 'USSR taking over Poland and making it communist after the war'.

Q3b(ii) Far more candidates tackled this option and it was well answered with valid features including the decision to partition Poland and the buying of time featuring prominently. Occasionally, less able candidates confused it with agreements made with Italy and Japan.

One key feature was that Hitler would not have to fight a war on two fronts. If he invaded Poland without ~~the pact~~ making a pact with Stalin, Hitler expected both Britain and France, and Russia, to declare war on him (as the former had promised to defend Poland, and the latter also wanted to invade). This would mean fighting on both the East and West fronts: not a viable military option. ~~So~~ Therefore the pact protected Germany's Eastern front.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This paragraph, from a response which scored maximum marks, neatly encapsulates the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

In 1939, Stalin and Hitler signed the Nazi-Soviet pact. This was a pact of non-aggression, which meant that Russia would not attack Germany, or vice versa. The Pact also said that Russia would get half of Poland, ~~and~~ which was ex-soviet territory, and Germany would take the other half which used to be part of Eastern Prussia.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This extract was taken from a response which secured top marks. In the paragraph, it clearly discusses the non-aggression aspect of the pact as well as the fate of Poland. The rest of the response focused on the motives of the two signatories.

Question 3 (c)

Many candidates understood the focus of this question which was how and why Hitler was able to get away with his policies. Reasons included appeasement, sympathy with German aims fifteen years on when the Treaty of Versailles was widely regarded as unfair, revulsion at the idea of another war particularly just as countries were coming to terms with moving out of Depression, Hitler's growing confidence as he interpreted sympathy for weakness, League of Nations preoccupation with events in Abyssinia, the Spanish Civil War et al. Other candidates concentrated more on what Hitler did without pointing their responses to how or why, thus penalising themselves as they lost the question focus. Less able candidates gave very vague and imprecise responses usually random examples of what they had learnt about Nazi Germany. However one strong response argued convincingly that Hitler could not have altered the Treaty of Versailles unless he had the support of the majority of his citizens.

(c) Explain why Hitler was able to challenge the Versailles settlement in the years 1935-38.

(12)

One reason as to why Hitler was able to challenge the Versailles settlement was he was able to expand his army past 100 000 men and introduce conscription, as well as creating a Luftwaffe, the air force, which were both expressly forbidden in the Treaty of Versailles. However the expansion of his army ensured that he could go on to complete his other military aims, therefore provided a platform for his other conquests yet breaking the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. However this was accepted by some of the major powers in Europe as they saw the Treaty of Versailles to be very harsh. Therefore it was slightly important

Another reason as to why he challenged the settlement was his re-occupation of the Rhineland and the Saar. He took a chance by marching into the Rhineland, as he knew he was breaking the Treaty. However he wasn't stopped by either British or French forces as they thought that he

was marching into his own back yard' and therefore didn't want to mobilise. Also, he held a plebiscite in the Saar, and 99.75% of people voted

that they return to Germany. Expanding his territories was forbidden by the Treaty, however he continued as Britain and France showed no resistance. This interlinks with the first factor as due to the fact he was allowed to expand his army with no resistance, meant that he felt he could expand his territories as it was only trust between Germany and the allies that might of prevented him from continuing. His armed forces may have also proved somewhat intimidating to the other powers. Hitler then also went on to take the Sudetenland and force through an Anschluss with Austria in 1938, again expanding his territory, which was forbidden under the Treaty of Versailles, so it was quite important.

However a third reason, and the most important reason I believe was that the British foreign policy of appeasement was very weak. It was based on trust where the Britain would accept any demands from Hitler that were reasonable. However, Hitler kept on breaking the Treaty of Versailles time after time, and Britain were allowing him to do it, highlighting the clear weakness of their policy. This interlinks with the other two factors, as it shows how Britain allowed Hitler to expand his army and his territory,

continually challenging the treaty and breaking
the trust between the countries, with a domino
effect of seizing Austria and the the substantial
create problems ahead. Therefore it is the most
important factor as it appeared to be the root cause of
him breaking the treaty and was the most important.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response is an excellent Level Three - it has coverage, analysis and is able to link and prioritise.

Question 4 (a)

This response was a question that many candidates struggled with. The most common error was confusion with the Berlin Wall and events in 1961, the 'brain drain', etc. Thus, candidates spoke of up to 3 million refugees and Khrushchev and could not receive any reward. Another very common error was due to chronological confusion of events surrounding the decision.

Many candidates also defined the blockade itself and this was not rewarded.

The underlying cause of the blockade is quite simple and a number of rewarded candidates achieved at least 1 mark by outlining either Stalin's desire to remove western influence and/or take control of all of Berlin. Development often cited the reason as the geographical location of Berlin behind the iron curtain. Other good responses spoke of the fear of future inequality and propaganda implications, Stalin's desire to keep Berlin weak and Allied contravention of Potsdam.

However, it was clear that candidates commonly struggled to pinpoint this event and confused it with later developments.

(a) Describe **one** reason why the Soviet Union blockaded Berlin in 1948.

(2)

Stalin imposed a blockade on Berlin in 1948 because he wanted to prove that a divided Germany was not viable. The Western zones all had very friendly relationships and in 1947 the British and American zones had merged to form Bizania, and in doing so introduced a new currency. Stalin was spiteful that his zone was becoming politically and economically isolated, and so cut Berlin off from the West to show that the zonation could not go on much longer.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a very full answer and could have been truncated. Though there is a misuse of a word, the meaning is clear and the recall ensured a Level Two mark.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Try to write to the point without over-elaborating an answer.

(a) Describe **one** reason why the Soviet Union blockaded Berlin in 1948.

(2)

The soviet blockaded Berlin because he felt angered by the fact that the US & Britain united their zones and didnt consult him. Also the fact they changed their currency also angered him. Stalin also believed Germany should be his.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response would have reached Level Two with the first sentence - the notion of combining zones and then the mention of the lack of consultation.

Question 4 (b)

Q4b(i) Many candidates understood the Yalta Conference and were able to offer valid features particularly the decision to temporarily partition Germany and Berlin, the question of war criminals and reparations, the USSR's promise to enter the war against Japan and the creation of UNO. Those factors relating to Eastern Europe were less confidently tackled in part because although the issue of spheres of influence were discussed, clear cut decisions were not really taken at Yalta beyond free elections etc. Inevitably perhaps, less able candidates confused Yalta with Teheran and Potsdam. Again, candidates should avoid simply listing terms; as such an approach tends to preclude developed features.

Q4b(ii) This question was well answered with issues relating to Churchill's Iron Curtain speech and the Truman Doctrine being particularly well understood; Marshall Aid which was announced in 1947 was allowable so long as it was recognised that it did not actually begin until 1948. Some candidates tried to extend their answers to the Berlin Airlift and creation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This emphasises the importance of looking at the dates defining the question as many such responses did identify 1949 and 1955 as the timing of their chosen features. Overall however, knowledge within the question parameters was good.

Having already discussed spheres of influence at Tehran, it was decided that the USSR could have a sphere of influence in the East of Europe and that the USA, (and by extension, Britain,) could have a sphere of influence in the west. This meant that this was the part of Europe that they had control over.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This extract from a Level Two answer, discusses the notion of 'spheres of influence' and the amplification immediately placed the response in Level Two.

One key feature of the Allied response to Soviet control of Eastern Europe in the years 1945-47 was the Truman Doctrine 1947. This doctrine said that the USA would be willing to offer help to those countries in Europe that didn't want to fall to communism, as it was in the USA's favour to keep most of Europe capitalist because President Truman wanted to limit the USSR's power in Europe.

A second key feature of the Allied response to Soviet control of Eastern Europe in the years 1945-47 was the Marshall Plan 1947, this plan was created to offer money and economic aid to countries in Europe that needed it, under the condition that the country would agree to be an ally of the USA before taking the money. This was also another way

of the USA's to stop countries from falling to communism.

A third key feature of the Allied response to Soviet control of Eastern Europe in the years 1945-47 was Kennan's long telegram 1946. In this telegram from the USA's ambassador in the USSR he said that if the USA allowed the Soviet union to take control of Eastern Europe then it wouldn't be long before they tried to have power over the world. This shows that the USA had little trust for the USSR and wanted to prevent them from taking further control over Europe.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response was awarded top Level Two. It develops the Truman Doctrine and then expands on the Marshall Plan. A good answer written with economy.

Question 4 (c)

This question received mixed responses with some candidates showing excellent knowledge and identifying three valid reasons notably the repression of Rakosi, the impact of economic woes and the false dawn following de-stalinisation; ensuring that the response remained rooted in the notion of Soviet control. Some candidates were able to demonstrate how the example of some liberalism in Poland impacted on Hungary. However, many simply wanted to go through the causes of the Uprising without tailoring the information to the demands of the question.

The vast majority seemed to understand the decision to leave the Warsaw Pact was a crucial tipping point as far as Khrushchev was concerned. Less able candidates often confused events in Hungary with those in Czechoslovakia or at least the names of the principal characters. Again, there was too much narrative of the Soviet invasion.

(c) Explain why Soviet control of Hungary caused an uprising in 1956.

(12)

Soviet Control of Hungary caused an uprising in Hungary for many reasons. The most important reason was the role of Rakosi in treating the people.

↳ The most important reason why Soviet control caused an uprising in Hungary is because it led to the implementation of Rakosi running the country. Rakosi was a hardline Communist. He killed 2000 people and imprisoned 200,000 people in his purge. He also imprisoned Cardinal Mindszenty in 1949. As well as this he used his secret police, the AVH, to strike fear into the Hungarian people. This caused an uprising because it made the Hungarian people angry!

The second most important reason why the Soviet Union caused an uprising in Hungary was because it refused to allow the people any say. Hungary The Soviet Union invaded Hungary in 1944 as one of Hitler's allies. Upon the ending of the war Soviet troops remained in the country. An allied control Commission, containing Soviet, American and British officials was set up, but the Soviet Union was the

Most influential. This meant that ^{in effect,} they ruled Hungary. This caused an uprising in Hungary because the people became frustrated at not having a voice.

The third most important reason why Soviet control of Hungary caused an uprising was because of economic problems. In 1952 Hungary experienced their lowest ever agricultural output. Many Hungarians were starving to death. Hungary's economy was run by Comecon, which was set up in 1949, so as a result, they were short of materials needed for themselves. Reform economic reforms were attempted in the 1960s, but these failed.

The final reason was because of Soviet refusal to allow leadership from other parties. In elections held in 1947, the smallholders party won 57% of the vote, with the communist party winning only 17%. However, Marshall Vorshilov refused to allow the smallholders control, and they formed a coalition government with the communist party.

Overall, the main reason why Soviet control of Hungary caused an uprising was because ~~strictly~~ Soviet

Control lead to Rakosi taking over. He was responsible for Mass Murder and was hated by the people. It was this hatred that fuelled the anger to power the uprising. This is linked to economic problems, as Rakosi tried to implement the unsuccessful economic reforms, making him even more unpopular.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This essay was awarded a Level Three mark. It focuses directly on the question and tailors information at all times to the impact of Soviet control on Hungary.

In addition, it prioritises throughout the work and makes clear links.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Ensure that the demand/focus of the question is recognised and that information is targeted directly.

Question 5 (a)

This question was answered well with a significant proportion of candidates writing a number of well developed statements that linked to the sole, original statement. Dubcek was frequently mentioned as a reformer who threatened the stability of the eastern bloc, or was allowing too many freedoms hence, Brezhnev feared for the Warsaw Pact. These answers came in a variety of forms mentioning the liberal developments, some accurate comparisons with Hungary, 'socialism with a human face', concerns by Ulbricht and Gomulka. All were very impressive.

Common errors were often found in pockets amid overall understanding. Nagy or Khrushchev may have been inappropriately used but in many cases the rest of the development was so accurate that 2 marks were still rewarded.

However, candidates did sometimes get Hungary and Czechoslovakia confused and where it was obvious that the candidate was discussing Hungary no marks were rewarded. Another error was when candidates spoke of Dubcek's desire to leave the Warsaw Pact. Sometimes 'capitalism' was used rather clumsily.

A minority spoke of the soviet desire to create a buffer zone and therefore were operating around events in 1948. Fewer, but still a notable number were very misguided and seemed very confused over the ideological sides drawn up after WWII.

(a) Describe **one** reason why Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968.

One reason was that Dubcek had ~~announced~~ ⁽²⁾ announced reforms that he called "socialism with a human face", which included less censorship and some capitalist elements in the economy. Brezhnev claimed that this threatened the whole of the Eastern Bloc and therefore moved in.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good example of a candidate making a point and then expanding it. This was awarded a Level Two mark.

(a) Describe **one** reason why Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968.

(2)

This is because Alexander Dubcek brought in reforms that were too liberal for the Soviet union. They proposed to relax press censorship and bring in capitalist elements to communism to remove the most repressive aspects of communism. Dubcek was accused of betraying socialism and Brezhnev felt they had to invade to maintain Soviet power.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a very clear response which is articulate and uses good subject specific vocabulary. A Level Two mark was awarded.

Question 5 (b)

Q5b(i) This was by far the more popular question of the two options.

The reasons for the building of the Berlin Wall were very well understood and responses to this question almost always reached Level 2. Besides the expected halting of migration and geopolitical jockeying with Kennedy, some candidates also mentioned the genuine Soviet fear of espionage and infiltration. Some even showed how the Wall eased tensions because, as a fait accompli, it largely stopped the 'brain drain' and the fissure in the Iron Curtain. Once again, there were those candidates who confused the Wall with the Berlin Blockade/ Airlift.

Q5b(ii) More able candidates generally answered this question. When they did answer, they seemed to have a good grasp of the USA and foreign communist parties disassociating themselves and some mentioned Yugoslavia and Romania.

One key feature of building the Berlin wall is why it was done. Khrushchev noticed that many highly skilled workers were escaping from East Berlin to West Berlin and sometimes from there into West Germany. The reason they were doing this is because of the much more wealthy and popular lifestyle in the West. Khrushchev did not like this as ~~to~~ this showed just how unpopular communism was. Therefore, over night one night, he had a wall constructed to stop people leaving.

Another key feature of ~~to~~ the building of the Berlin Wall is the reaction from the rest of Europe. ~~For~~ John F. Kennedy (the American president since 1960) said "it is not a very nice solution, but a wall is a hell of a lot better than a war". Furthermore, in 1963 he visited West Berlin and gave an emotional speech to the Berlin people where he condemned communism and

famously said "Ich bin ein Berliner!".

A final key feature of the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 is what this led to in the long-run. The division of East and West Berlin and communism and capitalism ~~also~~ reflected how Europe was divided in 1961. However, it did prevent a nuclear war so Khrushchev was happy as the USSR was not ready for war.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a response that had three features - any two would have secured the top Level Two mark. Each paragraph contains good recall and clear development of a point. It was a pity that the candidate wasted time writing a third point which was not required.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Remember - only two features are required to reach top of Level Two.

A second reaction was that of Western Europe. The government of Western European countries, like America did, and condemned the invasion but did not send military aid. ~~The~~ Surprisingly, Communist parties in Western Europe such as Italy and France were outraged by the invasion and their connection with the Soviet Communist party weakened as they grew nearer to Chinese communists.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This extract was a part of an answer which was awarded the top of Level Two. The extract discusses not only the governments of Western Europe but also includes reference to the Communist Parties of that area.

Question 5 (c)

The Cuban Missile crisis is well known to the extent that many candidates strayed into too much narrative, relating the Crisis with varying degrees of accuracy. Robert Kennedy emerged in a hugely positive light. Having said this, in the vast majority of cases there was also enough valid reasoning in terms of why it was a flashpoint to attain at least Level 2. The most common reasons offered were Castro's revolution and downturn in relations with the USA, Cuba's growing trading relations with the USSR, the attempted invasion at the Bay of Pigs and Castro's ensuing drift to the USSR for military protection resulting in the Cuban Missile Crisis. Many candidates still misunderstand the chronology, so typically the Bay of Pigs Invasion came after the discovery of missile sites or in some instances the discovery of the missile sites was the instigator of the whole process. It is worth emphasising the importance of clarity in terms of events because obviously getting them in the wrong order can seriously skew the response.

Candidates also tended to go beyond the question by examining the results of the Crisis, notably the withdrawal of US missiles from Greece and Turkey and the installation of the hotline. This is a topic which is generally so well known that candidates are tempted to tell us all they know at the risk of losing sight of the actual question. Notably, responses to this question tended to be longer than others – even the best responses often included detailed narrative within the reasons. Strong responses were able to discern links in terms of how the USSR were able to exploit the situation and the USA became more and more concerned about having a Communist neighbour with increasing links to the USSR; prioritisation too was well explained, often in terms of how one thing led to another as the situation escalated.

Initially, all the stated factors are intertwined and seem to enhance each other's significance, although, in conclusion, it would be possible to derive that Cuba's alliance with the Soviet Union triggered underlying tensions and suspicion that would rapidly evolve to make Cuba a 'flashpoint'.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This extract, from a Level Three answer, makes a point about the importance of the Cuban-Soviet friendship and sees how it is difficult to divorce the reasons behind the notion of a 'flashpoint'.

Question 6 (a)

This was a question that was answered confidently and with sufficient development in many cases. Many candidates commented on retaliation for the US Moscow boycott of 1980. Some developed points further relative to events in Afghanistan. Overall, responses yielded success. When candidates went wrong, it was because they did not develop the statement adequately.

Sometimes, increased tensions were directly linked to relevant events and Chernenko's decision. For example, a few candidates wrote about Grenada, or CIA support for the Mujahideen.

A number of candidates who failed to score usually did so because they wrote a generalised, imprecise comment about the capitalist west and the communist east not getting on.

Virtually all candidates attempted a response. Some developed their response to discuss the Friendship Games, or the Liberty Bell Classic, or the number of countries that boycotted.

(a) Describe **one** reason why the Soviet Union boycotted the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984. (2)

They saw that they didn't believe the security was good enough for the athletes but it is believed that it was simple retaliation from the Moscow Olympic boycott 4 years previously.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This was an interesting answer which gave not only the official Soviet reason but then went on to offer another interpretation of the decision. It was awarded a Level Two mark.

(a) Describe **one** reason why the Soviet Union boycotted the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984. (2)

One reason why the Soviet Union boycotted the Los Angeles Olympic Games was because of the USA's actions, ~~did the same thing as in~~ the 1980s Olympics in Moscow. This was done for retaliation of the previous incident which was boycotted by the USA. Therefore USSR ^{and other countries} did the same thing.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response was awarded a Level Two mark - it looks at the context of the 1980 boycott.

Question 6 (b)

Q6b(i) Candidates answering questions of détente in the 1970s seemed either to know it very well or else not at all. There were many excellent responses with detailed knowledge of SALT 1, the joint Apollo-Soyuz mission and the Helsinki Agreements. However, there were also imprecise accounts of various treaties relating to the 1960s and 1980s, USSR invasion of Afghanistan and Reagan's 'Evil Empire' speech. Again, it is important to bear in the mind the dates in the question.

Q6b(ii) While SDI was generally well known it is important to recognise that it was a theory – it was never actually put into operation. Some candidates asserted that it was, in fact, put into place. Within this scenario there were also various flights of fancy from Death Stars to satellites bombarding Earth with nuclear weapons – suggesting some confusion with various science fiction films of the period. Having said this, many candidates understood that if it was a bluff it worked - because the USSR knew it could not compete.

Another key feature was the Helsinki agreement of 1975. The Soviet Union and the USA along with 33 other signatory states agreed to comply with the regulations regarding human rights, co-operation and security. This showed that relations between the two superpowers were greatly improving.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This extract from a response shows mention of the Helsinki Agreements. It was sufficiently developed to place the response in Level Two. It required a little more focus on the detail concerning US-Soviet relations to ensure a top level mark.

The ~~Strategic~~ Strategic Defence Initiative was set up by the USA in order to progress further in the Arms race. The USA claimed it had the ultimate technology in order to win a ~~not~~ nuclear war.

The USA had sent their defence systems into outer space. They claimed to have created a ~~sat~~ satellite that could detect nuclear missiles and, ^{that} it ~~could~~ fire a laser beam at it and ~~it~~ detonate it before it ~~it~~ could cause any damage. Therefore it meant the USA was far ahead of the USSR in the arms race, as they had ~~very~~ neither the technology nor the funding. This was also known at this time as 'star wars'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This extract put SDI into some context and mentions the notion of 'claimed' thus understanding the nature of the issue.

It was from a Level Two response.

Question 6 (c)

Many candidates understood the relationship between Gorbachev and Reagan well and wrote with confidence of the various summits which culminated in the INF Treaty, Gorbachev's reforms which Reagan welcomed and which saw the groundwork for the ending of the Cold War. Gorbachev's motivation was particularly well understood in terms of the weakness of the USSR – and many candidates understood that the USA were also seeking solutions.

Less able candidates were inclined to over-generalise in their responses to this question – the protagonists liking each other, their wives getting on and putting pressure on their husbands to reach agreements and 'Gorbymania'. Such comments often rarely rose beyond the level of simple statements and in some cases were irrelevant. Equally some wrote about the 'Evil Empire' speech, the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan which were not only out of period but negated the whole point of the question.

(c) Explain why the relationship between Reagan and Gorbachev in the years 1985–88 helped to end the Cold War.

One way in which ^{these} relations helped to ~~do~~ end the cold war was Gorbachev's actions which initially started off these good relations. As soon as he came into power ^{in 1985} he introduced sweeping reforms throughout the Soviet Union. One of these reforms programmes was known as glasnost. This involved releasing dissidents from jail, allowing freedom of speech and introducing a plan to allow local ~~etc~~ democratic elections. He also made reforms to the economy (perestroika) such as removing collectivisation of agriculture and state run industry. ~~These reforms not~~ These reforms moved communism more towards ~~capitalist~~ capitalist values and also showed that Gorbachev was unlike other leaders and willing to co-operate to end the cold war.

Once Reagan realised that Gorbachev was willing to end the cold war the two leaders developed good relations. These good relations developed ~~at~~ at the Geneva ~~meet~~ meeting in November 1985 when Gorbachev and Reagan discussed their aims: to speed up arms talks, to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and to focus more on human rights. This led to treaties being signed such as the INF treaty in 1987 which

eliminated all conventional and nuclear ground-launched ballistic missiles so that by June 1991, 2692 of ~~these~~ these

missiles had been destroyed. This began the end to the arms race which was a major part in ending the Cold War as the threat of invasion from either side was greatly reduced.

These good relations and achievements made ~~to~~ in nuclear and conventional way may mean that Gorbachev did not want to jeopardize them by interfering in other satellite states. In 1988 he denounced the Brezhnev doctrine which meant that he was allowing Warsaw Pact countries to make their own reforms and changes without fear of Soviet invasion.

This meant that in 1988 he did not send in Soviet troops when ~~the Polish~~ ^{the Polish} began to strike against communism and in that same year he allowed Hungary to form a multi-party state. This virtually eliminated all US fear that the USSR still wanted to spread communism throughout Europe and the world which was the main reason why the Cold War had started in the first place: due to fear between the two sides.

The most important reason why the relationship between Reagan and Gorbachev ~~changed~~ ~~ended~~ ended the Cold War was because it allowed treaties to be signed to reduce the weaponry held by each side and end the arms race. This virtually ended all rivalry between the superpowers. The Cold War had officially ended before the majority of ~~Eastern~~ ^{eastern} European countries broke ~~out~~ away from communism anyway.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response shows what can be achieved in this paper. It is an essay which has focus, presents a case and gives much substantiating material. It was given a Level Three mark.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- It is important that Centres look at the full report to consider the paper as a whole.
- In sub-question (a), candidates need to consider the concept of the developed point to reach Level Two.
- In responses to sub-question (b) candidates need now offer only two developed points to reach the top of Level Two.
- In sub-question (c), which will always be a causation question, reasons must be advanced in order to move to Level Two and in order to reach Level Three, there must be clear links and/or prioritisation.
- If dates and names are given in the question then these are guides and aids which should be used appropriately.
- Understanding chronology is crucial and in most instances, questions will only ask for an analysis of a brief period. Candidates must learn the correct sequence of events.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE