

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCSE  
in History A (5HA01)

Paper 01

Unit 1: International Relations:

The Era of the Cold War, 1943–1991

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2015

Publications Code UG041798

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	
<b>1</b>	Give <b>two</b> ways from Source A which show how Dubček 'introduced a series of reforms which became known as the Prague Spring'.  <b>Target:</b> understanding source material (AO3).
Mark	Descriptor
<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1–2</b>	One mark for each way identified.  <i>e.g.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He introduced free elections. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• He reduced the power of the secret police. <b>(1)</b></li> <li>• He wanted to lift travel restrictions (1)</li> </ul>

Question Number	
<b>2</b>	Outline <b>two</b> steps that Brezhnev took to oppose the policies of Dubček.  <b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection (AO1).
Mark	Descriptor
<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1–4</b>	Award up to 2 marks for each outline of a step that Brezhnev took. The second mark should be awarded for additional detail.  <i>e.g.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Brezhnev ordered the invasion of Czechoslovakia. <b>(1)</b> 500,000 troops from the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact members were involved. <b>(1)</b></i></li> <li>• <i>Brezhnev formulated the Brezhnev Doctrine. <b>(1)</b> This stated that the Soviet Union had a right to invade any communist country if that country threatened the security of the Warsaw Pact. <b>(1)</b></i></li> </ul> <p>Accept other appropriate alternatives.</p>

Question Number		
3		<p>How useful are Sources B and C as evidence of the reasons for the USA's involvement in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1949?</p> <p>Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your own knowledge.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> evaluation of source utility in historical context (AO1/AO2/AO3).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<p><b>Judgement based on simple valid criteria.</b></p> <p>EITHER</p> <p>Comments based on assumed utility because source is from an eyewitness, etc.</p> <p><i>e.g. Source B is not that useful because it is published by a US newspaper and I have to question its truthfulness.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Undeveloped comment on usefulness of content: subject, amount of detail contained, etc.</p> <p><i>e.g. Source C is very useful because it tells me about the actions of the Soviet Union at the time.</i></p>
2	4–6	<p>EITHER</p> <p><b>Judgement based on the usefulness of the sources' information.</b></p> <p>Answers give examples of what source is useful for or its limitations. Candidates extract useful information from sources.</p> <p><i>e.g. Both sources are useful because of their content. Source B shows the Soviet Union being aggressive about Berlin and Source C says that the Soviet Union accepts there will be a series of conflicts with the West. In addition, Source C talks of insecurity and Source B shows the two Superpowers at loggerheads almost fighting.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Judgement based on evaluation of the nature/origin/purpose of the sources.</b></p> <p>Answers focus on how representative/reliable/authoritative the sources are.</p> <p><i>e.g. There has to be some doubt about Source B because it is printed in a US newspaper and shows the Soviet Union to be aggressive. The newspaper wants to show the Soviet Union in a bad light and win over its American readers. That's why it shows the Soviet bear trying to hit the US eagle and shows how the US will stand up by saying 'No Push-Over'. Likewise Source C says the USA should stand up to the Soviet Union, but again there are doubts about this. It is from a US ambassador to President Truman and he is confirming the view of Source B about what the USA should do.</i></p>

		N.B. Maximum 5 marks if Level 2 criteria met for only one source.
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<p><b>Judgement combines both elements of Level 2, assessing the contribution the sources can make to the specific enquiry.</b></p> <p>Answer provides a developed consideration of the usefulness of the sources, which takes into account an aspect of its nature/ origin/purpose (for example how representative/authoritative/ reliable it is). The focus must be on what difference this aspect makes to what the source can contribute. It is not enough to say it is reliable/unreliable/typical. Comments must be developed or else mark at Level 2.</p> <p><i>e.g. Both sources are useful because of their content. Source B shows the Soviet Union being aggressive about Berlin, clearly meaning the beginning of the blockade and Source C says that the Soviet Union accepts there will be a series of conflicts with the West (as was happening with the Airlift). In addition, Source C talks of insecurity and Source B shows the two Superpowers at loggerheads almost fighting.</i></p> <p><i>There has to be some doubt about Source B because it is printed in a US newspaper and shows the Soviet Union to be aggressive. The newspaper wants to show the Soviet Union in a bad light and win over its American readers. That's why it shows the Soviet bear trying to hit the US eagle and shows how the US will stand up by saying 'No Push-Over'. However, it does not state that the USA was breaking agreements about Berlin which were made at Potsdam. Source C says the USA should stand up to the Soviet Union, but again there are doubts about this. It is from an ambassador to President Truman and he is confirming the view of Source B about what the USA should do. Though it mentions international relations since 1945, it does not discuss how the USA had formed Bizonia or had brought in a new currency.</i></p> <p><i>Hence the sources are of use but the information and provenance must be looked at with some scepticism.</i></p> <p>Award 10 marks if evaluation of both sources meets Level 3 criteria.</p> <p><b>NB: No access to Level 3 for answers that do not make use of additional recalled knowledge.</b></p>

Question Number		
<b>4 (a)</b>		Describe the key features of the decisions made about Germany at the Potsdam Conference, 1945.  <b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1/AO2).
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<b>Simple statement(s).</b>  <i>e.g. Germany was to be divided into four zones of occupation.</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for one simple statement.</li> <li>• 2 marks for two simple statements.</li> <li>• 3 marks for three or more simple statements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<b>Developed statement(s).</b> (A developed statement is a simple statement supported by factual detail.)  <i>e.g. The Allies decided that Germany would be divided into four zones of occupation. France, Britain, the USA and the Soviet Union would each have a zone and would be permitted to station troops there. In addition, each country could administer its zone as it saw fit.</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4–5 marks for one developed statement, according to degree of support.</li> <li>• 5–6 marks for two or more developed statements.</li> </ul>

Question Number		
<b>4 (b)</b>		Describe the key features of the Bay of Pigs invasion, 1961. <b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1/AO2).
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<p><b>Simple statement(s).</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Cuban exiles backed by the USA invaded Cuba at the Bay of Pigs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for one simple statement.</li> <li>• 2 marks for two simple statements.</li> <li>• 3 marks for three or more simple statements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<p><b>Developed statement(s).</b></p> <p>(A developed statement is a simple statement supported by factual detail.)</p> <p><i>e.g. About 1,500 Cuban exiles based in Florida had some backing from the USA in their attempt to invade and overthrow Castro. They received money and training from the CIA, however, at the last moment the US government withdrew military support. This led to the venture failing.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4–5 marks for one developed statement, according to degree of support.</li> <li>• 5–6 marks for two or more developed statements.</li> </ul>

Question Number		
<b>5</b>		<p>Explain the importance of <b>three</b> of the following in international relations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Truman Doctrine, 1947</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Truman Doctrine was the US idea that money would be given to Greece and Turkey to fight communism.</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>2–3</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action and states importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Truman Doctrine was the US idea that money would be given to Greece and Turkey to fight communism. It was important because it showed that the USA would help stop the spread of communism.</i></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>4–5</b>	<p><b>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Truman Doctrine was the US idea that money would be given to Greece and Turkey to fight communism. It was important because it showed that the USA would help stop the spread of communism. President Truman had been alarmed at the spread of communism and the way in which Stalin had gone back on his promises about free elections. The Doctrine was important because it was a clear indication that the USA would not permit countries to be coerced into the communist fold and ensured US involvement in European affairs for the future.</i></p>

Question Number		
<b>5</b>		<p>Explain the importance of <b>three</b> of the following in international relations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Hungarian Uprising, 1956</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1956, the Hungarian people rose up against the Soviet forces and demanded freedom.</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>2–3</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action and states importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1956, the Hungarian people rose up against the Soviet forces and demanded freedom. It was important because it showed that the Soviet Union could be challenged but it was also important because it showed that the Soviet Union was not concerned about international reaction.</i></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>4–5</b>	<p><b>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1956, the Hungarian people rose up against the Soviet forces and demanded freedom. It was important because it showed that the Soviet Union could be challenged but it was also important because it showed that the Soviet Union was not concerned about international reaction. The Uprising showed that despite US distaste for the Soviet invasion, it would not go to war to help a Soviet satellite. The Uprising was important because the West saw Khrushchev's idea of a 'thaw' as a sham and international relations grew worse.</i></p>

Question Number		
<b>5</b>		<p>Explain the importance of <b>three</b> of the following in international relations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The construction of the Berlin Wall, 1961</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Soviet Union and East Germany built the Wall in 1961 to stop refugees fleeing to the West.</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>2–3</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action and states importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Soviet Union and East Germany built the Wall in 1961 to stop refugees fleeing to the West. It was important because it heightened the dispute between the USA and the Soviet Union about the presence of Britain, France and the USA in West Berlin.</i></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>4–5</b>	<p><b>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. The Soviet Union and East Germany built the Wall in 1961 to stop refugees fleeing to the West. It was important because it heightened the dispute between the USA and the Soviet Union about the presence of Britain, France and the USA in West Berlin. However, it was also important because it avoided a war between the USA and the Soviet Union and it made Khrushchev seem a strong leader. In addition, the Wall was important because it made the USA determined to support West Berlin as was seen by Kennedy's visit in 1963.</i></p>

Question Number		
<b>5</b>		<p>Explain the importance of <b>three</b> of the following in international relations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The end of the Warsaw Pact, 1991</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1991, the members of the Warsaw Pact formally agreed to end their membership and dissolve the Pact completely.</i></p>
<b>2</b>	<b>2–3</b>	<p><b>Describes the event or action and states importance.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1991, the members of the Warsaw Pact formally agreed to end their membership dissolve the Pact completely. This was important because it signalled the end of the Cold War.</i></p>
<b>3</b>	<b>4–5</b>	<p><b>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</b></p> <p><i>e.g. In 1991, the members of the Warsaw Pact formally agreed to end their membership and dissolve the Pact completely. With the collapse of the Soviet Union there was no reason for the Warsaw Pact to continue. This was important because it signalled the end of the Cold War. It was important because the enmity between the West and the East now seemed to be over and the division of Europe and the world was at an end.</i></p>

Question Number		
6		<p>Explain why relations between the USA and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1979-87.</p> <p>You may use the following in your answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Carter Doctrine</li> <li>• Mikhail Gorbachev</li> </ul> <p>You <b>must</b> also include information of your own.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> knowledge recall and selection, causation and significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).  <b>Assessing QWC i-ii-iii:</b> for the highest mark in a level <b>all</b> criteria for the level, including those for QWC, must be met.  <b>Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG):</b> up to 3 additional marks will be awarded for SPaG.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<p><b>Simple or generalised statement(s) of causation.</b>  The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>e.g. Relations grew worse because of the impact of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.  Reagan's introduction of SDI frightened the Soviet Union and, if anything, worsened relations.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for one cause stated.</li> <li>• 2 marks for two causes stated.</li> </ul> <p><b>QWC i-ii-iii</b></p> <p>Writing communicates ideas using everyday language and showing some selection of material, but the response lacks clarity and organisation. The candidate spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.</p>
2	3–6	<p><b>Describes causes.</b>  The candidate supports the cause(s) given with relevant contextual knowledge but does not explain how they led to the stated outcome.</p> <p><i>e.g. Relations worsened because of the Carter Doctrine.  Carter said the USA would not allow the Soviet Union to gain control of the oil-rich Middle East. He said the USA would use military force if necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Relations worsened in 1983 when Reagan announced 'Star Wars', the Strategic Defence Initiative. This was a plan to shoot down Soviet missiles using lasers in space. It was a plan for a ground and space-based, laser-armed ballistic missile system. It meant increasing the US defence budget and showed how serious the USA was in trying to win the Cold War.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3–4 marks for one cause described, according to the quality of description.</li> <li>• 4–5 marks for two causes described, according to the quality of description.</li> </ul> <p><b>QWC</b></p>

<p><b>i-ii-iii</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5–6 marks for three or more causes described, according to the quality of description.</li> </ul> <p>Maximum 5 marks for answers that do not detail an aspect in addition to those prompted by the stimulus material, for example: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; Reagan and the announcement of SDI.</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of historical terminology and showing some skills of selection and organisation of material, but passages lack clarity and organisation. The candidate spells, punctuates and uses some of the rules of grammar with general accuracy.</p>
<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>QWC</b> <b>i-ii-iii</b></p>	<p><b>7–10</b></p>	<p><b>Explains causes.</b></p> <p>The candidate explains how the cause(s) led to the stated outcome and supports the explanation with relevant contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>e.g. One reason why relations changed is because President Reagan openly stated his hatred of communism and made it clear he would oppose the Soviet Union whenever he could. He wanted to defeat it. His famous 'Evil Empire' speech is evidence of this. Relations worsened in 1983 when Reagan announced 'Star Wars', the Strategic Defence Initiative. This was a plan to shoot down Soviet missiles using lasers in space. It was a plan for a ground and space-based, laser-armed ballistic missile system. It meant increasing the US defence budget and showed how serious the USA was in trying to win the Cold War.</i></p> <p><i>One reason why relations changed was in 1985, when Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev was aware that the Soviet Union was experiencing economic problems and the war in Afghanistan was a huge drain on Soviet finances. Therefore, he had to take drastic steps to ensure the survival of communism. He introduced changes to the Soviet Union and agreed to meet Reagan at a summit conference in Geneva. The two leaders met privately without advisers and at the end of the meeting said the world was now a 'safer place'. Thus by the end of 1985, relations were improving substantially.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7–8 marks for one explained cause, according to the quality of explanation.</li> <li>• 8–9 marks for two explained causes, according to the quality of explanation.</li> <li>• 9–10 marks for three or more explained causes, according to the quality of explanation.</li> </ul> <p>Maximum 9 marks for answers that do not explain an aspect beyond those prompted by the stimulus material, for example: Olympic boycotts, the many changes in the Soviet leadership.</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas using historical terms accurately and showing some direction and control in the organising of material. The candidate uses some of the rules of grammar appropriately and spells and punctuates with considerable</p>

		accuracy, although some spelling errors may still be found.
<b>4</b>	<b>11–13</b>	<p><b>Prioritises causes or sees link between them.</b>  This considers the relationship between causes. (This level can be achieved only if the response has explained at least three causes and has made explicit comparisons of the relative importance of, <u>or shown the inter relationship between</u>, two of them in coming to a judgement.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12-13 marks for judgement of the relative importance of more than two causes or for an answer which shows the inter relationship between three causes in coming to a judgement.</li> </ul> <p><i>e.g. As Level 3 plus '...Both Reagan and Gorbachev are important but I think it was Reagan who was the most important reason behind changes in the relationship. He was more threatening than any previous US president and his speeches and defence policy (notably SDI) did cause the Soviet leadership grave concern. Without Reagan's policies, the Soviet Union would not have continued to spend huge amounts on defence thus worsening their economic position. Reagan forced the Soviet Union to change their position and eventually gave Gorbachev the opportunity to move towards ending the Cold War. Although Gorbachev represented a new style of Soviet leader and was willing to embrace change it was Reagan who eventually forced the Soviet Union to change their position.'</i></p> <p>NB: No access to Level 4 for answers which do not explore an aspect beyond those prompted by the stimulus material, for example: the many changes in the Soviet leadership, summits, INF Treaty.</p> <p>Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely-selected historical terms and organising information clearly and coherently. The candidate spells, punctuates and uses the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy, although some spelling errors may still be found.</p>
<b>QWC</b> <b>i-ii-iii</b>		
<b>Marks for SPaG</b>		
Performance	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Errors severely hinder the meaning of the response or candidates do not spell, punctuate or use the rules of grammar within the context of the demands of the question.
Threshold	1	Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.
Intermediate	2	Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.
High	3	Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with

		precision.
--	--	------------

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom