



Pearson

Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

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 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.

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 5HA01_01_msc _20170817

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

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, ie 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.

Placing a mark within a level mark band

- The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. Follow these unless there is an instruction given within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, **always** follow that guidance.
- **2 mark bands**
Start with the presumption that the mark will be the higher of the two. An answer which is poorly supported gets the lower mark.
- **3 mark bands**
Start with a presumption that the mark will be the middle of the three. An answer which is poorly supported gets the lower mark.
An answer which is well supported gets the higher mark.
- **4 mark bands**
Start with a presumption that the mark will be the upper middle mark of the four. An answer which is poorly supported gets a lower mark.
An answer which is well supported and shows depth or breadth of coverage gets the higher mark.

Quality of Written Communication (QWC)

- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which, strands of QWC are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
 - ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*
 - select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*
 - organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar (SPaG) marking guidance

- The spelling, punctuation and grammar assessment criteria are common to GCSE English Literature, GCSE History, GCSE Geography and GCSE Religious Studies.
- All candidates, whichever subject they are being assessed on, must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Spelling, punctuation and grammar marking criteria should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have demonstrated rather than penalised for errors.
- Examiners should mark according to the marking criteria. All marks on the marking criteria should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the marking criteria are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, ie if the answer matches the marking criteria.
- Examiners should be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the marking criteria.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the marking criteria 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.
- Handwriting may make it difficult to see if spelling, punctuation and grammar are correct. Examiners must make every effort to assess spelling, punctuation and grammar fairly and if they genuinely cannot make an assessment, the team leader must be consulted.
- Specialist terms do not always require the use of complex terminology but the vocabulary used should be appropriate to the subject and the question.
- Examiners are advised to consider the marking criteria in the following way:
 - How well does the response communicate the meaning?
 - What range of specialist terms is used?
 - How accurate is the spelling, punctuation and grammar?

| Question | |
|------------|--|
| 1 | Give two ways from Source A that Khrushchev tried to deal with the problem of Berlin in 1958. Target: understanding source material (AO3). |
| Mark | Descriptor |
| 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1–2 | One mark for each way identified. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demanded direct discussions between FRG and GDR (West and East Germany) (1) • Ultimatum to Western powers to leave Berlin (1) • Soviet Union to hand over control of communications (1) |

| Question | |
|------------|--|
| 2 | Outline two steps that Khrushchev took in 1960-61 to try to solve problems in Berlin. Target: knowledge recall and selection (AO1). |
| Mark | Descriptor |
| 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1–4 | Award up to 2 marks for each outline of a step that Khrushchev took. The second mark should be awarded for additional detail. <i>e.g.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>He called a summit meeting. (1) He invited the US, Britain and France to discuss the problems. (1)</i> • <i>Khrushchev permitted the building of the Berlin Wall. (1) This would stop the escape of refugees from the East to the West. (1)</i> <p>Accept other appropriate alternatives.</p> |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|---|
| 3 | | <p>How useful are Sources B and C as evidence of the reasons for the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact forces in 1968?</p> <p>Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your own knowledge.</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context, analysis of how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways (AO1/AO2/AO3).</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1–3 | <p>Judgement based on simple valid criteria.</p> <p>EITHER</p> <p>Comments based on assumed utility because source is from a newspaper of the time, etc.</p> <p><i>e.g. Source B is not that useful because it is from 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 useful because it tells me the actions of the Warsaw Pact at that time.</i></p> |
| 2 | 4–6 | <p>EITHER</p> <p>Judgement based on the usefulness of the sources' information.</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 they provide us with valuable information. Source B tells me that the Soviet Union was concerned about the activities of Czechoslovakia. Source C tells me that the Warsaw Pact was concerned about the press and people having a range of opinions...</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Judgement based on evaluation of the nature/origin/purpose of the sources.</p> <p>Answers focus on how representative/reliable/authoritative the sources are.</p> <p><i>e.g. There are clear reservations about Source B because it is a US newspaper and clearly shows the Soviet Union to be very aggressive. This will create a bad impression for the readership and reinforce views about the Soviet Union. Source C is Dubček's autobiography and he is bound to criticise the Warsaw Pact's actions. Yet, it is useful because Dubček seeks to criticise Brezhnev by discussing the attendance of the Soviet military...</i></p> <p>N.B Maximum 5 marks if Level 2 criteria met for only one source.</p> |

| | | |
|---|------|---|
| 3 | 7–10 | <p>Judgement combines both elements of Level 2, assessing the contribution the sources can make to the specific enquiry.</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 how the Soviet Union is fearful of Czechoslovakia's activities and its possible desire to leave the Warsaw Pact or even threaten the Soviet Union. Brezhnev is portrayed as the man with the gun but it is the word 'freedom' which is most useful. The source is trying to show how the Soviet Union did not want its satellites to break away and wanted to keep control just as in Hungary in 1956. However, this is from a US newspaper and 1968 was a time before détente and the paper seems to want to show the Soviet Union as a repressive nation, which maintained control by means of the gun.</i></p> <p><i>Source C is useful because it was written by Dubcek who was there throughout the whole period. He clearly shows the menace of the Warsaw Pact nations. Autobiographies have to be looked at with some doubt because the writers tend to justify their own actions or pick faults with their opponents. Dubcek wrote this long after the invasion and Brezhnev was dead. Moreover, as Dubcek was removed from his post by Brezhnev in 1969, there are further doubts about the source's utility.</i></p> <p>Award 10 marks if evaluation of both sources meets Level 3 criteria.</p> <p>NB: No access to Level 3 for answers that do not make use of additional recalled knowledge.</p> |
|---|------|---|

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|---|
| 4 (a) | | Describe the key features of the Yalta Conference, 1945. Target: knowledge recall and selection, key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1/AO2). |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1–3 | Simple statement(s). <i>e.g. Stalin agreed to fight Japan once Germany was defeated.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for one simple statement. • 2 marks for two simple statements. • 3 marks for three or more simple statements. |
| 2 | 4–6 | Developed statement(s). (A developed statement is a simple statement supported by factual detail.) <i>e.g. The Declaration on Liberated Europe was issued and it committed the Big Three to democracy in Europe. There were to be free elections in the countries liberated from Nazi control and the elections would take place as soon as was possible...</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4–5 marks for one developed statement, according to degree of support. • 5–6 marks for two or more developed statements. |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|--|
| 4 (b) | | Describe the key features of the Helsinki Agreements, 1975. Target: knowledge recall and selection, key features and characteristics of the periods studied (AO1/AO2). |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1–3 | Simple statement(s). <i>eg There was greater cooperation between the superpowers.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for one simple statement. • 2 marks for two simple statements. • 3 marks for three or more simple statements. |
| 2 | 4–6 | Developed statement(s). (A developed statement is a simple statement supported by factual detail.) <i>e.g. There was international recognition and acceptance of the borders created in 1945. The Soviet Union readily accepted recognition by the West of its annexation of the Baltic States and the existence of East and West Germany as two separate countries...</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4–5 marks for one developed statement, according to degree of support. • 5–6 marks for two or more developed statements. |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|---|
| 5 | | <p>Explain the importance of three of the following in international relations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cominform, 1947</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1 | <p>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was Stalin's attempt to bring together European Communist parties.</i></p> |
| 2 | 2–3 | <p>Describes the event or action and states importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was Stalin's attempt to bring together European Communist parties. It was important because it meant Stalin could impose his style of communism on all Communist Parties in Europe...</i></p> |
| 3 | 4–5 | <p>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was important because it showed how much Stalin was concerned about controlling Europe and having influence even those countries he had not occupied. Control was significant in Eastern Europe, where states were expected to trade primarily with Cominform members and all contacts with non-communist countries were to be discouraged...</i></p> |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|--|
| 5 | | <p>Explain the importance of three of the following in international relations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Bay of Pigs invasion, 1961</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1 | <p>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. This was the invasion of Cuban exiles organised by the CIA.</i></p> |
| 2 | 2–3 | <p>Describes the event or action and states importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. This was the invasion of Cuban exiles organised by the CIA and demonstrated how much the USA would become involved in the affairs of other countries if it felt there were any possibility of threats to the US mainland or position in the Americas...</i></p> |
| 3 | 4–5 | <p>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</p> <p><i>e.g. The invasion was important because it pushed Castro closer to the Soviet Union and he made a defence agreement with that country. This then became extremely important because the Soviet Union exploited the relationship to get Cuban permission to place ballistic-missile launch sites on Cuban soil, leading to the Missiles Crisis and dreadful relations between the US and Soviet Union</i></p> |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|--|
| 5 | | <p>Explain the importance of three of the following in international relations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, 1979</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1 | <p>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</p> <p><i>e..g Soviet forces removed Amin and installed Karmal.</i></p> |
| 2 | 2–3 | <p>Describes the event or action and states importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. The invasion was important because it worsened relations between the US and the Soviet Union – the US began to supply the forces (Mujahideen) which opposed the Soviet Union...</i></p> |
| 3 | 4–5 | <p>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</p> <p><i>e.g. The invasion was important because it soured relations with the US for several years. The Carter Doctrine was issued and there was a US trade embargo. Moreover, the Olympic Games were disrupted in 1980 and 1984 with each superpower boycotting the other’s games.</i></p> |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------------|--|
| 5 | | <p>Explain the importance of three of the following in international relations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The Intermediate–range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), 1987</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2).</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1 | <p>Describes the event or action without considering importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. The Soviet Union and the United States of America signed the treaty to reduce the size of their nuclear arsenals.</i></p> |
| 2 | 2–3 | <p>Describes the event or action and states importance.</p> <p><i>e.g. It was important because both Reagan and Gorbachev showed they were willing to reduce the number of weapons and they both looked to reduce weapons in the future...</i></p> |
| 3 | 4–5 | <p>Explains importance, with detailed factual support.</p> <p><i>e.g. The treaty was important because under INF, both countries accepted stringent verification procedures to check nuclear weapons were being destroyed and this was crucial to its success. It clearly showed both superpowers were, for once, serious about arms reduction and that relations continued to improve...</i></p> |

| Question Number | | |
|-----------------|------|---|
| 6 | | <p>Explain why relations between the USA and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1949-56.</p> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berlin Airlift • Formation of the Warsaw Pact <p>You must also include information of your own.</p> <p>Target: knowledge recall and selection, causation and significance within a historical context (AO1/AO2). Assessing QWC i-ii-iii: for the highest mark in a level all criteria for the level, including those for QWC, must be met. Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG): up to 3 additional marks will be awarded for SPaG.</p> |
| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
| | 0 | No rewardable material. |
| 1 | 1–2 | <p>Simple or generalised statement(s) of causation. The candidate makes statements which lack any supporting contextual knowledge or makes unsupported generalisations.</p> <p><i>eg Relations changed because the US were angry that they had to fly in supplies to West Berlin in order to keep the people alive.</i> <i>They changed because the Warsaw Pact was a military agreement and threatened the USA.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for one cause stated. • 2 marks for two causes stated. <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> |
| QWC i-ii-iii | | |
| 2 | 3–6 | <p>Describes causes. 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 changed because of the Berlin Airlift. Stalin had blocked the communication routes to West Berlin and the US were sending in supplies by air. Each day for almost a year, the US sent in supplies in what was known as the Berlin Airlift. The US received help from Britain and other countries and the Airlift lasted until May 1949...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3–4 marks for one cause described, according to the quality of description. • 4–5 marks for two causes described, according to the |

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---|
| <p>QWC i-ii-iii</p> | | <p>quality of description.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5–6 marks for three or more causes described, according to the quality of description. <p>Maximum 5 marks for answers that do not detail an aspect in addition to those prompted by the stimulus material, for example: the formation of NATO.</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>3</p> <p>QWC i-ii-iii</p> | <p>7–10</p> | <p>Explains causes.</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. Relations really worsened because of the formation of the Warsaw Pact. This clearly showed that there were now two camps in the world – East/West or capitalist nations v communist nations. Importantly, the two sides were armed and they were building up not only conventional forces but also weapons of mass destruction. The Pact showed that the alliances of the Second World War had now finally evaporated and the US could depict the Soviet Union as a country controlling its satellites with a rod of iron. The fear of war, the war of words and the arms race escalation all seemed to be included in the formation of the Warsaw Pact...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7–8 marks for one explained cause, according to the quality of explanation. • 8–9 marks for two explained causes, according to the quality of explanation. • 9–10 marks for three or more explained causes, according to the quality of explanation. <p>Maximum 9 marks for answers that do not explain an aspect beyond those prompted by the stimulus material, for example: formation of NATO, creation of East and West Germany.</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 accuracy, although some spelling errors may still be found.</p> |
| <p>4</p> | <p>11–13</p> | <p>Prioritises causes or sees link between them.</p> <p>This considers the relationship between causes. (This level can be achieved only if the response has explained three causes and has made explicit comparisons of the relative importance of, or shown the inter-relationship between, two of them in coming to a judgement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12-13 marks for judgement of the relative importance of more than two causes or for an answer which shows the |

| | | |
|-----------------|-------------|---|
| QWC i-ii-iii | | <p>inter-relationship between three causes in coming to a judgement.</p> <p><i>e.g. As Level 3 plus '...The Airlift, NATO and the Warsaw Pact are important contributors to the worsening of relations. However, the two organisations are clearly linked. Stalin needed his own version of NATO in order to feel secure and even threaten the US. NATO is important but without it there would have been no Warsaw Pact. But the most important was the Airlift. This warned Stalin that the US would not be intimidated, would spend huge amounts of money, and would ensure its Allies would help. Moreover, the US showed its intention to remain in Europe and resist the Soviet threat – this was a change in US foreign policy – from isolationism to involvement. Thus the Airlift can be seen as crucial in the worsening relations. However, the death of Stalin and a new leader seemed to herald a time of improving relations...</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: Creation of FRG, GDR, COMECON, NATO.</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> |
| | Performance | <p>Marks for SPaG</p> <p>Descriptor</p> |
| | 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. |