



**GCSE (9-1)**

**History-**

**Paper 2 - Superpower  
Relations and the Cold  
War (1HI0/26/27)  
exemplar pack**

## **Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Question 1</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Candidate response to question 1</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Question 2</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Candidate response to question 2</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Question 3</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Candidate response to question 3</b>	<b>13</b>

## Introduction

This exemplar booklet has been created using student responses from the summer 2018 exam paper in GCSE History paper 2 – Period Studies (1H10/26/27) for the Superpower relations and the Cold War, 1941-91 option. The answers and examiner commentaries in the guide can be used to show the application of the mark scheme.

The exam duration is 1 hour and 45 minutes. The paper is marked out of 64 marks and is worth 40% of the qualification. \*The examination paper for 2018 was divided into section A (Q1-3) – Period study and section B (Q4-5) – British depth study. This exemplar book will only focus on section A - Period study which is worth 20% of the final total.

The exam paper covers AO1 and AO2. We also use a mixture of question types, demand levels and response structures throughout our exam papers. The structure of the 2018 question paper was as follows:

	Total marks	Assessment objective	Question description	Example question stem
1	8	AO1 AO2	Explanation of consequences	Explain two consequences of...
2	8	AO1 AO2	Writing an analytical narrative	Write a narrative account analysing... You may use the following in your answer. <i>+ two stimulus points</i>
3	16	AO1 AO2	Explanation of importance	Explain two of the following: The importance of...
4/5 (a)	4	AO1	Description of key features	Describe two features of...
4/5 (b)	12	AO1 AO2	Explanation of causation	Explain why... You may use the following in your answer. <i>+ two stimulus points</i>
4/5 (c)	16 + 4 SPaG	AO1 AO2	Judgement relating to one of the following: causation, consequence, change, continuity, significance, similarity and difference	['Statement.'] How far do you agree? Explain your answer. You may use the following in your answer. <i>+ two stimulus points</i>

These examples are designed to help students engage with what they're being asked to do, but also understand the length and type of answer expected.

The questions provided are 1, 2 and 3 from section A - Period study. The questions are all new question types for the Period study section.

In general, candidates who perform well on this paper are able to demonstrate accurate, relevant knowledge of the topics being examined. When assessing AO1, examiners look for accurate and relevant information that has been precisely selected to show good contextual knowledge. This is characterised by detailed yet succinct responses to the questions set. Content is carefully selected to ensure it provided an insight into the focus of the question, particularly in the narrative account.

**\* (Please note from summer 2019 onwards, Paper 2 will be split into two separate question-and-answer booklets: the Period study (booklet P), and the British depth study (booklet B). Students will only be provided with questions for the topics they have studied. You can find out more [here](#).**

## Question1

Explain **two** consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

### Mark Scheme

Question		
<b>1</b> Explain <b>two</b> consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall. <b>Target:</b> Analysis of second order concepts: consequence [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. <b>AO2:</b> 4 marks. <b>AO1:</b> 4 marks. <b>NB</b> mark each consequence separately (2 x 4 marks).		
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple or generalised comment is offered about a consequence. [AO2]</li> <li>Generalised information about the topic is included, showing limited knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]</li> </ul>
2	3–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Features of the period are analysed to explain a consequence. [AO2]</li> <li>Specific information about the topic is added to support the explanation, showing good knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]</li> </ul>

### Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying **no** qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

### Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- East German protestors now saw the opportunity to end control by the Soviet Union and to call for the reunification of Germany.
- The fall of the Berlin Wall became very symbolic and encouraged other parts of Eastern Europe to challenge control by the Soviet Union.
- After the fall of the Berlin Wall it became clear that the Soviet Union's control of Eastern Europe could not continue and it led to the breaking up of the Warsaw Pact.
- The fall of the Berlin Wall meant that for the first time many German friends and relatives could visit each other.

### Comments on Question Type

Question 1 focuses on the second order concept of consequence. It requires candidates to explain two valid consequences of an event or development. There are 4 marks available for each consequence; the AO2 strand of the mark scheme rewards the analysis and explanation of consequence while the AO1 strand rewards specific supporting information showing good knowledge and understanding (AO1). There are 4 marks for each consequence so they should be given equal attention by the candidate.

# Candidate answers to question 1

## Response 1

1 Explain **two** consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Consequence 1:

East and west Berlin were reunited and so people who had families on both sides could be finally be together. And people ~~was~~ were walking through both sides of Berlin because they might not have been with ~~each other~~ seen the other sides of Berlin.

Consequence 2:

Most people went to west Berlin to find better paying jobs and they ~~was~~ had ~~more~~ better quality houses and also they wanted to ~~find~~ use their skills for the jobs that they wanted.

### Examiner Comments

**This response was awarded Level 1, 4 marks.**

Level 1, 2 marks were given for both Consequences to give an overall total of 4 marks for Question 1. In both instances, for AO2 simple comments were offered about a consequence of the the fall of the Berlin Wall. For Consequence 1 the candidate wrote 'East and West Berlin were reunited' and for Consequence 2 'better paying jobs'.

For AO1 there was generalised information about the topic for both Consequences with the comment for 1 'they might not have seen the other side of Berlin' and for 2 'better quality houses' and 'use their skills for jobs that they wanted'.

Level 1 for both AO2 and AO1 meant that the best-fit mark was top Level 1 (2 marks) for each consequence.

## Response 2

1 Explain **two** consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Consequence 1:

One consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall was the <sup>break-up</sup> ~~collapse~~ of the Eastern Bloc. The fall of the Berlin Wall signified the end of communism and other countries followed this pattern. Communist ~~governments~~ parties were beaten in free elections due to more freedom in voting and countries got rid of communism. <sup>Also,</sup> ~~the~~ the Eastern Bloc which was such a strong buffer zone for the ~~USSR~~ Soviet Union that had collapsed.

Consequence 2:

Another consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall was the end of the Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact was signed by all the Eastern European countries so that if they were attacked, the other countries in the Pact must help to defend them. The Warsaw Pact broke up in 1991 due to the Berlin Wall as these countries did not want to be communist and did not want the Soviet Union in their lives.

### Examiner Comments

**This response was awarded Level 2, 8 marks.**

Both Consequences are at Level 2 for AO2 and AO1. Both responses analyse features of the period to explain a consequence (AO2) and were awarded Level 2. Consequence 1 includes comments on the break-up of the Eastern Bloc and that the fall of the Berlin Wall 'signified the end of communism'. In Consequence 2 the response comments on the end of the Warsaw Pact. For AO1 the candidate includes specific information about the topic for both Consequences to support the explanation and it therefore reaches Level 2.

Each answer was awarded Level 2 for both AO2 and AO1 and therefore each answer was top Level 2, 4 marks, making a total of 8 marks.

## Question 2

### Question

Write a narrative account analysing the key features of détente during the 1970s.

You may use the following in your answer:

- SALT 1 (1972)
- Afghanistan (1979)

### Mark Scheme

Question		
2		<p>Write a narrative account analysing the key events of détente during the 1970s.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SALT I (1972)</li> <li>• Afghanistan (1979)</li> </ul> <p>You <b>must</b> also use information of your own.</p> </div> <p><b>Target:</b> Analytical narrative (i.e. analysis of causation/consequence/change) [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics) [AO1].  <b>AO2:</b> 4 marks.  <b>AO1:</b> 4 marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A simple or generalised narrative is provided; the account shows limited analysis and organisation of the events included. [AO2]</li> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the events is shown. [AO1]</li> </ul>
2	3–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrative is given, showing some organisation of material into a sequence of events leading to an outcome. The account of events shows some analysis of the linkage between them, but some passages of the narrative may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2]</li> <li>• Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the events. [AO1]</li> </ul> <p><i>Maximum 4 marks for answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
3	6–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A narrative is given which organises material into a clear sequence of events leading to an outcome. The account of events analyses the linkage between them and is coherent and logically structured. [AO2]</li> <li>• Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the key features or characteristics of the events. [AO1]</li> </ul> <p><i>No access to Level 3 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>

### **Marking instructions**

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge and understanding.

The middle mark in Levels 2 and 3 may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

### **Indicative content guidance**

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- In 1972, Brezhnev and Nixon signed SALT I which showed the spirit of détente as it was the first time the Superpowers agreed to limits on the number of nuclear weapons held.
- The Superpowers showed continued commitment to détente with Nixon visiting Moscow in 1972 and Brezhnev visiting Washington the following year.
- Improving relations led to the Helsinki Conference in 1975 and détente was strengthened by both sides agreeing to respect human rights and to promote links and exchanges.
- The joint space mission in 1975 demonstrated increased cooperation with US astronauts and Soviet cosmonauts meeting in outer space.
- The SALT II negotiations contributed to détente with both the USA and the USSR agreeing in principle to reduce their stocks of nuclear warheads.
- In 1979, the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan contributed to the ending of détente with renewed tension between East and West resulting in the Carter Doctrine and the US failure to ratify SALT II.

### **Comments on Question Type**

Question 2 focuses on analytical narrative, in which candidates are expected to write an account that not only describes what happened (AO1), but to also find connections and make sense of events through an analysis of the links between events as they unfolded (AO2). It is vital they understand the narrative concept, with the sense of a beginning, development and end, rather than produce three paragraphs which do not directly link to each other.



## Candidate answers to question 2

### Response 1

By the 1970s, both the USA and USSR had reasons to cut spending on arms, as the USA was facing demonstrations and unrest in their country as they were involved in the Vietnam war and the USSR was facing poor standards of living, from the amount of investment they were putting into developing weapons. This led to SALT 1 in 1972 where limits on weapons were decided. SALT 1 included the Anti-Ballistic Treaty which <sup>was</sup> limited to only 2 sites containing ABM's with a maximum of 100 missiles and also the interim treaty which limited the use of ICBM's and SLBM's (for example both US and USSR were allowed a maximum of 140 SLBM's). As a result, there were better, relations more peaceful relations during détente in the 1970's. As a result of the improved relations, the Helsinki Accords were agreed in 1975, where there were 3 baskets of agreements. ~~Basket 4 was~~ One Basket was about improved co-operation between the East and West, ~~which led to~~ including cooperating in developing technology, which led to a US and USSR joint space mission in 1975. Another basket was

about accepting the borders. This led to the formal acceptance of East Germany's borders. Additionally, there was also a basket on human improved human rights, as there were concerns by the west about human rights in the communist countries as there was a lack of free speech and press. Consequently, ~~there~~ during this time there was improved relations and decreased spending on arms. As a result of this, SALT 1 was also put together which had complete details on the use of weapons such as missiles, however the period of détente was beginning to come to an end by 1979. In 1979, Islamic revolution had invaded the US embassy in Tehran and kept Americans hostage for 444 days. Then, in December 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. This was heavily resented in the US and, as SALT 2 was <sup>still</sup> in the process of being ratified in Congress, it was then withdrawn from Congress, which caused the period of détente to end.

### Examiner Comments

**This response was awarded Level 3, 8 marks.**

For AO2 the response meets the criteria for Level 3 as there is a clear linkage of events and an analysis which is coherent and logically structured. This is shown with the linking of the Superpowers' need to cut spending to SALT 1 and then, as a result of improving relations, to the agreements made with the Helsinki Accords.

The response also meets the criteria for Level 3 at AO1 with relevant information such as the details given for SALT 1 and the contents of the baskets agreed in 1975.

This answer is securely Level 3 for both AO2 and AO1 and therefore the mark given was at the top of the Level.

## Response 2

In 1972 SALT 1 was ratified by both ~~the~~ the USA and USSR which showed the era of détente and cooperation of the two Superpowers. This led to the Helsinki conference in Finland where both superpowers and nearly all European countries agreed to greater treatment and freedoms of people. This coincided in SALT 2 which was ~~isn't~~ signed by both superpowers but never ratified due to the Afghanistan conflict.

This era of ~~cooperation~~ Cooperation caused the Afghanistan conflict as Brezhnev (then Soviet president) believed that because ~~the~~ Afghanistan was on their border and wouldn't affect the USA (and because of their recent friendliness), the US wouldn't ~~care~~ mind if they invaded. However, then president Jimmy Carter did mind and helped the Mujahadeen\* coming up with the Carter ~~doctrin~~ doctrine. ~~That's~~ Finally, this showed the end of Détente and start of frostier relations. The Second Cold War had begun.

\* through giving them money, equipment and training to fight off the communists.

### Examiner Comments

This response was awarded Level 2, 5 marks.

For AO2 the candidate demonstrates sufficient links within the account of events to be awarded Level 2. The answer shows SALT 1 leading to the Helsinki Conference and then to SALT 2.

There is also accurate and relevant information showing some knowledge, which meets the AO1 requirements for Level 2, such as the comments on agreements at Helsinki, the failure for SALT 2 to be ratified and how détente came to an end.

The answer is a secure Level 2 for both AO2 and AO1 and therefore received the top mark in Level 2.

## Question 3

### Question

The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the superpowers in the years 1945-49.

The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.

The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.

### Mark Scheme

Question		
3		Explain <b>two</b> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the Superpowers in the years 1945-49.</li> <li>The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.</li> <li>The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.</li> </ul> <p><b>Target:</b> Analysis of second order concepts: consequence/significance [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1].  <b>AO2:</b> 8 marks.  <b>AO1:</b> 8 marks.  <b>NB</b> mark each part of the answer separately (2 x 8 marks).</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A simple or generalised answer is given, showing limited development and organisation of material. [AO2]</li> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]</li> </ul>
2	3-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An explanation is given, showing an attempt to analyse importance. It shows some reasoning, but some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2]</li> <li>Accurate and relevant information is added, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1]</li> </ul>
3	6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An explanation is given, showing analysis of importance. It shows a line of reasoning that is coherent and logically structured. [AO2]</li> <li>Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1]</li> </ul>

#### Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying **no** qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1a; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

The middle mark in Levels 2 and 3 may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

#### Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

#### The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb in for relations between the Superpowers in the years 1945-49.

Relevant points may include:

- Truman believed that the USA's development of the atomic bomb would give the USA the upper-hand in post-war negotiations with the Soviet Union.
- The USA's testing of the atomic bomb made relations between the Superpowers during the negotiations at Potsdam much more difficult.
- News of the USA's secret development of the atomic bomb increased hostility making Stalin more determined to protect the Soviet Union by creating a 'buffer zone' of communist states in Eastern Europe.
- It meant the beginning of an arms race with Soviet scientists working faster on the development of their own atomic bomb.

**The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.**

Relevant points may include:

- The USA's support for Cuban exiles showed its anti-communist position and led to a deteriorating relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union.
- The failure of the Bay of Pigs gave the Soviet Union and Cuba the opportunity to develop closer ties which threatened the USA. This eventually led to the USSR giving military support to Cuba.
- Relations became more confrontational between the Superpowers as Kennedy needed to show US strength after the humiliating failure at the Bay of Pigs.
- The Bay of Pigs incident undermined Khrushchev's belief in co-existence and strengthened the USA's belief in containment.

**The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.**

Relevant points may include:

- The Doctrine was used to maintain the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia in 1968 by suppressing attempts at reform and enforcing adherence to communism as followed in the USSR.
- The Doctrine declared the Soviet Union's right to intervene in Czechoslovakia with military force if necessary to preserve communism as accepted by the USSR.
- The Doctrine justified the removal of Dubček, ensuring that Czechoslovakia remained a one-party communist state.
- The Doctrine maintained control by the Soviet Union by ensuring that Czechoslovakia continued as a loyal member of the Warsaw Pact.

**Comments on Question Type**

For Question 3, candidates were required to analyse the importance of an event/person/development. The question focuses on what difference the event/person/development made in relation to situations and unfolding developments. For example, in the second choice on this question, candidates are not being asked to comment generally on the importance of the Bay of Pigs incident, but to consider its importance for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union. It is vital that candidates recognise this focus in the AO2 strand of the mark scheme and then support their analysis with specific details and understanding, as required by the AO1 strand.

### Candidate answers to question 3

#### Response 1

- The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the superpowers in the years 1945-49.
- The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.
- The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.

The USA's development of the atomic bomb was important for relations between superpowers because it annoyed the USSR as there <sup>any</sup> didn't inform them that they had developed such technology as the USSR believed that the USA had to share everything. This worsened relations as the USSR believed that the atomic bomb was going to be used as a threat towards the ~~Soviet~~ USSR.

~~It was also important because~~

The atomic bomb was also important because ~~it~~ for relations between the superpowers because it began the arms race between the two

~~Super~~ Superpowers as they constantly wanted to beat each other in weaponry which lead to the creation of satellite states in later years. This worsened relations as the USSR and USA were constantly in competition with each other.

However, the atomic bomb also increased relations between the USA and USSR as they were both fighting Japan and the USA fought with the USSR when later lead to the USA dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

### Examiner Comments

**This response was awarded Level 2, 5 marks.**

The response reaches Level 2 for AO2 with an explanation that attempts to analyse importance. The first paragraph comments on why relations worsened, with the USSR not being informed by the USA of their development of the atomic bomb, and then explains about the start of the arms race and a sense of competition between the Superpowers.

For AO1 there is sufficient detail to show an understanding of the features and characteristics of the period and this reaches Level 2.

This is an answer that is securely Level 2 for both AO2 and AO1, this receives the mark at the top of the Level.

## Response 2

- The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.
- The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.

The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for the relations between the USA and the Soviet Union was that it increased tensions and eventually led to the Cuban Missile crisis.

The Bay of Pigs occurred as Castro, a communist, declared his takeover of Batista, an American-influenced dictator. Castro wanted Cuba to be communist so he removed all American influence ~~of~~ in Cuba which angered America so they stopped all sugar trade with Cuba which damaged its economy massively. This led to increased tensions as the Soviet Union joined forces with Cuba and started trading sugar with them and giving them weapons/military support and financial support. This meant the USSR were very close to America and could watch what



they were dang; so when America found out they planned an invasion - the Bay of Pigs. However, Castro knew that America were coming to invade and was waiting for America to arrive on the Bay. When America arrived they were shocked and unprepared - meaning that Castro could capture most of America's troops and hold them captive. This damaged relations as it was the USSR which provided Cuba with around 2000 troops, heightening tensions as the war was almost real. This meant it led to the Cuban missile crisis as Stalin thought Cuba needed more protection so planted a missile base in Cuba starting up the arms race again, intensifying it. Eventually leading to the Cuban missile crisis where the two oppositions were nearly at nuclear war but made them realise that is not what they want so they slowed it down a bit.

### Examiner Comments

**This response was awarded Level 3, 7 marks.**

For both AOs this response is in Level 3. For AO2, the given explanation provides an analysis of importance through comments on 'increasing tensions' and in the latter part of the response 'this damaged relations'.

For AO1, accurate and relevant knowledge of the period has been included regarding Castro's actions and the USSR's deployment of troops.

The response is a secure Level 3 for AO1 but the AO2 is not as well developed; therefore the 'best-fit' approach produces an overall mid-Level 3 mark.

For information about Pearson Qualifications, including Pearson Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications visit [qualifications.pearson.com](http://qualifications.pearson.com)

Edexcel and BTEC are registered trademarks of Pearson Education Limited

Pearson Education Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 872828  
Registered Office: 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL

VAT Reg No GB 278 537121