

INTERNATIONAL ADVANCED LEVEL

# HISTORY

## SAMPLE ASSESSMENT MATERIALS

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Subsidiary in History (XHI01)

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (YHI01)

First teaching September 2015

First examination from June 2016

First certification from August 2016 (International Advanced Subsidiary) and

August 2017 (International Advanced Level)

Issue 2



## **Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications**

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification website at [qualifications.pearson.com](http://qualifications.pearson.com). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [qualifications.pearson.com/contactus](http://qualifications.pearson.com/contactus)

## **About Pearson**

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 35,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at [qualifications.pearson.com](http://qualifications.pearson.com)

*References to third party material made in this specification are made in good faith. Pearson does not endorse, approve or accept responsibility for the content of materials, which may be subject to change, or any opinions expressed therein. (Material may include textbooks, journals, magazines and other publications and websites.)*

*All information in this specification is correct at time of going to publication.*

ISBN 978 1 4469 5694 6

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Limited 2018

# Summary of Pearson Edexcel Level 3 International Advanced/Subsidiary GCE in History Sample Assessment Materials

## Issue 2 changes

Summary of changes made between previous issue and this current issue	Page number(s)
Paper number references have been corrected in question papers, source booklets and mark schemes for the following papers: WHI02/1A/1B/1C/1D, WHI03/1A/1B/1C/1D and WHI04/1A/1B/1C/1D.	45, 51, 55, 65, 71, 75, 85, 91, 95, 105, 111, 115, 125, 129, 133, 143, 147, 151, 161, 165, 169, 179, 183, 187, 197, 201, 205, 215, 219, 223, 233, 237, 241, 251, 255, 259
Titles of the following question papers, source booklets and mark schemes have been corrected: WHI02/1D	105, 111, 115
The mark schemes for WHI02/1C Section A Q1(a) and Q1(b) have been amended to clarify what is required of candidates.	99-101

If you need further information on these changes or what they mean, contact us via our website at: [qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/contact-us.html](http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/contact-us.html).



# Contents

---

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>General marking guidance</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations</b>	<b>5</b>
Option 1A: France in revolution, 1774–99	5
Mark scheme	9
Option 1B: Russia in Revolution, 1881–1917	15
Mark scheme	19
Option 1C: Germany, 1918–45	25
Mark scheme	29
Option 1D: Britain, 1964–90	35
Mark scheme	39
<b>Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation</b>	<b>45</b>
Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition	45
Mark scheme	55
Option 1B: China, 1900–76	65
Mark scheme	75
Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin	85
Mark scheme	95
Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–2014	105
Mark scheme	115
<b>Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation</b>	<b>125</b>
Option 1A: The USA, Independence to Civil War, 1775–1865	125
Mark scheme	133
Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945	143
Mark scheme	151
Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990	161
Mark scheme	169
Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009	179
Mark scheme	187

<b>Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations</b>	<b>197</b>
Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71	197
Mark scheme	205
Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945	215
Mark scheme	223
Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90	233
Mark scheme	241
Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90	251
Mark scheme	259

# Introduction

---

The Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History is designed for use in schools and colleges. It is part of a suite of International A Level qualifications offered by Pearson.

These sample assessment materials have been developed to support this qualification and will be used as the benchmark to develop the assessment students will take.



# General marking guidance

---

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than be penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme – not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- 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/indicative content will not be exhaustive.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, a senior examiner must be consulted before a mark is given.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## How to award marks

### Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

### Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements fully, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only barely meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a reasonable match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1A: France in revolution, 1774–99**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI01/1A**

**You do not need any other materials.**

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **TWO** questions.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49982A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

**Answer TWO questions from the following.**  
**You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 1** Historians differ in their judgements about the problems that caused unrest in France in the years 1774–89.

‘The most significant cause of discontent in France in the years before 1789 was the taxation system.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 1 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 2** Historians have different suggestions for the event in 1789 that marked the beginning of the French Revolution.

‘It was the Tennis Court Oath (20 June) rather than the storming of the Bastille (14 July) that marked the true onset of the French Revolution.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** Historians have different explanations for the failure of constitutional monarchy (1789–93).

‘Louis XVI was mainly responsible for the failure of constitutional monarchy.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4** Historians differ in their judgements of government by the Directory in the years 1795–99.

‘The Directory was both unsuccessful and unpopular.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





Mark scheme

Sample assessment materials for  
first teaching September 2015

International Advanced  
Subsidiary in History  
(WHI01/1A)

Paper 1: Depth Study with  
Interpretations

Option 1A: France in Revolution,  
1774-99

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 1

**Targets: AO1 (10 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**AO3 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to issues relevant to the question.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selecting and explaining some key points of view that are relevant.</li> <li>• Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining the issues of interpretation raised by the claim.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> </ul>

## Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the most significant cause of discontent in France in the years before 1789 was the taxation system.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The taxation system was unfair with the poorest people in France paying the majority of the taxes; the nobility and clergy were mainly exempt</li><li>• The inefficient collection of taxes, including funding for war, and the system of tax 'farming' led to regional inequalities, corruption and resentment</li><li>• Indirect taxation added to the existing economic burdens of the rural and urban poor</li><li>• Attempts to introduce tax reform created hostility from those groups most heavily affected, such as property owners and office holders</li><li>• The rejection of new taxes by the Assembly of Notables led to the 'revolution of the aristocracy' in 1789.</li></ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The taxation system merely contributed to popular discontent being created by more serious socio-economic problems in rural areas and towns</li><li>• Problems associated with the growth of towns, such as poor living standards and high bread prices, were more significant in the growth of popular unrest</li><li>• The perceived extravagance of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette combined with the mishandling of the royal finances by Louis' ministers led to increasing criticism of the monarchy</li><li>• Resentment of nobles' rights and corruption at court and in the Church were encouraged by the growth of the ideas of the Enlightenment</li><li>• French involvement in the American Revolution led to both increased royal debt and the spread of Enlightenment ideas.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether it was the Tennis Court Oath (20 June) rather than the storming of the Bastille (14 July) that marked the true onset of the French Revolution.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Oath was a direct challenge to the power of the king to dissolve the National Assembly</li> <li>• The Oath reiterated the decision made by the Third Estate on June 17th to declare themselves a National Assembly representing the people of France</li> <li>• Louis XVI's reaction to the Oath encouraged deputies from both the First and Second Estates to join with the National Assembly</li> <li>• Popular opinion in Paris began to turn against the ancien regime</li> <li>• The storming of the Bastille was purely a symbolic act; there were only a handful of prisoners and it was of little military importance.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Louis XVI had no intention of letting the events following the Oath lead to a true reduction in royal power; he dismissed Necker and brought in troops</li> <li>• The storming of the Bastille symbolised the outbreak of a true popular revolution against the monarchy; the Bastille represented the despotism of the French monarchy</li> <li>• The events at the Bastille were orchestrated by the sans-culottes – the driving force behind the violence of the revolution</li> <li>• Louis XVI lost control of Paris and was forced to share his power with the National Assembly.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Louis XVI was mainly responsible for the failure of constitutional monarchy.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Louis seemed reluctant to accept the legitimacy of a constitutional monarchy, particularly after the Civil Constitution of the Clergy</li> <li>• The flight to Varennes and his proclamation to the French people undermined the support of moderate politicians and caused popular resentment</li> <li>• Louis' apparent willingness to listen to the advice of the anti-revolutionary sentiments of Marie Antoinette added to the mistrust of Louis' intentions</li> <li>• Louis' support for the threatened military intervention from Austria and Prussia encouraged the belief that he was becoming a threat to the security of France.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Louis initially cooperated with the revolutionaries and accepted the new Constitution in September 1791</li> <li>• Louis had little control over events and from October 1789 was effectively kept prisoner of the 'people' in Paris</li> <li>• The decisions of the National Assembly, and later the Legislative Assembly, undermined the effectiveness of constitutional monarchy</li> <li>• Political clubs in Paris, such as the Jacobins, and the sans-culottes became more radical and anti-monarchist over time</li> <li>• The impact of the war from April 1792.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether The Directory (1795–99) was both unsuccessful and unpopular.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instability caused by annual elections and disagreements between the Directors and the Councils led to decline in voter turnout in elections</li> <li>• Economic policies led to inflation, the failure of a new paper currency and high food prices leading to a lack of popularity amongst all social groups</li> <li>• The imposition of martial law in the provinces failed to solve the problems of lawlessness and disorder while creating resentment</li> <li>• Measures used to prevent both neo-Jacobin and royalist influence in France undermined confidence in the legitimacy of Directory leading to opposition and protest</li> <li>• Between 1797–99, French attacks against Britain in Egypt had stalled and French forces were defeated by the Second Coalition, increasing its unpopularity before the coup of Brumaire.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Directory was the longest lasting republican government during the revolutionary period; introducing the metric system and laying the groundwork for the French education and banking systems</li> <li>• In its initial stages the Directory acted as a successful model of a moderate democratic constitution</li> <li>• By 1798, the Directory had managed to balance the budget and introduce a more effective and efficient system of taxation</li> <li>• The Directory survived a series of attempted coups, protests and revolts with the support of the National Guard and the army</li> <li>• Until 1797, the Directory prosecuted a successful military campaign against Austria while gaining conquests in Italy.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1B: Russia in Revolution, 1881–1917**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI01/1B**

**You do not need any other materials.**

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **TWO** questions.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49983A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

**Answer TWO questions from the following.**

**You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 1** Historians differ in their judgements about Sergei Witte's economic policies in the years 1891–1903.

'Sergei Witte's policies transformed the Russian economy in the years 1891–1903.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 1 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 2** Historians have different explanations for the survival of Tsarist rule in the years 1881–1903.

'Divisions among opposition groups were mainly responsible for the survival of Tsarist rule in the years 1881–1903.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** Historians differ in their judgements about the extent to which the Tsarist political system was reformed in the years 1903–14.

'The Tsarist political system remained essentially the same in the years 1903–14.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4** Historians have different explanations for the Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917.

'The Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917 was primarily due to Trotsky's actions.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**





Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Subsidiary in History  
(WHI01/1B)

Paper 1: Depth Study with  
Interpretations

Option 1B: Russia in Revolution,  
1881–1917

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 1

**Targets: A01 (10 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to issues relevant to the question.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selecting and explaining some key points of view that are relevant.</li> <li>• Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining the issues of interpretation raised by the claim.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> </ul>

## Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Sergei Witte's policies transformed the Russian economy in the years 1891–1903.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the years up to 1903 Witte accumulated state capital, through tariffs and foreign loans, much of which was used to finance a transport revolution based on railways (for example the Russian rail network doubled between 1890 and 1904)</li><li>• Witte's policy of direct state intervention significantly increased industrial production (for example coal and iron ore production trebled) and Russian annual economic growth stood at 8 per cent – then the highest in the world</li><li>• Witte placed the rouble on the gold standard (1897) as a confidence-building measure in a successful bid to encourage foreign investment in Russian economic modernisation</li><li>• Witte's policies also encouraged the expansion of Russia's industrial base (for example 40 per cent of all industry in 1900 had been founded since 1891).</li></ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Witte neglected light industries such as textiles and failed to develop smaller machine and electrical industries to reduce reliance on imports</li><li>• He was overly concerned with prestige projects, such as the Trans-Siberian Railway, which did not serve Russia's immediate requirements</li><li>• Witte's policy of high taxation placed a further financial strain on the already economically burdened masses and harmed the domestic market</li><li>• Witte neglected Russian agriculture and increased grain extractions from the peasants</li><li>• The Russian economy remained overwhelmingly rural.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether divisions among opposition groups were mainly responsible for the survival of Tsarist rule in the years 1881–1903.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Populists were divided over tactics (education/agitation versus terrorism/assassination) and suffered a wave of public condemnation following the assassination of Alexander II (1881)</li> <li>• The Socialist Revolutionaries aimed to gain broad national support but disagreed over tactics and divided into anarchist and revolutionary wings</li> <li>• The Social Democrats split into Menshevik and Bolshevik factions in 1903 and were weakened organisationally by the exile of some prominent leaders (for example Lenin and Martov)</li> <li>• Liberals were basically divided into moderates (for example Shipov) who hoped for reform under an enlightened Tsar, and radicals (for example Milyukov) who advocated a parliamentary-style regime</li> <li>• These opposition groups also failed to unite in a broad front against Tsarism, which weakened their impact overall.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government repression (via the Okhrana, the police and the army) ensured the survival of Tsarist rule by breaking up opposition cells and maintaining press censorship</li> <li>• Sustained economic growth in the 1890s, stimulated by Witte's policies, dampened political discontent among some groups</li> <li>• Opposition groups struggled in this period to attract mass support (for example many peasants were highly suspicious of the Populists and Russian liberalism rested on a slender middle-class base)</li> <li>• The Russian Orthodox Church acted as a powerful supporter of the regime and instrument of social control by continuing to preach that obedience to the Tsar was God's will.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Tsarist political system remained essentially the same in the years 1903–14.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the period the political authority of the autocracy continued to be underpinned by the loyalty of the Orthodox Church, the army and the bureaucracy, and significant peasant support</li> <li>• The Fundamental Laws of 1906 made it clear that, although the Duma had been established, the autocracy would continue as the politically dominant institution</li> <li>• Nicholas II continued to marginalise reform-minded ministers (for example resignation of Witte (1906), and Stolypin was close to being dismissed when he was assassinated (1911))</li> <li>• The Electoral Law of 1907 also demonstrated that the Tsar retained considerable power since the measure excluded virtually all workers and peasants and it was introduced, unconstitutionally, without the consent of the Duma.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The October Manifesto (1905) marked a major political departure with the creation of a legislative Duma, which effectively diluted the Tsar's powers and continued to function up to 1914</li> <li>• Political parties became legally recognised organisations (1905) with the right to hold meetings and sit in the Duma</li> <li>• Press censorship was relaxed from 1905 ushering in a new, less repressive period when political issues could be discussed openly in the press and the main political parties had their own newspapers</li> <li>• Even though the Duma faced restrictions, it changed the political process under the Tsarist regime (for example the radicalism of the first two Dumas (1906–07) demonstrated that the Assembly was not a passive political 'rubber stamp' for Tsarist policies).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917 was primarily due to Trotsky's actions.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trotsky strongly backed Lenin's call for a Bolshevik seizure of power in October when other senior Bolsheviks, notably Zinoviev and Kamenev, raised objections</li> <li>• For tactical reasons, Trotsky persuaded Lenin to delay the attempted coup until the Second Congress of All-Russian Soviets so that the Bolshevik insurrection could be presented as a popularly-endorsed soviet takeover</li> <li>• Trotsky used the Military Revolutionary Committee (MRC) to plan the overthrow of the Provisional Government and, under his guidance, the MRC extended its control over soldiers in Petrograd and stockpiled weapons</li> <li>• Under Trotsky's command, Red Guard detachments, garrison soldiers and sailors seized the main strategic points in Petrograd on the night of 24–25 October, paving the way for the Bolshevik capture of the Winter Palace the following night.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lenin's role was central in ensuring Bolshevik success in October 1917 (for example he forced through the April Theses as party policy and pressured the Bolshevik Central Committee into staging the October rising)</li> <li>• Bolshevik success owed more to working-class party activists who were concentrated in Petrograd and Moscow, the key centres of the revolution (for example working-class Bolsheviks helped local party committees stay in step with shifting public attitudes)</li> <li>• The Bolshevik takeover was also facilitated by the Provisional Government's refusal to take Russia out of the war and its inability to tackle land reform and economic problems; by October 1917 the regime was drained of popular support and dangerously exposed</li> <li>• Kerensky made a series of mistakes that worked to the advantage of the Bolsheviks (for example the June offensive, the Kornilov affair and underestimating the strength of the Bolsheviks).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1C: Germany, 1918–45**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI01/1C**

**You do not need any other materials.**

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **TWO** questions.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49984A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

1/1

**Answer TWO questions from the following.**  
**You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 1** Historians differ in their judgements about the threats to the newly created Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23.

‘The most significant challenge to the political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23 was from the extreme right.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 1 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 2** Historians have different explanations for the political success of the Nazi Party.

‘The use of intimidation and violence was the main reason for Nazi political success in the years 1928–34.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** Historians differ in their judgements about the success of Nazi social policy.

‘The Nazis were successful in creating a *Volksgemeinschaft* in Germany in the years 1933–41.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4** Historians differ in their judgements about the impact of the Allied bombing campaign against Germany during the Second World War.

‘The Allied bombing campaign during the Second World War was not significant in the defeat of Germany.’

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Subsidiary in History  
(WHI01/1C)

Paper 1: Depth Study with  
Interpretations

Option 1C: Germany, 1918–45

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 1

**Targets: A01 (10 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to issues relevant to the question.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selecting and explaining some key points of view that are relevant.</li> <li>• Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining the issues of interpretation raised by the claim.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> </ul>

## Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use their own knowledge and understanding of issues of interpretation to consider the views presented in the question. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the view that the most significant challenge to the political stability of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23 was from the extreme right.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The extreme right was supported by influential individuals and groups in German politics who attempted to undermine the Weimar Republic throughout the period</li><li>• The extreme right had considerable sympathy amongst the army</li><li>• The early successes of the Kapp Putsch significantly undermined the Weimar Republic in March 1920</li><li>• The attempted Munich Putsch (1923) by the Nazi Party had the support of significant Weimar opponents, for example General Ludendorff</li><li>• Over 300 political assassinations were carried out by right-wing terror organisations, including that of the Weimar politician Walter Rathenau.</li></ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Neither the Kapp Putsch nor the Munich Putsch was successful in overthrowing the Weimar Republic</li><li>• The extreme right failed to gain enough popular support to successfully challenge the Weimar Republic</li><li>• Other political factors were more significant, for example the threat from the extreme left, the design of the Weimar Constitution</li><li>• Economic challenges were more significant, for example post-war debt, the impact of hyper-inflation</li><li>• The consequences of the Versailles Treaty were more significant, for example loss of faith in the Republic, reparations.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the use of intimidation and violence was the main reason for Nazi political success in the years 1928–34.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The use of violence to intimidate political opponents at rallies and polling stations was a feature of Nazi electoral success 1928–33</li> <li>• From January 1933, the Nazis controlled the Prussian police, and used them to intimidate political opponents</li> <li>• The arrest of Communists, in reaction to the Reichstag Fire and the passing of the Emergency Decrees, strengthened the political power of the Nazis</li> <li>• The use of violence by the SA followed by its own violent destruction (Night of the Long Knives) allowed Hitler and the Nazi Party to take total control in 1934.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 1928, Hitler and the Nazi party chose to use the electoral system to gain power</li> <li>• Political success was based more on popularity and propaganda than on intimidation and violence</li> <li>• The backstairs intrigue that brought Hitler to the Chancellorship was the result of the self-interest of the political elite</li> <li>• The increase in Nazi power 1933–34 was built on a foundation of popular consent, or at the very least apathy, within Germany</li> <li>• Chance factors played a major role in Nazi success, for example the Wall St Crash, the death of Hindenburg.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the Nazis were successful in creating a <i>Volksgemeinschaft</i> in Germany in the years 1933–42.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many Germans were supportive of Nazi policies designed to create a classless and racially pure 'people's community', for example mass participation in Nazi-organised rallies</li> <li>• Participation in the DAF, the provision of leisure opportunities through the KdF and the promise of consumer goods such as the Volkswagen encouraged the belief in a 'workers' community'</li> <li>• The <i>Kinder, Küche, Kirche</i> policy promoted the values of family life and female domestication, leading to an increase in the birth rate and fewer women in work</li> <li>• Most German children belonged to the Hitler Youth and were being educated/indoctrinated through a Nazi-controlled education curriculum</li> <li>• The Nazis introduced increasingly discriminatory measures against Jews, other ethnic minorities, the mentally ill, 'asocials' and religious organisations.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all German citizens supported the <i>Volkegemeinschaft</i> and, from 1939 particularly, some sectors of German society started to show some disillusion, for example little evidence of wide support for the invasion of Poland, worker disillusion</li> <li>• The idea of 'Blood and soil' was undermined by the reality of continued urbanisation</li> <li>• Policies to encourage the domestication of women were undermined by economic pressures and the demands of war</li> <li>• Dissent was on the increase towards the end of the period from German youth and German churches</li> <li>• Racial and eugenicist policies (for example boycott of Jewish shops 1933, the introduction of euthanasia for the mentally ill) were not wholly supported.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the view that the Allied bombing campaign in the Second World War was not significant in the defeat of Germany. The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British attempts to bomb Berlin 1943–44 was an expensive failure</li> <li>• The impact of US daytime bombing was undermined by the failure to carry out follow-up raids, allowing both German workers and the infrastructure to recover</li> <li>• The bombing campaign allowed Albert Speer to convince the Nazi leadership to give more support to his economic policies leading to more efficient and effective industrial output</li> <li>• The Germans put immense effort into rebuilding industrial capacity after bombing raids, for example the Ruhr dam raids (1943), often building facilities underground or moving factories/workforces into occupied territory</li> <li>• The bombing campaigns appear to have had little direct effect on either the physical or psychological ability of the Germans to fight the war until the latter stages of the war.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1943 Germany was forced to divert two million men and 50,000 artillery weapons away from the war fronts and into anti-aircraft service</li> <li>• The bombing campaigns had both a direct and indirect effect on industrial production, workers were redirected to the rebuilding schemes and vital aircraft and tank production decreased by one-third</li> <li>• Bombing raids on civilian targets resulted in the deaths of over 300,000 Germans and 800,000 wounded, with 20% of the housing infrastructure destroyed</li> <li>• Heavy damage to the German Air Force had a major impact on the German ability to fight the war on both the Eastern and Western fronts</li> <li>• Nazi records suggest that from 1943 the negative psychological effects of the bombing on the German population began to grow, for example work absenteeism, cynicism, lack of confidence in an eventual victory.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1D: Britain, 1964–90**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI01/1D**

**You do not need any other materials.**

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **TWO** questions.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49985A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

**Answer TWO questions from the following.**  
**You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 1** Historians differ in their judgements about the significance of the 'feminist revolution' in Britain in the years 1964–75.

'The significance of the 'feminist revolution' in Britain, in the years 1964–75, has been exaggerated.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 1 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 2** Historians have different explanations for the electoral defeat of the Labour Government in 1970.

'The failure of 'In Place of Strife' (1969) was the main reason for the defeat of the Labour Government in the 1970 general election.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** Historians differ in their judgements about how well British Prime Ministers handled the economy in the years 1970–79.

'Heath, Wilson and Callaghan were ineffective in tackling the economic problems facing Britain in the years 1970–79.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4** Historians differ in their judgements about the domestic record of the Thatcher governments (1979–90).

'The most important domestic achievement of the Thatcher governments (1979–90) was the reduction in trade union power.'

Assess this view using your own knowledge of the issue.

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Subsidiary in History  
(WHI01/1D)

Paper 1: Depth Study with  
Interpretations

Option 1D: Britain, 1964–90

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 1

**Targets: A01 (10 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the view presented in the question.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the issue in the question.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some understanding of the issue raised by the question is shown and analysis is attempted by describing some points that are relevant.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but it lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to issues relevant to the question.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given, but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding and some analysis of the issue raised by the question is shown by selecting and explaining some key points of view that are relevant.</li> <li>• Knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the issues raised by the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement on the view and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by analysing and explaining the issues of interpretation raised by the claim.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> </ul>

## Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the significance of the 'feminist revolution' in Britain, in the years 1964–75, has been exaggerated.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The 'feminist revolution' did little to change low levels of female representation in the professions (for example barristers and GPs) or parliamentary politics</li><li>• The Equal Pay Act (1970) did not become fully effective for another five years and proved difficult to enforce</li><li>• Some key issues affecting women were not properly addressed until after this period (for example the Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act was not passed until 1976)</li><li>• Feminism during this period tended to appeal mainly to younger middle-class educated women and encountered much male (and some female) resistance.</li></ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In formal legal terms, women's rights were advanced considerably during this period across a range of issues (for example the Abortion Act (1967), the Matrimonial Property Act (1970) and the Guardianship of Children Act (1973))</li><li>• High profile feminists, such as Germaine Greer, promoted women's liberation through their writings and the media to make feminist issues part of public debate and the national political agenda</li><li>• Some legal changes affecting women had dramatic results (for example following the Divorce Reform Act (1969) the annual number of female divorce petitions increased from 34,400 (1968) to over 100,000 by the mid-1970s)</li><li>• The Sex Discrimination Act (1975) established the Equal Opportunities Commission to monitor fair treatment, which made it easier for women to fight for parity of status and earnings case by case.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the failure of 'In Place of Strife' (1969) was the main reason for the defeat of the Labour Government in the 1970 general election.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wilson government's failure to introduce legally-backed trade union reform in 1969 alienated moderate voters (for example opinion polls revealed that 60 per cent of the British public approved of 'In Place of Strife')</li> <li>• 'In Place of Strife' also alienated many union members who regarded the White Paper as a fundamental betrayal of the Labour Party's central political function – to protect working people and their organisations</li> <li>• The Parliamentary Labour Party was badly split on this issue, which also damaged the government's credibility in the eyes of the electorate (for example when the White Paper was debated in the Commons in March 1969 there was a major Labour backbench revolt)</li> <li>• Wilson's 'solemn and binding' compromise with the TUC further damaged the government in the public's eyes since it was legally unenforceable and represented a clear victory for the trade unions over the Labour administration.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Labour's poor economic record concerned voters by 1970 (for example failure of the DEA (1964–67), the devaluation crisis (1967) and balance of payments deficits (£398 million in 1968))</li> <li>• Unemployment continued to rise under Labour, increasing the government's unpopularity (for example by 1970 600,000 were jobless)</li> <li>• The 'Powell factor' (the impact of Enoch Powell's infamous 1968 'rivers of blood' speech on immigration) gained the Conservatives additional working-class votes in 1970</li> <li>• Chancellor Roy Jenkins failed to provide a 'give-away' budget before the general election, which may have lost the government crucial support</li> <li>• Heath's election campaign, which targeted the economic failings of the Labour Government, and poor last-minute trade figures, may have resonated with more of the electorate immediately before polling day.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether Heath, Wilson and Callaghan were ineffective in tackling the economic problems facing Britain in the years 1970–79.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heath's government (1970–74) presided over a period of high unemployment (929,000 in 1972) and worsening industrial relations (23.9 million working days lost in 1972), which adversely affected Britain's economic performance</li> <li>• Mounting economic difficulties forced Heath to perform a policy 'U turn' by holding down wages and re-imposing controls but there was no immediate improvement</li> <li>• Under Wilson (1974–76) inflation soared to 27 per cent, unemployment passed the 1 million mark and the government's 'Social Contract' with the TUC failed to improve the economy</li> <li>• Callaghan's government (1976–79) failed to lower unemployment (which averaged 1.5 million per year), was forced to approach the IMF for a £3 billion 'bail-out' loan, and could not avert the economically damaging Winter of Discontent (1978–79).</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public spending cuts under Callaghan, coupled with the revenue generated by North Sea oil brought some economic improvement (for example by late 1977 the balance of payments was in surplus and inflation had fallen below 10 per cent)</li> <li>• Heath used government subsidies to save ailing industries (for example £35 million was pumped into Upper Clyde Shipbuilders saving thousands of jobs in the Glasgow area)</li> <li>• Wilson's government secured TUC agreement for a £6 a week limit on wage rises, which helped to reduce inflation in 1975–76</li> <li>• All three Prime Ministers, particularly Wilson and Callaghan, had to deal with the far-reaching inflationary consequences of the international oil price rise of 1973, an event over which they had no real control.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the most important domestic achievement of the Thatcher governments (1979–90) was the reduction in trade union power.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thatcher's Employment Acts of 1980 and 1982, and other measures, succeeded in placing a range of legal constraints and conditions on trade union activity, which was generally perceived as a solution to a major economic problem</li> <li>• The defeat of the miners' strike (1984–85) was a defining victory for the Thatcher governments since, for many, it represented the triumph of parliamentary democracy and the rule of law over ideologically motivated union strike action</li> <li>• Government legislation to control the unions, and the miners' defeat, encouraged other employers to resist union demands and introduce new technology and more efficient working practices (for example Eddie Shah (1982) and Rupert Murdoch (1986))</li> <li>• The success of her policy to reduce trade union power strengthened Thatcher's resolve to tackle other 'negative' forces in Britain (for example 'undemocratic' and economically wasteful local government).</li> </ul> <p>The evidence countering or modifying the given view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Thatcher government succeeded in its stated aim of 'rolling back the state' (for example public spending fell from 44 per cent of GDP in 1979 to under 40 per cent in 1990)</li> <li>• The pursuit of 'popular capitalism' through the Thatcher governments' privatisation programme attracted wide support (for example by 1990 over two-thirds of state industrial assets had been sold off and the number of private shareholders had increased from 3 million to 9 million)</li> <li>• The Thatcher governments could also claim important economic achievements (for example productivity increased by over 4 per cent per year during the 1980s, income tax was reduced, and living standards improved for most people)</li> <li>• The Thatcher governments' achievements may be seen in a broader context (for example high unemployment in the years 1979–90 assisted her efforts to reduce the power of the trade unions).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1A**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49986A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

1/1





## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 How accurate is it to say that, in the years 1857–1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain’s needs?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 To what extent did British government legislation, in the years 1909–35, result in a change in India’s relationship with Britain?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4 How accurate is it to say that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence?

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: **Question 2** ☒ **Question 3** ☒ **Question 4** ☒

[Area with horizontal dotted lines for writing answers]

[The live question paper will contain nine more pages of answer lines.]

**TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 25 MARKS**

**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 50 MARKS**



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1A**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49986A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From a telegram sent by the British High Commissioner in India to the Commonwealth Relations Office in London, 15 September 1947. The Commonwealth Relations Office was a government department created in 1947. Here, the High Commissioner is discussing events in the Punjab and areas adjacent to it.

Priority Immediate and Secret

The Punjab

The following is the main information received during the last two days regarding the situation.

- A) There was continued tension in rural areas of East Punjab, but the movement of refugees has continued satisfactorily. 5
- B) In Ambala District, the situation was reported to have deteriorated greatly, and in Rohtak district, heavy killing was reported at one place (please treat this paragraph as confidential).
- C) A mob of 25,000 people attacked a village about 30 miles north of Delhi, but was beaten off by military force. 10
- D) Disturbed conditions continue in Jullundur, Hoshiarpur and Kapurthala.
- E) A refugee column near Amritsar was attacked and there were about 60 casualties in the raiders.
- F) A refugee train between Jullundur and Kapurthala was attacked and there were about 70 casualties. The raiders also suffered heavy casualties. 15

Please treat the names of the communities concerned and the number of casualties as confidential.

**Source 2:** From a speech made to the House of Commons by Winston Churchill, Secretary of State for War, 8 July 1920. Churchill strongly opposed moves towards Indian independence. This speech was part of a debate that took place after the Hunter Committee issued its findings into the events at Amritsar in 1919.

Let me marshal the facts about events at the Jallianwallah Bagh. The crowd was unarmed, except with sticks. It was not attacking anybody or anything. It was only holding an unlawful meeting. When fire was opened to disperse the crowd, it tried to run away. After 379 persons, which is about the number gathered together in this Chamber to-day, had been killed, and when most certainly 1,200 or more had been wounded, the troops, at whom not even a stone had been thrown, swung round and marched away. This is not the British way of doing business. 5

Amritsar is an episode which appears to me to be without precedent or parallel in the modern history of the British Empire. It is an extraordinary event, a monstrous event, an event which stands in singular and sinister isolation. I shall be told that it 'saved India'. I do not believe it for a moment. The British power in India does not stand on such foundations. It stands on much stronger foundations. Our reign in India or anywhere else has never stood on the basis of physical force alone, and it would be fatal to the British Empire if we were to try to base ourselves only upon it. The British way of doing things has always meant and implied close and effective co-operation with the people of the country. 10 15

### Acknowledgements

Source 1 is from The National Archives, *Developing Partition Situation by British High Commissioner in India 1947*, Open Government Licence v3.0. Source 2 is from Hansard, *Army Council and General Dyer, 1819*, © UK Parliament.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1A)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1A: India, 1857–1948:  
The Raj to Partition

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: AO2 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li></ul>

### Section A: Question 1(b)

**Target: A02 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(a)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the extent of communal violence in 1947.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences that could be drawn from and supported by from the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence of a number of instances of communal violence</li><li>• It provides evidence that the nature of the violence varied from 'tension' to 'heavy killing'</li><li>• It provides evidence of the diversity of the attacks – 'village', 'refugee column', 'refugee train'</li><li>• It suggests that the extent of violence may have been mitigated by 'military force'.</li></ul></li><li>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The writer of the telegram is likely to have access to reliable sources of information, whilst the recipient of the telegram would require reliable information about what was happening in the region</li><li>• The date of the telegram is approximately a month after partition has taken place</li><li>• The source references only a brief period of time, implying that communal violence would have been more extensive than this</li><li>• The constant references to secrecy and confidentiality imply that there is a concern about the extent of the communal violence.</li></ul></li><li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The conflicting claims of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs for territory in the Punjab</li><li>• The difficulties faced by the Boundary Commission in determining where the frontier between India and Pakistan should be placed in the Punjab, especially in relation to cities such as Lahore and Amritsar</li><li>• The fears of those who were displaced by partition in August 1947 for their future, leading to the massive movement of population in both directions</li><li>• The inability of the 50,000 strong British army left in India between August 1947 and mid-1948 to control the extent of the violence.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the reaction in Britain to the Amritsar Massacre.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Churchill was a member of the British Government and likely to be well informed about events in India, which is supported by the knowledge of events that is demonstrated</li> <li>• The language used by Churchill suggests that he was morally outraged by events, for example 'a monstrous event'</li> <li>• As Churchill opposed moves towards Indian independence, his criticisms of British behaviour at Amritsar give considerable weight to his views</li> <li>• The need to set up a committee into the events suggests that there was some controversy surrounding them.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that Churchill was critical of the actions taken by the British ('our reign in India or anywhere else has never stood on the basis of physical force alone')</li> <li>• It suggests that not all people in Britain agreed with Churchill's assessment of the events at Amritsar ('I shall be told that it 'saved India''')</li> <li>• It claims that the level of violence was excessive even though the meeting at the Jallianwallah Bagh was 'unlawful'.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The findings of the Hunter Committee, with its censuring of the actions of General Dyer and its reprimand of the governor of Punjab, O'Dwyer</li> <li>• The response to the massacre by the ladies of the Punjab who sent a letter to Dyer telling him that he had saved them</li> <li>• The response of the British press to the treatment of Dyer suggests that he had support for his actions in Britain, for example £26,000 fund raised by the Morning Star</li> <li>• The debates that took place in Parliament after the findings of the Hunter Committee were released indicate the level of disagreement – Dyer was censured in the House of Commons but supported in the House of Lords.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1A: India, 1857–1948: The Raj to Partition

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• India was important as a source of raw materials for Britain, for example raw cotton, and jute and the export of these delayed the development of Indian production</li><li>• Some of the agricultural production in India involved cash crops – and this contributed to the periodic outbreaks of famine in the subcontinent, thus demonstrating the primacy of British needs for these crops above Indian needs for food</li><li>• Rice was exported to Britain, which further contributed to periodic famine</li><li>• India was the largest overseas market for the sale of British goods in this period, although this was beginning to decline by the end of the period as Indian industry developed; this enabled the growth of British industry at the expense of Indian industry</li><li>• Investment opportunities in India were set up in ways that would directly benefit British investors, for example the building of railways began in 1853 with state contracts that guaranteed a return of 5% to British companies who invested.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that counter the view that in the years 1857-1914, economic development in India was dictated by Britain's needs should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• British investment in India's infrastructure, irrigation and industry enabled the Indian economy to grow and develop, for example irrigated land increased eight-fold following the decision to allow the government of India to raise loans for productive purposes in 1871</li><li>• Indian companies developed, for example the first Tata cotton factory was opened in 1887 and soon followed by its acquisition of iron and steel works</li><li>• The development of Indian cotton factories in the second half of the 19th century had cost advantages over British factories and, although this was mitigated to a degree by the Factory Act of 1881, India was still the world's 4th largest manufacturer of cotton by 1914.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, resulted in a change in India's relationship with Britain.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, resulted in a change in India's relationship with Britain should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased levels of participation at the highest level: in 1909, white officials outnumbered Indians on the Viceroy's Executive Council; in 1919 the numbers advising the Viceroy equalised and in 1935 the Viceroy's Executive Committee was largely Indian</li> <li>• Under each piece of successive legislation provincial councils were enlarged and given increasing levels of responsibility so that by 1935 they controlled almost everything except defence and foreign policy</li> <li>• There was a shift in perception at each new piece of legislation that India was moving closer towards ultimate self-government even if, as in 1919, there was no clear timescale</li> <li>• There was increasing participation in the electoral process, which impacted on the relationship with Britain – from a very limited franchise for the wealthy in 1909 to a still restricted electorate of about 5 million in 1919 to a larger electorate of 60 million in 1935.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that British Government legislation, in the years 1909-35, did not result in a change in India's relationship with Britain should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Viceroy, and hence Britain, still maintained overall control of Indian affairs</li> <li>• Congress opposed both the 1919 and the 1935 legislation as not going far enough</li> <li>• Separate electorates enabled the British to continue to maintain a degree of divide and rule</li> <li>• Dissatisfaction with the legislation meant that Britain did not achieve its aim of undermining support for nationalism through limited concessions to the Indian middle classes.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gandhi had an inspirational style of leadership that appealed to many different castes and religions in India. This enabled him to attract mass support for his satyagraha campaigns in 1920–22 and 1930, thus putting pressure on the British to make concessions</li> <li>• Gandhi developed a range of tactics that enabled ordinary people to participate in the campaign, for example tax boycotts, boycotts of British goods</li> <li>• Gandhi developed strategies that gave the moral high ground to the nationalists, for example the Dharasana Satyagraha</li> <li>• Gandhi's ability to negotiate with the British when necessary, for example the agreement with Viceroy Irwin in 1931.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–39, Gandhi was not crucial in advancing the cause of Indian independence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of the campaigns directed by Gandhi ended in violence and had to be abandoned, for example 1920–22 campaign and events at the police station at Chauri Chaura</li> <li>• Some commentators argue that Gandhi's leadership style was confrontational and actually delayed progress towards at least dominion status</li> <li>• Events around the Round Table Conferences demonstrate that Gandhi did not speak for all Indians, despite his claims to do so</li> <li>• Gandhi's leadership style not only led to disagreements with the Muslim League but also divisions within Congress and thus delayed independence.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1B: China, 1900–76**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1B**

**You do not need any other materials.**  
**You must refer to the sources booklet (enclosed).**

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49987A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**





## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 To what extent was the Qing dynasty's reluctance to accept political reform in the years 1900–11 responsible for the revolution of 1911–12?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 How accurate is it to say that the Sino-Soviet alliance was beneficial for China's economic development in the 1950s?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4 To what extent were the years 1962–76 a period of economic recovery in China?

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

---

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**  
**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**  
**Option 1B: China, 1900–76**

**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1B**

**Do not return this Source Booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49987A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

### Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From an inner-party directive written by Mao Zedong for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, 18 January 1948. Here Mao is commenting on the importance of the different sections of the peasantry to the communist movement in China.

#### II. Some concrete problems of policy in the land reform and mass movements

Our Party must launch the land reform through the poor peasants and must enable them to play the leading role in the peasant associations and in the government agencies in the rural districts. This leading role consists in forging unity with the middle peasants\* for common action, and not in casting them aside and monopolising the work. The position of the middle peasant is especially important in the old liberated areas where they are the majority and the poor peasants a minority. The slogan: 'The poor peasants and farm labourers conquer the country and should rule the country' is wrong. In the villages it is the poor peasants, middle peasants, and other working people, united together under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, who conquer the country and should rule the country, and it is not the poor peasants alone who conquer the country and should rule the country.

\*middle peasants – better-off peasants

**Source 2:** From Otto Braun, *A Comintern Agent in China, 1932-39*, published in 1982. Braun was a key military agent who was sent to aid the Red Army by the Communist International (Comintern), set up in Moscow to help foreign Communists. He was the only European on the Long March, but he did not speak Chinese and lost his diary during the march. He was removed as one of the leaders of the Long March by Mao Zedong.

The strategic plan of crossing the Yangtze River was agreed. Obsessed with the idea of finding a place to cross, Mao Zedong and his Command Panel avoided larger battles, although there were many promising opportunities. There was no fortifications system to inhibit our mobility and the extremely mountainous terrain made it more difficult for the enemy to attack. This might give the impression that this segment of the march proceeded according to plan and was purely and simply a victory campaign for the Red Army. It is certainly portrayed as such by Maoists. In reality, it was nearly the opposite. The march increasingly resembled a retreat and eventually degenerated into outright flight. In its effort to avoid battle, the Red Army group pursued a zigzag route with endless parallel, forward, and backward marches, and even circles. Forced marches were the rule. Marching was done at night because the Guomindang air force flew incessant raids during the day, bombing us. 5 10

The number of deaths, more from disease and exhaustion than battle wounds, increased daily. Dissatisfaction with Mao's leadership assumed such proportions that a new power struggle was a real possibility. Mao's harshest critics were men who had previously been his strongest supporters: Lo Fu and Lin Biao. They openly blamed him and his Command Panel for 'flight before the enemy' and 'military bankruptcy'. 15

## Acknowledgements

Extract 1 is from Alan Lawrence, *China since 1900 Revolution and reform*, Routledge 2004. Source from: Works, Vol. 12, April 1929-June 1930.

Extract 2 is from Alan Lawrence, *China since 1900 Revolution and reform*, Routledge 2004. Source from: Works, Vol. 12, April 1929-June 1930.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1B)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1B: China, 1900–76

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: A02 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li></ul>

### Section A: Question 1(b)

**Target: A02 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1B: China, 1900–76

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(a)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for the specified enquiry.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information which the source provides and the inferences which could be drawn from and supported by the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provides evidence that Mao placed emphasis on the revolutionary potential of the peasantry, rather than the traditional Marxist emphasis on the urban working classes</li><li>Indicates that Mao wanted to draw the middle peasants into supporting the communist cause('in forging unity with the middle peasants for common action')</li><li>Suggests that the CCP's previous policy, that focused solely on the poor peasants, would limit its support and hence the chances of success (The slogan: 'The poor peasants and farm labourers conquer the country and should rule the country' is wrong)</li><li>Provides evidence that Mao believed that victory could only come through uniting the support of the peasant and working classes ('it is the poor peasants, middle peasants, and other working people, united together under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, who conquer the country')</li></ul></li><li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mao was an astute leader who was aware that the CCP needed to be flexible in applying communist dogma in order to achieve the support needed for victory</li><li>The purpose of the directive is to instruct the leaders in the CCP to focus on winning the support of the whole peasantry and not to treat the middle peasants as class enemies</li><li>The nature of the source – a directive – may be regarded as significant in demonstrating Mao's authority over the direction of policy and in enforcing his plans.</li></ul></li><li>Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Mao's appeal to the middle peasants and middle classes was increasing as hyper-inflation undermined their support for the GMD</li><li>The middle peasants were wary of land reform that they feared would damage their economic and social position</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Communists won broad support from the peasant masses by policies including rent controls, aid to village communities and restrained behaviour by their troops</li> <li>• Deng Xiaoping mobilised vast peasant armies to support the PLA by the end of 1948.</li> </ul>
Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to the specified enquiry.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Braun was an eyewitness to the events on the Long March</li> <li>• Braun was a military adviser and so was well equipped to judge the quality of the military leadership of the Long March</li> <li>• Braun was a critic of Mao and, because he was removed from the leadership of the Long March by Mao in the Zunyi conference, is perhaps overly critical of Mao's strategy</li> <li>• Braun could not speak Chinese and lost his diary – his account from hindsight may be of questionable reliability given his hostility to Mao, for example his claim that dissatisfaction with Mao led to a power struggle is exaggerated and ignores the outcome of the Zunyi conference.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides evidence that the plan was agreed by all the CCP leaders ('Mao Zedong and his Command Panel')</li> <li>• Suggests that the Long March was a humiliating defeat ('The march increasingly resembled a retreat and eventually degenerated into outright flight')</li> <li>• Indicates that the strategy was responsible for a large loss of life ('The number of deaths ... from disease and exhaustion ... increased daily')</li> <li>• Provides evidence that there was reasoning behind Mao's strategy ('Marching was done at night because the Guomindang air force flew incessant raids during the day, bombing us').</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At first, Mao was not the leader of the Long March; he took control after the Zunyi conference of 1935, which demoted Bo Gu and Braun and turned the CCP away from the 28 Bolsheviks trained by the Comintern</li> <li>• Mao was responsible for the many changes in the direction of the march as the Communists sought to avoid the GMD</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="411 237 1294 300">• The death rate in the march was high – only c.6,000 out of c.85,000 survived</li><li data-bbox="411 315 1283 349">• The march was represented as a heroic victory by the Communists.</li></ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1B: China, 1900–76

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the reluctance to accept political reforms in the years 1900–11 was responsible for the revolution of 1911–12.</p> <p>The evidence that the reluctance to accept political reform was responsible for the revolution should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Constitutional reforms were announced in 1906 but they were not for immediate effect – a nine-year preparatory period was allowed</li><li>• Corrupt officials were ignored – officials were involved in taking bribes and skimming off the take from other officials</li><li>• Prince Chun, the regent for Emperor Pu Yi from 1908, used his position to preserve the royal house and the status quo</li><li>• In 1910–11 a national consultative council and cabinet was established - but was dominated by imperial relatives and Manchu nobles, which suggested nothing had really changed.</li></ul> <p>The evidence that other reasons were responsible for the revolution of 1911–12 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The growth of nationalism driven especially by foreign domination of railways allowed by the Qing dynasty led to calls for change</li><li>• Financial crisis and the increase in taxes to pay for the reforms that were introduced made the government unpopular</li><li>• Growth of revolutionary ideas promoted, for example Sun Yat-sen in his revolutionary newspaper smuggled around China and read by students and reformers</li><li>• The reforms that were implemented made revolution more likely– the establishment of local assemblies in 1908 and provincial assemblies in 1909 raised expectations that were not fulfilled</li><li>• Military reform led to the establishment of regional military forces that were not loyal to the Qing dynasty. The catalyst was a coup led by Yuan Shikai, the leading general of the new armies.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether the Sino-Soviet alliance was beneficial for China's economic development in the 1950s.</p> <p>The evidence that the Sino-Soviet alliance was beneficial for China's economic development in the 1950s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial aid and investment: USSR under Khrushchev provided generous assistance to China to promote the first Five Year Plan – nearly 42 per cent investment came from the USSR</li> <li>• Technical aid: in the early 1950s, the alliance was cemented by the Soviets sending thousands of experts to assist China's economic development by training Chinese technicians; they also played a key role in restoring the railways</li> <li>• Import of Soviet machinery: the Soviets sped up China's economic development by providing machinery and building industrial plants that China could not otherwise have afforded; China's economy grew by 11 per cent in the First Five Year Plan</li> <li>• China's relationship with the Soviet Union gave her access to nuclear technology.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that the Sino-Soviet alliance was damaging to China's economic development in the 1950s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of the economic aid – the \$300 million provided by Khrushchev was a loan not a gift; the PRC had to repay the full amount plus interest</li> <li>• The cost of technical support – China had to pay the total cost of the upkeep of the 10,000 Soviet advisers sent to China and give the bulk of her bullion reserves to the USSR</li> <li>• Economic dependence on the USSR – the Sino-Soviet alliance led China into enmity with the USA; the economic consequence was the loss of access to dollars needed for foreign trade and increased China's dependency on the Soviet Union as a trading partner</li> <li>• Ideological influence – China had copied the Soviet economic model, which reflected the rigidities of Soviet ideology, described by Mao as 'walking on one leg'.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the years 1962-76 as a period of economic recovery in China.</p> <p>The evidence that the years 1962-76 were a period of economic recovery in China should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recovery of finances – the budget deficit had been turned into a surplus by 1962 and there was increasing foreign investment in the 1970s</li> <li>• Recovery of agriculture across the period – by 1965, agricultural production had been restored to the levels achieved before the Great Leap Forward and between 1966 and 1976 food production had increased by more than 90 billion kilograms</li> <li>• Recovery of industry – greater flexibility, restoration of a hierarchy and wage differentials helped industrial growth to reach 20 per cent by 1965; new technology was developed, for example first satellite launched in 1970</li> <li>• Oil production – increased by 10 times by 1965 and a further 6.7 times by 1976, thus ending China’s reliance on Soviet imports.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that this period was not one of economic recovery should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disruption as a consequence of the Cultural Revolution led to serious economic setbacks in the period 1966-76; industrial production fell by 13.5 per cent in the years 1966-68 including massive reductions in the production of steel, coal and iron</li> <li>• The criticism, demotion and even imprisonment of most engineers, managers, scientists and technicians had a negative impact on recovery by removing expertise</li> <li>• Agricultural production fell in the years 1966–68 and again in 1972, although the reduction was less severe than the decline in industrial production</li> <li>• Austerity programme introduced in 1968, which restricted borrowing from, and lending by, banks and restricted travel from one province to another.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**  
**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**  
**Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1C**

**You must have:**  
Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49988A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

1/1





## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 How accurate is it to say that Stalin achieved absolute control over the Soviet Government in the years 1929–41?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 To what extent was dissidence a problem for the Soviet state in the years 1965–82?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 4 How far was resistance within the Communist Party responsible for the failure of economic reform in the years 1982–91?

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

**History**

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin**

**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1C**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

P49988A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From a speech on agrarian policy by Joseph Stalin to a conference of Marxist students, 27 December 1929. Here is he commenting on the policy of collectivisation.

Until recently the Party adhered to the policy of only restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks. This policy was absolutely correct at the time. We could not have undertaken such an offensive against the kulaks some five years or three years ago. We should certainly have failed. In 1927 the kulaks produced over 600 million poods\* of grain, about 130 million poods of which they sold outside the rural districts. That was a serious power to be reckoned with. We did not yet have the state farms and collective farms which could be the basis for a determined offensive against the kulaks. 5

But today we have an adequate material base for us to strike at the kulaks, to break their resistance, to eliminate them as a class, and to replace their output by the output of the collective farms and state farms. You know that in 1930 the gross grain output of the collective farms and state farms will amount to incomparably more than the kulaks supplied in 1927. 10

\*pood – a unit of measurement equal to approximately 16 kg

**Source 2:** From Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed: What Is the Soviet Union and Where Is It Going?*, published in 1937. Leon Trotsky, a leading member of the Bolshevik government after the 1917 revolution, wrote this book in 1936 in Norway after he had been exiled by Stalin's government. Trotsky was the most prominent of Stalin's opponents. Here he is commenting on the policies towards women in the Soviet state.

The October revolution honestly fulfilled its obligations in relation to women. The young government not only gave them all political and legal rights in equality with men, but, more importantly, did all that it could to secure their access to all forms of economic and cultural work. The revolution made a heroic effort to destroy the so-called 'family hearth' – that outdated institution in which the women of the toiling classes perform slave labour from childhood to death. The family was to be replaced by a system of crèches, kindergartens, schools, social dining rooms and social laundries. This was to bring to women a real liberation from slavery. 5

The working women and the more advanced peasants appreciated the advantages of the collective care of children as well as the socialisation of the whole family economy. During the lean years of the 1920s, workers and families ate in social dining rooms. But from the moment of the abolition of the food-card system\* in 1935, all the better-placed workers began to return to the home dining table. But home-cooking, which is now shamefacedly celebrated by journalists, means the return of the workers' wives to their pots and pans - that is a return to the old slavery. It is doubtful if the 1935 resolution of the Communist International on the 'complete triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union' sounds very convincing to the women of the factory districts. 10  
15  
20

\*food-card system – this was a system for rationing food introduced by the Communist Party in 1931

### Acknowledgements

Source 1 is from *Works, Vol. 12, April 1929–June 1930*.

Source 2 is from *Works, Vol. 12, April 1929–June 1930*.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1C)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91:  
From Lenin to Yeltsin

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

---

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: A02 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li></ul>

### Section A: Question 1(b)

**Target: AO2 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(a)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse the source and consider its value for an inquiry into the reason for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Suggests that Stalin had long desired to launch an attack on the kulaks ('We could not have undertaken such an offensive against the kulaks some five years or three years ago')</li><li>• Provides evidence that Stalin wanted to destroy the kulaks because he regarded them as class enemies ('to break their resistance, to eliminate them as a class')</li><li>• Indicates that the Stalin could not attack the kulaks before 1929 because the Soviet Union relied on their grain production ('In 1927 the kulaks produced over 600 million poods of grain')</li><li>• Claims that the collectivisation programme in the countryside had been a success ('in 1930 the gross grain output of the collective farms and state farms will amount to incomparably more than the kulaks supplied in 1927') and hence the kulaks were no longer needed.</li></ul></li><li>2. The following points could be made about the authorship or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stalin was making a speech to a Marxist audience who would be likely to support his attitude to the kulaks</li><li>• The purpose of the source was to indicate that collectivisation was to enter a new phase of removing 'enemies' of the communist state</li><li>• The propaganda nature of the source is evident from Stalin's claims about the success of collectivisation so far.</li></ul></li><li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The richer peasants and any peasant who resisted Stalin's collectivisation programme were branded as kulaks and enemies of communism</li><li>• The kulaks had prospered under the NEP and supported capitalist economic policies; Stalin was appealing to the many Bolsheviks who had been hostile to both the NEP and the 1917 Land Decrees that had permitted private land ownership</li><li>• The collectivisation programme, which began in 1928, was an essential part of the securing sufficient food supplies to support industrialisation under the Five Year Plan</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="395 237 1294 302">• Stalin wanted to be able to sell grain abroad to fund the purchase of machinery for industrialisation.</li></ul> Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trotsky had played a role in the government established in 1917 that had introduced reforms designed to revolutionise the role of women and is therefore not a disinterested witness</li> <li>• Trotsky was an opponent of Stalin's regime, and had been absent from the USSR since 1929, so it is not unexpected that he is critical of the direction of policy by 1936, which he claims 'is caused by the cultural bankruptcy of the state'</li> <li>• The book was written while Trotsky was in exile, allowing him to comment freely on Soviet policy without fear of censorship.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of resulted in a change in information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicates that the rights of women and their role in society were significantly improved by the Bolshevik government ('gave her all political and legal rights in equality with man, but, more importantly, did all that it could to secure her access to all forms of economic and cultural work')</li> <li>• Claims that the reforms in the 1920s had been successful in liberating women from family duties ('appreciated the advantages of the collective care of children as well as the socialisation of the whole family economy')</li> <li>• Indicated that the changes had had an impact across different groups of women ('working women and the more advanced peasants')</li> <li>• Claims that recent changes in policy reversed the progress made under Lenin ('the return of the workers' wives to their pots and pans that is, to the old slavery').</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laws introduced in 1917 granted new freedoms to women, for example social welfare laws that granted paid maternity leave; divorce law allowed either sex to terminate the marriage on ground of incompatibility</li> <li>• The role of the Zhenotodel in encouraging women into greater participation in economic and political life</li> <li>• The failure of policies in the 1920s to bring about the desired freedoms, for example shortage of funding prevented the establishment of crèches and public canteens to free women from household duties</li> <li>• 1936 Family Code introduced by Stalin restored traditional values, including making divorce harder and outlawing abortion.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1C: Russia, 1917–91: From Lenin to Yeltsin

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether Stalin achieved absolute control over the Soviet Government in the years 1929-41.</p> <p>The evidence that Stalin achieved absolute control over the Soviet Government in the years 1929-41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stalin emerged as leader in 1929 and proceeded to establish dominance over Party institutions in the next decade, for example control over the Politburo established during the 1930s</li><li>• Power was focused in sub-groups set up outside the Politburo over which Stalin could exercise firm control, for example Stalin's practice of attending meetings and intimidating the members</li><li>• Personal dictatorship developed and maintained through the use of terror to silence opposition including the show trials and the Great Terror</li><li>• Evidence of support for Stalin's policies by the rank and file of the Communist Party.</li></ul> <p>The evidence that Stalin did not have absolute control over the Soviet Government should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In theory, the 1936 Constitution limited Stalin's control by enshrining the powers held by the Soviets</li><li>• Challenges to Stalin's policy in the Politburo, for example Ryutin's criticisms of Stalin's policy in the Central Committee and the refusal of the Politburo to allow the execution of Ryutin in 1932; criticisms of the use of brutality</li><li>• The popularity of Sergei Kirov in the 1934 Congress implied a challenge to Stalin's dominance. The 1934 Party Congress diluted Stalin's position of power as General Secretary by giving both Stalin and Kirov the title of Secretary of Equal Rank</li><li>• Widespread Trotskyite influence in the army and the left opposition.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether dissidence was a problem for the Soviet state in the years 1965-82.</p> <p>The evidence that dissidence was a problem should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power of Soviet ideology was weakened by criticism – the long-term impact of de-Stalinisation had meant it was no longer possible to suggest that everything done in the name of the party or state was beyond reproach</li> <li>• The Soviet government was concerned about the spread of dissidence, for example the arrest, trials and imprisonment of Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuri Daniel for anti-Soviet satirical writing in 1965-66</li> <li>• The establishment, as recommended by Andropov, Head of the KGB, of a new section committed to the struggle against 'ideological diversions' – the Fifth Directorate. The establishment of a register of all dissidents</li> <li>• Extreme measures taken against dissidence suggest the seriousness of the threat to the state – a network of psychiatric hospitals was established after 1969 to defend the 'Soviet Government and socialist order' from dissidents</li> <li>• Impact of dissidence on international relations – dissidents used the Helsinki Agreement, endorsed by the USSR in 1975, to demand greater freedom of expression, whilst evidence of ill treatment of dissidents in the Soviet Union led to international condemnation.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that dissidence was not a problem should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissidents did not, at any time, claim to be seeking the overthrow of the regime</li> <li>• Many people grumbled about everyday dissatisfactions but there was no evidence of widespread public political dissatisfaction</li> <li>• The regime was successful in presenting dissidents as troublemakers and, at worst, as unpatriotic traitors</li> <li>• By 1982 the regime had reduced the amount of dissident activity, the number of dissidents in prison had fallen and fewer of their publications were in circulation.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about whether resistance within the Communist Party was responsible for the failure of economic reform in the years 1982-91.</p> <p>The evidence that resistance within the Communist Party was responsible for the failure of economic reform in the years 1982-91 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition from party organisations – Gosplan was resistant to reform, for example it told Andropov that economic experiments must proceed cautiously whilst Gorbachev’s plan for acceleration was submitted three times to Gosplan before it was approved</li> <li>• Opposition from within the party – Chernenko dropped Andropov’s anti-corruption programme to reassure the party that its privileges would not be eroded by reform</li> <li>• Vested interests within the ministries – bureaucratic obstructions to Gorbachev’s reforms, for example money was diverted into agriculture by powerful ministries with vested interests, rather than into machine building as Gorbachev had intended</li> <li>• Opposition by leading party members – failure of the Shatalin Plan in 1990, which was blocked by Gorbachev and Ryzhkov because it proposed decentralising economic power to the Republics and a rapid move to a market-based economy.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence that there were other reasons that explain the failure of economic reform should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reforms failed to tackle the deep-rooted problems in the economy, for example Andropov’s reforms focused on absenteeism by rounding up so-called ‘slackers’ rather than lack of resources, backward technology and corruption</li> <li>• Poor economic planning, for example Gorbachev was not an economist and his policies were a hotchpotch of initiatives that were not well thought through and were characterised by indecision</li> <li>• Nationalist tensions led to major disturbances, for example major coal miners’ strikes in 1989, 1990 and 1991, which impacted on production; devolving powers to the Republics led to the establishment of customs barriers between regions and prevented enterprises from getting vital raw materials</li> <li>• Economic reform was undermined by other priorities that prevented investment in reform, for example the cost of the Soviet Union’s foreign policy – cost of the war in Afghanistan, commitment to match US defence spending.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**  
**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**  
**Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–2014**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1D**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

--

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49989A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**





## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

2 To what extent did the Sharpeville massacre of 1960 weaken apartheid in the 1960s?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

3 To what extent did living standards of blacks in South Africa improve in the years 1994–2014?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

4 How accurate is it to say that economic sanctions in the 1980s were responsible for the ending of apartheid in 1990?

**(Total for Question 4 = 25 marks)**

---

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA





**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**  
**Paper 2: Breadth Study with Source Evaluation**  
**Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–2014**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI02/1D**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49989A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.

1/1



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From Desmond Tutu, *Truth and Reconciliation*, an article written in 1 September 2004

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission granted those who had committed political crimes the opportunity to appeal for amnesty by giving a full and truthful account of their actions and, if they so chose, an opportunity to ask for forgiveness – opportunities that some took and others did not. The commission also gave victims of political crimes a chance to tell their stories, hear confessions, and thus unburden themselves from the pain and suffering they had experienced. 5

Those who forget the past, as many have pointed out, are doomed to repeat it. In South Africa, we knew that to have a complete amnesty where no disclosure was made would not deal with our past. It is not dealing with the past to say glibly, 'Let bygones be bygones', for then they will never be bygones. How can you forgive if you do not know what or whom to forgive? In our commission hearings, we required full disclosure for us to grant amnesty. 10

**Source 2:** From an address made by Hendrik Verwoerd to the Native Representative Council, 5 December 1950. Verwoerd was the National Party's Minister of Native Affairs at this time. The Native Representative Council, which comprised six white officials and twelve elected black officials, could offer advice to the government.

I wish to explain the main features of what is implied by the policy of Apartheid. These main features will clarify what will be done and how this will be as much in the interests of the Bantu\* as in those of the European. If Bantu and European in future develop as 'intermingled communities', then the following must be understood. There will be competition and conflict everywhere. So long as the points of contact are still comparatively few, as is the case now, friction and conflict will be few and less evident. The more this intermixing develops, however, the stronger the conflict will become. In such conflict, the Europeans will, at least for a long time, hold the stronger position, and the Bantu be the defeated party in every phase of the struggle. This will cause the Bantu to feel an increasing sense of resentment and revenge. Neither for the European, nor for the Bantu, can this increasing tension and conflict be an ideal future, because the intermixed development involves disadvantage to both. 5

If mixed development is to be the policy of the future in South Africa, it will lead to the most terrific clash of interests imaginable. The endeavours and desires of the Bantu and the endeavours and objectives of all Europeans will be antagonistic. Such a clash can only bring unhappiness and misery to both. 15

\*Bantu – a term used by the National Party for black Africans

**BLANK PAGE**

**Acknowledgements**

Source 1 is from Desmond Tutu, *God has a dream*, Doubleday 2004. Source 2 is from William H. Worger, Nancy L. Clark, Edward A. Alpers, *Africa and the West: From colonialism to independence, 1875 to the present*, Oxford University Press 2001, 2010. By permission of Oxford University Press.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Subsidiary  
in History (WHI02/1D)

Paper 2: Breadth Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–  
2014

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 2

### Section A: Question 1(a)

**Target: AO2 (10 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little substantiation. The concept of value may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and with some substantiation for assertions of value. The concept of value is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>7–10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences, as well as to expand or confirm matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and based on valid criteria although justification is not fully substantiated. Explanation of value takes into account relevant considerations such as the nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author.</li></ul>

## Section A: Question 1b

**Target: A02 (15 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little supporting evidence. The concept of reliability may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis, by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. The concept of reliability is addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of weight takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria, with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>12–15</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>7–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>13–18</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>19–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–2014

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(a)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse the source to consider its value for an enquiry into the aims of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The value could be identified in terms of the following points of information from the source, and the inferences which could be drawn and supported from the source:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) offered 'those who had committed political crimes' the opportunity for amnesty</li><li>• It suggests that the victims of crime could find closure ('unburden themselves from the pain and suffering')</li><li>• It suggests that this was a mechanism for enabling South Africa to deal with its past and move on ('It is not dealing with the past to say glibly, 'Let bygones be bygones'').</li></ul></li><li>2. The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe value to information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The writer of the article was the chairman of the TRC</li><li>• The date of the article is shortly after the last hearings had taken place in 2004</li><li>• The author is a leading Christian clergyman and the language reflects this, for example 'forgiveness', 'confession'.</li></ul></li><li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The TRC was established in 1995 under the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act; the approach that was taken by the TRC was to offer restorative justice through its three committees – Human Rights Violations, Reparation and Rehabilitation and Amnesty</li><li>• The Human Rights Violations Committee investigated human rights abuses that had taken place between 1960 and 1994 through interviewing victims in many locations in the country</li><li>• The Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee aimed to provide victim support; a President's Fund, funded by Parliament and private contributions, was set up to pay urgent interim reparations to the victims</li><li>• The Amnesty Committee considered applications for amnesty; all requests had to be submitted by 1997 and, if successful, meant that the perpetrator could not be prosecuted for the crimes revealed.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
<b>1(b)</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the source in relation to an enquiry into the purpose of apartheid under the National Party.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when giving weight to selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author was a leading member of the South African government – 'Minister of Native Affairs' and a supporter of apartheid</li> <li>• The address was directed at the Native Representative Council, which offered advice to the South African Government and may have been designed to influence them towards support for apartheid</li> <li>• The author frequently repeats the word 'conflict' and synonyms for this in order to emphasise his view of the consequences of not implementing apartheid.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It claims that the purpose of apartheid is to bring benefits to all South Africans ('as much in the interests of the Bantu as in those of the European')</li> <li>• It claims that the purpose of apartheid is to mitigate 'friction and conflict'</li> <li>• It claims that without apartheid there will be 'increasing tension and conflict', which will lead to 'unhappiness and misery' for all communities</li> <li>• It implies through its use of language such as 'clash' and 'antagonistic' that the purpose of apartheid is to prevent violence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of the content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The attitudes and the role played by Verwoerd as Minister for Native Affairs</li> <li>• The implementation of a range of legislation to embed apartheid in every aspect of South African life, such as the Group Areas Act and the Pass Laws</li> <li>• The implementation of the 1953 Bantu Education Act and its consequences in supporting the economic needs of the National Party and its supporters.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1D: South Africa, 1948–2014

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the Sharpeville massacre weakened apartheid in the 1960s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Sharpeville massacre weakened apartheid in the 1960s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The opposition that existed to the policies of the South African Government at home was made clear</li><li>• The opposition to the policies of South Africa abroad was made clear. The massacre generated international outrage at events in South Africa including the condemnation by the UN Security Council. This contributed to the ongoing development of South Africa's international isolation</li><li>• Many leading activists went into exile immediately after Sharpeville to avoid arrest, for example Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo</li><li>• Changes to the armed struggle took place as non-violence no longer seemed an effective strategy. The ANC and PAC changed their strategy from non-violent protest to direct military action through MK and Poqo, which would in the longer term prove effective.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Sharpeville massacre did not weaken apartheid in the 1960s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mass arrests of many of the anti-apartheid campaigners followed the Sharpeville massacre with a total of about 18,000 arrested, including many of the movement's leaders, for example PAC president Robert Sobukwe who remained in prison until 1969</li><li>• The methods of controlling opposition were tightened, for example the 1963 General Laws Amendment Act that made it easier to arrest critics of the policies of the government</li><li>• The governmental response to the opposition meant that it had largely been broken by 1964</li><li>• The development of the policy of 'Grand Apartheid' with the forced removal of about two million black Africans from their homes to 10 'homelands' by the end of the 1960s helped end organised resistance as people were more concerned with the immediate issues of survival</li><li>• The NP won the 1961 and 1966 elections with increased majorities; even in 1970 they still had a majority, thus indicating support for their policies from white South Africans.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which living standards for blacks in South Africa improved in the years 1994-2014.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that living standards for blacks in South Africa did improve in the years 1994-2014 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On average, educated black South Africans grew richer: inflation dropped from 14% in 1994 to 6% in 2014 whilst GDP quadrupled in this period</li> <li>• The percentage of the population living in absolute poverty (with an income of less than \$2 a day) fell by 10% between 1994 to 2014, standing at 31% of the population in 2014</li> <li>• A black middle class emerged in this period, for example in 1994, 4% of senior managers were black, in 2014 the figure had risen to 39%, in 2014 the ratio of black to white engineering students was 1:44, in 2014 it was 1:1</li> <li>• Most households had access to basic amenities and the worse impacts of poverty were ameliorated by the growth in welfare provision – the number of people receiving welfare grew from 2.6 million in 1994 to nearly 16million in 2014</li> <li>• Rates of violent crime fell in the period, for example the murder rate fell from 67 per 1000 of the population in 1994 to 30 per thousand – although these rates remained high by international comparison standards.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that living standards for blacks in South Africa did not improve in the years 1994-2014 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor black South Africans tended not to share in the benefits of economic growth experienced by educated blacks</li> <li>• Unemployment rose from 20% in 1994 to 25% of the workforce in 2014, whilst only 43% of the working age population actually had jobs in 2014</li> <li>• Low wages and poor conditions amongst those in employment gave rise to a number of strikes, for example Marikana 2012, with the accompanying suppression by violence</li> <li>• In 2010, only 4 out of every 10 children who had started school completed successfully; South Africa was ranked 146th out of 148 countries in educational standards by the World Economic Forum</li> <li>• A number of health indicators deteriorated in the period: life expectancy fell from 62 years to 56 years and this was accompanied by an increase in the prevalence of HIV Aids in adults from 2% to 18%.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about how accurate it is to say that economic sanctions in the 1980s were responsible for the ending of apartheid in 1990.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that economic sanctions in the 1980s were responsible for the ending of apartheid in 1990 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the disinvestment campaign, which had first been mooted in the 1960s, began to be felt fully from the mid-1980s and exacerbate existing economic problems within South Africa, thus putting international pressure on South Africa to remove apartheid</li> <li>• US legislation such as the 1986 Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act and the 1987 Budget Reconciliation Act resulted in both a reduction of trade (US imports from South Africa declined by 35% 1985-87) and a reduction in US investment, increasing pressure on the National Party to end apartheid</li> <li>• In 1986, the European Community voted to ban imports of iron, steel, gold coins from South Africa and agreed that there should be no new investment in the country, further exacerbating the pressures on the government to end apartheid</li> <li>• The October 1989 a three-tier plan was agreed by all Commonwealth countries, except Britain, agreeing to maintain existing economic sanctions, thus demonstrating a continuing international commitment to pressurising the South African regime</li> <li>• Sanctions by individual companies boycotting trade with South Africa after concerns expressed by their consumers, for example Pepsi, Barclays Bank, Kodak, further demonstrated the extent of international opposition to apartheid.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that factors other than economic sanctions in the 1980s were responsible for the ending of apartheid should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role played by anti-apartheid organisations within South Africa, both those advocating passive resistance and those advocating armed insurrection</li> <li>• The contributions of Mandela and De Klerk in leading negotiations to end apartheid</li> <li>• The use of sporting and other forms of sanctions increased the pressure on apartheid</li> <li>• International media publicity, for example Artists Against Apartheid at Sun City 1985, Nelson Mandela's 70<sup>th</sup> birthday party tribute in London, 1988.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1A: The USA, Independence to Civil War, 1775–1865**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1A**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer **ALL** questions in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49990A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 What, in your judgement, were the reasons for the different outcomes to crises over states' rights in 1832–33 and in January 1861?

Explain your answer.

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 'In 1787, the acceptance of slavery within the USA was essential for a successful union but in 1863–65 only its abolition appeared a viable political option for a reunited USA.'

How far do you agree with these statements?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1A: The USA, Independence to Civil War, 1775–1865**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1A**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49990A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From *Taxation No Tyranny*, Dr. Samuel Johnson, 8 March 1775. This was a pamphlet written by a famous British writer defending the position of the British Government against the claims of the American Colonists. The government was on the point of bringing in firm measures against the Port of Boston and had decided to reinforce the garrison there.

Of every Empire, all the subordinate communities are liable to taxation, because they all share the benefits of Government, and therefore ought all to meet their proportion of the expense.

This the Americans have never openly denied. That it is their duty to pay the cost of their own safety, they seem to admit; nor do they refuse their contribution to needful emergencies, whatever they may be, of the British Empire; but they are very uncertain as to the extent of their participation in sharing the public burden of taxation. They see their obligations as temporary, occasional, and of their choice. They reserve to themselves the right of settling the degree, the time, and the duration of judging when it may be required. 5 10

They allow to the supreme power nothing more than the liberty of notifying to them its demands or its necessities. Of this notification, they profess to think for themselves, how far it shall influence their counsels, and of the necessities alleged, how far they shall endeavour to meet them. They assume the exclusive power of settling not only the method but the quantity of this payment. They are ready to cooperate with all the other Dominions of the King; but they will not cooperate in any way which they do not like. 15

This claim, wild as it may seem, supposes dominion without authority and subjects without subordination.

**Source 2:** From *Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms*, Thomas Jefferson and John Dickenson, 6 July 1775.

This document was written to justify armed resistance to British forces, which had already taken place. It was made public by George Washington when he took command of the American Army besieging Boston. John Dickenson was a lawyer and landowner and a leading member of the Continental Congress.

We have suffered numerous injuries, but why should we enumerate our injuries in detail? By the so-called Declaratory Act it is declared that Parliament can 'of right make laws to bind US IN ALL CASES WHATSOEVER'. What is to defend us against so enormous, so unlimited a power? Not a single man in this Parliament is chosen by us, or is subject to our control or influence; but on the contrary, they are all exempt from the operation of such laws, and an American revenue, might actually lighten their own burdens in proportion as they increase ours. We saw the misery to which such despotism would reduce us. We for ten years incessantly and ineffectually besieged the throne as supplicants; we reasoned, we remonstrated with parliament, in the most mild and decent language. But the government in London, realising that we would regard these oppressive measures as freemen ought to do, sent over fleets and armies to enforce them. 5

We are reduced to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force. The latter is our choice. 10

We are reduced to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force. The latter is our choice. 15

### Acknowledgements

Source 1 is from Dr. Samuel Johnson, *Taxation No Tyranny*, 8 March 1775.

Source 2 is from Thomas Jefferson and John Dickenson, *Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms*, 6 July 1775.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Level in  
History (WHI03/1A)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1A: The USA,  
Independence to Civil War,  
1775–1865

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: A02 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 1A: The USA, Independence to Civil War , 1775–1865

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the outbreak of the War of American Independence in 1775.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The pamphlet has been written in Britain specifically to defend the position of the British Government so it is not surprising that it takes a critical view of the American colonists</li><li>The dating of the pamphlet coincides with the government decision to bring in legislation against Boston and was aimed to persuade people in Britain that a tougher line was necessary against the troublesome colonists in New England</li><li>The writer does not appear to blame the government in the least for the crisis but puts all the blame on the unreasonable behaviour of the colonists.</li></ul></li><li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the behaviour of the colonists:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It asserts a general principle that all members of a political association are liable share the burdens of government through taxation</li><li>It provides evidence that that the colonists do not openly deny their liability to taxation</li><li>It provides evidence that they assert their right to determine the extent and frequency of taxation</li><li>It claims that their attitude is incompatible with being subjects to a legitimate authority.</li></ul></li><li>Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The very low level of taxation enjoyed in the colonies compared to Britain</li><li>The enormous cost to Britain of defending the colonies during the recent war and even in peacetime</li><li>The various attempts to tax the colonies between 1765 and 1775 and the responses of the colonies particularly Boston and New England.</li></ul></li></ol> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This is a work of propaganda justifying the taking up of arms against hitherto legitimate authority. It coincides with the first armed clashes</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is an attempt to persuade doubters in the colonies that resistance is reluctantly necessary</li> <li>• The tone used in writing is one of justified indignation.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the feelings of the colonists towards the British authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of a resentment of decision making by a body in which the colonists have no representation</li> <li>• It provides evidence of deep reluctance to resort to force despite provocations</li> <li>• It suggests that the reader may infer that the opposition is spread throughout all the colonies</li> <li>• It implies that liberty in the last resort is more important than loyalty.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There had been a series of clashes centred on Boston and this was published as the biggest of all was about to take place</li> <li>• The context and importance of the Declaratory Act</li> <li>• The British Government had recently reinforced the garrison in Boston and one British MP had recently suggested the city be burned to the ground.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to raise taxes was a primary function of government</li> <li>• Both sources are works of propaganda produced at a time of escalating tension</li> <li>• Both sources were aimed primarily against opponents on their sides of the Atlantic.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1A: The USA, Independence to Civil War, 1775–1865

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on what were the reasons for the different outcomes to crises over states' rights in 1832–33 and in January 1861.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence explaining the peaceful outcome of the 1832–33 crisis should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The crisis ended in a peaceful compromise despite much rhetoric about states' rights from Calhoun and clear assertion of federal power by Jackson</li><li>• Jackson was clearly prepared to take a strong line on federal power, but was not opposed to slavery and was a slave owner</li><li>• Jackson was a popular president who enjoyed widespread support throughout the South</li><li>• Calhoun, leader of the states' rights movement, was Vice-President until his resignation during the crisis but he continued to play a major role in federal politics</li><li>• The Southern states still had an equal share of senatorial seats and did not feel an oppressed and threatened minority within the USA. They were able to extract a satisfactory compromise over the issue of federal tariffs.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence explaining the very different outcome of the 1861 crisis should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The crisis ended in secession and a bitter war to enforce federal authority</li><li>• The newly-elected president, Lincoln, had hardly any support in the South and was an opponent of slavery</li><li>• The South saw itself as a threatened minority facing an ever more powerful force of free states who had a majority in the Senate</li><li>• The recent presidential election campaign was divisive and left a legacy of bitterness</li><li>• The abolitionist lobby had grown significantly since the 1830s and tensions had steadily increased in the 1850s.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that 'In 1787, the acceptance of slavery within the USA was essential for a successful union but in 1863–65 only its abolition appeared a viable political option for a reunited USA.'</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that support the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southern states with 700,000 slaves in 1787 insisted that the continuation of the institution was necessary for their form of agriculture and some recognition of it was a necessary basis for union</li> <li>• A compromise acceptance of slavery was arrived at in 1787 with slaves counting as three-fifths of white citizens for the purpose of apportioning congressional seats and federal tax liabilities, thereby meeting the requirements of the South</li> <li>• The delegates to the Philadelphia convention agreed to a compromise on the continuation of the slave trade</li> <li>• By 1863 the abolitionist movement in the North was far stronger than in the 1780s and the northern states were economically more important than they had been in the 1780s and radical Republicans would not accept the recreation of the union on any other terms</li> <li>• Lincoln decided that Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 had to be made permanent with the Emancipation Amendment of 1865</li> <li>• The violence and suffering of the war could only be justified by a great moral cause.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that contradict the statement that 'In 1787, the acceptance of slavery within the USA was essential for a successful union but in 1863–65 only its abolition appeared a viable political option for a reunited USA should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was growing opposition to slavery in many northern States in the 1780s and the Federal North West Ordinance outlawed slavery in the new North Western territories from Ohio to Wisconsin. This was accepted by all states</li> <li>• Slavery received renewed economic encouragement in the South after 1787 with the invention of the cotton gin in 1793</li> <li>• Even within the South the prevailing enlightenment ideas of the 1780s made the defence of slavery half-hearted amongst many of the educated elite</li> <li>• In the years 1863–65, it is possible that a majority would still have accepted slavery if the majority favouring it in the Confederate states was added to those Northern conservatives who did not see it as a priority</li> <li>• The border states were excluded from the Emancipation Proclamation, which came into force on January 1863</li> <li>• Lincoln struggled to secure complete abolition in 1865 even with the southern states excluded.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1B**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49991A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

**History**

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1B**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49991A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From *Memorial de Sainte Helene: Journal of the Private Life and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon at St Helena 1815–16*, written by Emmanuel, le Comte de Las Cases, published in 1823. Las Cases accompanied the ex-Emperor to St Helena and acted as an informal secretary recording his conversation. His record was published after the Emperor's death. Here he records Napoleon's reflections on the Battle of Waterloo and the Duke of Wellington. Napoleon left 10000 francs in his will to a French veteran who tried to assassinate Wellington.

The Duke of Wellington owes Blücher and the Prussians a great deal. Without them I've no idea where His Grace might be, but of course I would not be here on St. Helena. His troops were admirable, his strategy deplorable. Well, it would be better to say he had none. He placed himself in a completely impossible position; and the strangest thing, it is that which ended up saving him. Had he been able to start his retreat he would have been lost. He remained master of the battlefield, that is without doubt, but was it due to his troop dispositions? He received the fruits of a great victory, but had his genius created this? His glory is all negative, his faults are enormous. He, the European general, given such huge responsibilities, having in front of him an enemy as quick and as daring as I am, to leave his troops thinly spread, whilst he was sleeping in Brussels and to be taken by surprise! No, Wellington has but one special talent, he is lucky, but he has no creativity. Fortune has done much for him. His victories, their results, their influence will remain imprinted on history; but his reputation will be brought down even whilst he lives.

**Source 2:** From *the Greville Memoirs*, by Charles Greville, published in 1875. This was the entry for June 24th 1821. Charles Greville was a well-connected government official who kept a record of his meetings with important people. Here he records a conversation with the Duke of York, who was the king's brother and was Commander in Chief of the Army. York had been Commander In Chief of the Army throughout most of the Napoleonic Wars.

The other day, as I and the Duke of York were going to the races from his house at Oatlands in Surrey, he gave me the history of the Duke of Wellington's life. The Duke of York's prejudice against Wellington is excessively strong, and I think that if ever the Duke of York succeeds to the throne and becomes King that the Duke of Wellington will not become Commander in Chief of the Army.

The Duke of York does not deny Wellington's military talents, but he thinks that Wellington was false and ungrateful and that he never gave sufficient credit to his officers. He thinks that Wellington was unwilling to put forward men of talent who might be in a situation to claim some share of credit, the whole of which he was desirous of claiming for himself. York says that at Waterloo, Wellington got into a messy situation and allowed himself to be surprised, and he attributes in great measure the success of that day to Wellington's second in command, the Marquis of Anglesea, who he says was hardly mentioned, and that in the coldest terms, in the Duke of Wellington's official despatch after the Battle of Waterloo.

**BLANK PAGE**

**Acknowledgements**

Source 1 is from Emmanuel, *Memorial de Sainte Helene: Journal of the Private Life and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon at St Helena 1815–16*, le Compte de Las Cases 1823. Source 2 is from Charles Greville, *the Greville Memoirs*, 1875.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced Level  
in History (WHI03/1B)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1B: The British  
Experience of Warfare, 1803–  
1945

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: A02 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li> <li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li> <li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li> <li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the abilities of the Duke of Wellington as a commander during the Waterloo campaign of 1815.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is the reported conversation of the Emperor Napoleon and no man had a better overall view of this his last campaign</li><li>• The defeated Napoleon might be expected to minimise Wellington's entitlement to the glory given to him as the reputed victor. He clearly bore a grudge against Wellington</li><li>• The writer was French and might be expected to have a partial view of the conduct and outcome of the Battle of Waterloo and the reported conversation took place several months after the battle and was not written up in book form until eight years later.</li></ul></li><li>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Wellington's conduct of the campaign<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that Wellington was completely taken by surprise</li><li>• It claims that Wellington's troop dispositions before the battle were poor</li><li>• It claims that Wellington was essentially very lucky.</li></ul></li><li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The confirmation by Wellington of his being surprised, for example 'Napoleon has humbugged me'</li><li>• Knowledge of Wellington's troop dispositions both initially at Quatre Bras and then at Waterloo</li><li>• Wellington's careful conduct of the battle.</li></ul></li></ol> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Duke of York was an experienced British soldier, particularly as an administrator and was devoted to the British Army</li><li>• He was notoriously hostile to Wellington as the source indicates</li><li>• This is a reported conversation from six years after the battle.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Wellington's conduct of the campaign:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of Wellington's military ability although in a grudging tone</li> <li>• It provides confirmatory evidence of the element of surprise inflicted on Wellington by Napoleon</li> <li>• It claims that the others deserve the credit for the successful outcome of the battle as much if not more than Wellington</li> <li>• It asserts that Wellington is defective in character, i.e. 'false and ungrateful'.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the ways in which it might be said that Wellington got into 'a messy situation' during the campaign</li> <li>• Knowledge of Wellington's relations with his subordinates and the frequent charge that he was over-controlling and did not delegate sufficiently</li> <li>• Knowledge of his often troubled relations with 'Horseguards' headed by the Duke of York.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They both agree that Wellington was surprised by Napoleon during the Waterloo campaign</li> <li>• Both sources are from hostile but well-informed sources although one French and one British</li> <li>• Both sources by focusing on the role Wellington during the campaign tacitly accept his perceived importance.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant'.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public opinion of the Crimean War was overwhelmingly supportive of the war, including most radicals who were ideologically hostile to Tsarist Russia</li><li>• The two leading parliamentary critics of the Crimean War, Richard Cobden and John Bright, both lost their seats in the election of 1857</li><li>• The bulk of the press in both wars supported the war effort. Press criticism of the government in the Crimean War turned on the issue of the efficiency in prosecuting the war not the fundamental issue of fighting the war</li><li>• Public opinion of the Boer War appears to have been largely in favour with the government winning a comfortable majority in the 1900 election and widespread public demonstration of support at other times</li><li>• In neither war does opposition to the principle of fighting the war appear to have influenced government decision making.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There was opposition to both wars from leading and eloquent politicians notably Cobden and Bright in the Crimean War and Lloyd George and Campbell Bannerman in the Boer War</li><li>• There was considerably more public opposition to the Boer War than the Crimean War particularly after the victory over the Boers in the summer of 1900 failed to end the fighting and Kitchener had to develop unpopular methods to counter guerrilla tactics</li><li>• The British press in the Boer War was more divided than in the Crimean War with some Liberal papers such as the Manchester Guardian and the Daily News (from early 1901) opposing the war</li><li>• In both wars the press raised widespread concerns about the efficient conduct of the struggles, which influenced the conduct of the war. For example, the Daily Mail, which was a strong supporter of the Boer War, nevertheless expressed concerns about its conduct</li><li>• The Boer War was opposed by two new parties that had not existed in the 1850s, namely The Irish Nationalist Party and the Labour Group (officially the Labour Party in 1906).</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18.'</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that support the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18', should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tank that dominated the battlefields of 1939–45 had first made its appearance in battle in September 1916</li> <li>• Air power, so important in 1939–45, had developed after 1914 to play an increasingly important role in land warfare by 1918</li> <li>• Submarines had developed as an increasingly important weapon at sea during 1914–18 and played a vital role in naval warfare in 1939–45</li> <li>• The first aircraft carrier had been created by Britain by the end of the First World War and this was to be the dominant capital ship of the Second World War</li> <li>• Radio became increasingly important for communication purposes on the battlefield towards the end of the First World War and was the key method of communication in 1939–45</li> <li>• Most of the key infantry weapons of 1939–45, such as grenades, mortars and the light machine gun, had been developed in 1914–18.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that contradict the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18.' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nuclear weapons were developed during the Second World War</li> <li>• The rocket technology so threatening in 1944 was developed by Germany in 1939–45</li> <li>• The technology of secret communication,(Enigma), and its countering (Turing's early versions of the computer) were developed post-1918</li> <li>• Aircraft technology was massively developed and advanced both immediately before and during the Second World War</li> <li>• Radar for aircraft and submarine detection systems was developed post-1918</li> <li>• Most of the explosives and propellants of 1939–45 pre-dated 1914.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel  
International  
Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1C**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49992A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

**2** 'War created the Second Reich and war destroyed it.'

How far do you agree with these judgements?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

**3** How far was the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany different from that of the Weimar Republic?

Explain your answer.

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1C**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49992A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From *Inside the Third Reich 1933–45*, by Albert Speer, published in 1969. Albert Speer was an architect favoured by Hitler and a close member of his inner circle in the 1930s. He later served as Minister for Armaments during the war but after Germany's defeat served a 20-year sentence in prison where he wrote much of these memoirs. Here he records Hitler's pattern of life in the 1930s.

I myself threw all my strength into my work and was baffled at first by the way Hitler squandered his working time. I could understand that he might wish his day to trail off in boredom and pastimes; but to my notion this phase of the day, averaging some six hours, proved rather long, whereas the actual working session was by comparison relatively short. When, I would ask myself, did he really work? Little was left of the day; he rose late in the morning and conducted one or two official conferences; but from the subsequent dinner on, he more or less wasted time until the early hours of the evening. His rare appointments in the late afternoon were imperilled by his passion for looking at building plans. The adjutants often asked me 'Please don't show him any plans today'. Then the drawings I had brought with me would be left by the telephone switchboard at the entrance, and I would reply evasively to Hitler's inquiries. Sometimes he saw through this game and would himself go to look in the anteroom or the cloakroom for my roll of plans. 5 10

In the eyes of the people Hitler was the leader who watched over the nation day and night. This was hardly so. But Hitler's lax scheduling could be regarded as a lifestyle characteristic of the artistic temperament. According to my observations, he often allowed a problem to mature during the weeks when he seemed entirely taken up with trivial matters. Then after a 'sudden insight' came, he would spend a few days of intensive work giving final shape to his solution. No doubt he also used his dinner and supper guests as sounding boards, trying out new ideas, approaching these ideas in a succession of different ways, tinkering with them before an uncritical audience, and thus perfecting them. Once he had come to a decision he relapsed into his idleness. 15 20

**Source 2:** From *At Hitler's Side: the memoirs of Hitler's Luftwaffe Adjutant, 1937–45*, by Nicolaus Von Below, published in 1980. As Luftwaffe adjutant, he saw Hitler on almost a daily basis for eight years but as a junior member of staff. Von Below was a non-Nazi and professional soldier from a family of the traditional military elite. His diaries were destroyed at the end of the war and these memoirs were written from notes made when in prison between January 1946 and May 1948.

With the exception of the most urgent business, during the day, Hitler never used a desk except to sit on it. It was his rather odd custom to burst into sudden dictation, and his adjutants would have to scribble down instructions and intentions and later practically recast them. These would be sudden inspirations and incomplete ideas. Errors in taking down the notes could have 5 serious consequences, and so many of his intentions were misrepresented that an official reading a draft would draw attention to a doubtful assertion with the observation 'Does the Führer know that?'

This story filtered throughout the Reich, so that any statement which caused a raised eyebrow would be greeted by this catchphrase in response. A serious 10 weakness in the whole system of dictatorial government in Germany was that nobody was able to say with any certainty what Hitler had really meant when he dictated something at speed and his original idea had passed through several pairs of hands.

### Acknowledgements

Source 1 is from Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, 1969. Source 2 is from Nicolaus Von Below, *At Hitler's Side: the memoirs of Hitler's Luftwaffe Adjutant, 1937–45*, 1980, with kind permission of Greenhill Books, London.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI03/1C)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Germany: United,  
Divided and Reunited, 1870–  
1990

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: A02 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate Hitler's approach to the conduct of government.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>This is from the memoirs of a close associate of Hitler who saw him frequently on friendly terms</li><li>The memoirs were written and published long after the events they describe and in a very different context of defeat and contrition</li><li>The writer was a highly educated and intelligent man.</li></ul></li><li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Hitler's approach to the conduct of government<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It provides evidence that Hitler worked in a very unusual way for a senior politician</li><li>It provides evidence of bursts of energy and enthusiasm</li><li>It suggests that he possessed creativity but not a bureaucratic temperament</li><li>It implies that Speer had a certain admiration for one who worked with an artistic temperament even in conducting the business of government.</li></ul></li><li>Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The confirmation of Hitler's obsession with architecture and the creation of monumental and symbolic buildings and how such obsessions could crowd out other areas of governmental importance</li><li>Knowledge of the political structure of the Third Reich</li><li>Hitler's attention to detail in matters that concerned him, for example the military and indifference to other areas, for example agriculture.</li></ul></li></ol> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The writer observed Hitler closely and on a daily basis</li><li>Von Below was not a Nazi Party member but a professional officer with family connections within the army elite</li><li>The memoirs are written in the context of the defeat of Germany and may seek to make Hitler a scapegoat.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Hitler's conduct of government:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of Hitler's unconventional style</li> <li>• It provides confirmatory evidence of frantic bursts of energy</li> <li>• It implies that Hitler's approach could cause chaos throughout the chain of government</li> <li>• It is fundamentally critical of the Nazi dictatorship.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the ways in which policies originated in Nazi Germany, for example The Nuremberg Laws of 1935</li> <li>• Knowledge of the concept of 'Working towards the <u>Führer</u>'</li> <li>• Knowledge of Hitler's relationship with cabinet colleagues and his approach to cabinet government.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They both agree that Hitler's approach to government was unconventional although Source 1 might be said to offer a defence of his style in a way Source 2 does not</li> <li>• Both sources are from after the war and written in a context of defeat and both may be trying to cash in on the large market for information on Hitler and Nazi Germany</li> <li>• Both sources, by focusing on the role of Hitler, accept his perceived importance and centrality to Nazi Germany.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement 'War created the Second Reich and war destroyed it'.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that 'War created the Second Reich and war destroyed it' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The war with France in 1870 and the victory at Sedan massively increased patriotic fervour in Germany, which translated into support for acceptance of Bismarck's version of unification within both the North German Reichstag and the Southern Parliaments</li><li>• The War enthusiasm and fear of France helped to overcome suspicions of Prussia in the South German States</li><li>• It was at Versailles in January 1871 that the Second Reich was triumphantly proclaimed</li><li>• By 1917-18, the strains of war massively increased popular discontent with the regime of the Second Reich leading to strikes and ultimately revolution</li><li>• The shock of defeat in 1918 undermined the prestige of the monarchy leading to the abdication and withdrawal of the Kaiser to the Netherlands.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that 'War created the Second Reich and war destroyed it' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The economic pressure on the South German States exerted by the importance of the Zollverein was of crucial importance particularly when Bismarck threatened Bavaria with exclusion</li><li>• The King of Bavaria was heavily bribed to offer the crown of the new Reich to Wilhelm of Prussia at Versailles in 1871</li><li>• The social and political tensions within the Second Reich had been increasing before 1914 threatening major changes</li><li>• The massive economic changes within the Second Reich since 1870 were undermining the political structures built around a different economic structure</li><li>• In some ways the war of 1914–18 did not destroy the Second Reich except in terms of its political superstructure. Germany remained united and the Weimar Constitution provided for a closer federal union.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the question: how different was the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) from that of the Weimar Republic?</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that point to differences should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a directly elected president under the Weimar Constitution with wide powers under article 48. Under the FRG the President was largely ceremonial and elected by the two federal assemblies</li> <li>• The powers of the Länder were greater under the FRG</li> <li>• There was greater balance between the Länder in 1949 with no one state enjoying the preponderance of Prussia as under the Weimar Constitution</li> <li>• The voting systems for the federal parliaments differed with that of 1919 relying on a purely proportional system of voting, but that of 1949 having a considerably modified version</li> <li>• The Chancellor was appointed by the President under the Weimar Constitution but by the Bundestag under the FRG constitution.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that point to similarities should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both were republics without hereditary rulers</li> <li>• Both were federal systems with significant powers devolved to the Lander</li> <li>• Both were bicameral systems with second chambers, the Reichsrat and Bundesrat, representing the Länder and having powers of veto over legislation</li> <li>• Both had federal parliaments, the Reichstag and Bundestag, elected on a wide and democratic franchise involving all adult males and females</li> <li>• Both had, as the head of the government, a Chancellor, dependant on the support of the national Parliament.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

## International Advanced Subsidiary

Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation

Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1D**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

--

### Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

### Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

### Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49993A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B.

You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 How far were the gains made by black Americans in the years 1865–77 lost in the years 1883–1900?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 'The role of the Supreme Court was highly significant in limiting the civil rights of black Americans in the years 1883–1900, and also in extending them in the years 1954–68'

How far do you agree with these judgements?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

**History**

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation**

**Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009**

**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI03/1D**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49993A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Sources for use with Section A.

**Source 1:** From *Executive Order 8802*, issued by President Roosevelt, 25 June 1941. It was prompted in part by the threat of a march in Washington organised by the NAACP. The executive order remained in force throughout the war.

WHEREAS it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the national defence program by all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, it is the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and WHEREAS there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in defence production solely because of considerations of race, creed, color or national origin, to the detriment of workers' morale and of national unity: 5

NOW THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, I do hereby declare that it is the duty of employers and of labor organisations, in furtherance of said policy and of this order, to provide for the full and equitable participation of all workers in defence industries, without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin. 10

And it is hereby ordered as follows: 15

1. All departments of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for defence production shall take special measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin

2. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any worker because of race, creed, color or national origin 20

3. There is established in the Office of Production Management a Committee of Fair Employment Practice which shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination in violation of the provisions of this order and shall take appropriate steps to redress grievances which it finds to be valid. 25

**Source 2:** From *A Choice of Weapons*, an autobiography by **Gordon Parks**, published in 1966. Parks was an African-American novelist, photographer, filmmaker and civil war activist. During the war he was a reporter-writer with officer rank, assigned to an all-black air force unit. Here he recalls an incident in Virginia during the war.

We filed out when the ferry whistled. It was still raining and I and four negro soldiers stood near the edge of the dock watching the boat fasten into the dock. Through the wetness I noticed a sign reading COLOURED PASSENGERS and another reading WHITES ONLY. The four black soldiers moved automatically to the coloured side and so did I. How ironic, I thought, such nonsense would not stop until we were in enemy territory. 5

After all the outgoing passengers were off, we started forward. Then I saw a negro girl step from the ferry. She was in the direct line of a large group of white enlisted men who stampeded to the boat, screaming at the top of their voices. I saw the girl fall beneath them into the mud and water. The four negro soldiers saw her go down. The five of us rushed to her rescue. She was knocked down several times before we could get to her and pull her from the scrambling mob. 10

'You lousy white bastards!' one of the negro soldiers yelled.

### Acknowledgements

Source 1 is from President Roosevelt, *Executive Order 8802*, 25 June 1941.

Source 2 is from Gordon Parks, *A Choice of Weapons*, 1966.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI03/1D)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race  
Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: A02 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li> <li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate race relations in the USA during the Second World War.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is an official proclamation signed by the President indicating its importance but it does not have the weight of a full Act passed by Congress</li><li>• It is dated from the period just before the outbreak of war as the USA began to gear up rearmament but it remained in force throughout the war</li><li>• It was issued in response to pressure from the NAACP and may have been an unwilling concession.</li></ul></li><li>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about race relations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It provides evidence that the President was concerned about the issue of race relations or wished to appear to be concerned about race relations</li><li>• It provides evidence of a concern to maximise resources for defence production</li><li>• It suggests that there was serious discrimination on grounds of race that was affecting production</li><li>• It provides evidence of the methods to be used to combat discrimination but with no precise penalties.</li></ul></li><li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The confirmation of racial problems in defence industries such as the strike and riots in Detroit in 1943</li><li>• Knowledge of the role of black workers in defence industries and the mass migration during the war from the south to the North and West</li><li>• The difficulties facing Roosevelt in taking Congressional action against discrimination.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content (continued)
1	<p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The writer was a multi-talented black American who had actually witnessed these and similar events</li> <li>• Gordon Parks was a successful American citizen but also a civil rights activist</li> <li>• The autobiography was written at a time when civil rights issues enjoyed a high profile.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about race relations during the Second World War: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of discrimination and Jim Crow Laws in operation</li> <li>• It relates to Virginia, part of the old south</li> <li>• It provides evidence of black resentment but also acceptance of segregation</li> <li>• It suggests a contempt for black Americans on the part of the white conscripts in the light of their treatment of the black American girl.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of the operation of Jim Crow Laws throughout the southern states</li> <li>• Knowledge of the paradoxes thrown up for the USA by the war against Nazi Germany</li> <li>• Knowledge of the widespread violence used against black Americans in the South, and the concern about lynchings.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They both agree that there was discrimination</li> <li>• One source relates to the whole country and particularly the North and West where the defence industries were largely based and the other to the area of traditional discrimination, the South</li> <li>• Both sources indicate some improvement in race relations, i.e. the presidential concern shown in Source 1 and the fact that the author of Source 2, although a black American, was an officer.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1D: Civil rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on 'how far were the gains made by black Americans in the years 1865–77 lost in the years 1883–1900.'</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the gains made by black Americans in the years 1865–77 were lost in the years 1883–1900, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The importance of the Supreme Court ruling on civil rights in 1883, opening the way for the proliferation of Jim Crow Laws</li><li>• Mississippi introduced segregated rail travel in 1888 followed by Louisiana in 1890. Their right to do so was confirmed by Plessy versus Ferguson in 1896</li><li>• Segregation in hotels, restaurants, hospitals, sports etc. spread in the 1890s throughout the southern states</li><li>• Lynching of black Americans to intimidate was high with 82% of all US lynchings in the 1890s being in the southern states</li><li>• The right to vote was steadily whittled away throughout the South, e.g. Louisiana had 130,000 black voters in 1896 but only 5,320 in 1900</li><li>• Black representatives disappeared from the South Carolina state legislature by 1900 as in most other southern states and in the US congress.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that the gains made by black Americans in the years 1865–77 were lost in the years 1883–1900 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Slavery was not restored and there was considerable freedom of movement</li><li>• The freedom to marry without a third party's consent remained</li><li>• There was a continuing improvement in literacy and educational opportunities</li><li>• There was a slow but increasing living standard with increases in the amount of land farmed by black Americans</li><li>• Black Americans in the North continued to be able to vote.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the role of the Supreme Court was highly significant in limiting the civil rights of black Americans in the years 1883–1900, and also in extending them in the years 1954–68.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that support the statement that the role of the Supreme Court was highly significant in limiting the civil rights of black Americans in the years 1883–1900, and also in extending them in the years 1954–68, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The importance of the Supreme Court ruling on civil rights in 1883, opening the way for the proliferation of Jim Crow Laws</li> <li>• The importance of Plessy versus Ferguson 1896 and other cases in the late 1890s in legalising segregation</li> <li>• The importance of the 1954 case, Brown versus the Board of Education</li> <li>• The role of Earl Warren and his rulings on desegregation in 1955</li> <li>• The role played by the federal judiciary in facilitating civil rights up to 1968, for example the ruling on the Selma march in 1965.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that might modify the statement that the role of the Supreme Court was highly significant in limiting the civil rights of black Americans in the years 1883–1900, and also in extending them in the years 1954–68 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Supreme Court did not instigate segregation and Jim Crow Laws. It merely made them possible</li> <li>• The initiatives for segregation came from individual southern states and reflected the prejudices of the populist white electorate</li> <li>• The initiative that led to the court ruling of 1954 came from a lengthy campaign by the NAACP</li> <li>• The 1955 rulings used the phrase 'with all deliberate speed' and did not produce instant or even extensive desegregation by 1960</li> <li>• The passage of new legislation in 1964, 1965 and 1968, which owed much to the political skills of President Johnson and pressure from various civil rights groups, might be considered much more significant than the role of the Supreme Court in extending civil rights.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1A**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49994A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

**Answer ONE question in Section B on the option for which you have been prepared.  
You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 2** How far were the provisions of the Vienna Settlement (1815) relating to Italy challenged in the years 1815–49?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** How far do you agree that the lack of a military force was the most significant factor in the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament (1848–49)?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

---

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ~~☒~~ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Area with horizontal dotted lines for writing answers.

[The live question paper will contain nine more pages of answer lines.]

**TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 25 MARKS**

**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 50 MARKS**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1A**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49994A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Extracts for use with Section A.

**Extract 1:** From I R Christie, *Wars and Revolutions: Britain 1760–1815*, published in 1982.

For 1813, Wellington planned a campaign to clear the French out of Spain. The circumstances were now far more favourable. Thousands of Napoleon's soldiers had been lost in Russia during the retreat from Moscow. Negotiations with the Spanish led to an arrangement whereby 50,000 Spanish troops were to be placed under Wellington's full control. 5

As the allied preparation went forward, the French were increasingly hampered by the actions of partisans. That spring Wellington was co-ordinating the activities of some 200,000 allied troops; extending from Catalonia through central Spain to the Portuguese border and supported on both flanks by British sea power, they enclosed the French armies. 10

Wellington's main campaign started in May, one contingent of 30,000 men advancing north-east while the main body, 60,000 strong, plunged into the difficult mountainous country further north. Outnumbered and outflanked, the French fell back across Castile and over the river Ebro until at last, in late June, they were cornered at Vitoria. From the battle which followed most of the French troops managed to make their escape to the border, but an enormous booty in money and military stores fell to the allies. 15

In Europe the effect was electric. The Austrians who had been hesitating as to whether to engage once more in war to defeat Napoleon at last committed themselves. In St Petersburg cathedral in Russia, for the first time in history, the triumph of a foreign army was celebrated. The groundwork was laid for the grand European alliance. 20

**Extract 2:** From T Blanning, *The Pursuit of Glory: Europe 1648–1815*, published in 2007.

By the Treaty of Teplitz of 9 September 1813, the three great continental powers pledged to provide armies of 150,000 each and not to make peace until Napoleon had been defeated.

This was the first time since the Revolutionary Wars had begun that Russia, Austria and Prussia had acted together. The effects were soon felt. In the course of a terrible four-day battle at Leipzig between 16 and 19 October, Napoleon's hold on Germany was shattered. At two crucial moments during the battle, the troops of his German allies were turned against him. According to an eyewitness, who was situated close to Napoleon, it was this that visibly demoralised him. On the following day, he ordered the retreat. In all the French lost 38,000 during the battle and at least another 30,000 as prisoners. A huge amount of ordnance fell into allied hands, including 325 pieces of artillery. Napoleon went straight back to Paris, leaving the remnants of his army to trudge back through the debris of his empire. By the end of 1813 the Prussian army under Blücher had crossed the Rhine into France.

5

10

15

### Acknowledgements

Extract 1 is from I R Christie, *Wars and Revolutions: Britain 1760–1815*, 1982.

Extract 2 is from T Blanning, *The Pursuit of Glory: Europe 1648–1815*, 2007.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI04/1A)

Paper 4: International Study  
with Interpretations

Option 1A: The Making of  
Modern Europe, 1805–71

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

### Section A

**Targets: AO1 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**AO3 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the defeat of Napoleonic France was ultimately due to Wellington's success in Spain in 1813.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p><b>Extract 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wellington's coordination of allied troops supported by British sea power enclosed the French armies, which were defeated at Vitoria.</li><li>• The failure of Napoleon's Russian campaign was significant in the downfall of the French Empire.</li><li>• The allies captured an enormous booty in money and military stores.</li><li>• The psychological effect of the defeat laid the groundwork for the grand European alliance.</li></ul> <p><b>Extract 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Treaty of Teplitz created a force of 450,000 soldiers committed to the defeat of Napoleon.</li><li>• By acting together for the first time Russia, Austria and Prussia were able to defeat Napoleon decisively at the battle of Leipzig.</li><li>• The French Army was reduced by over 60,000 and lost a huge amount of military equipment.</li><li>• Napoleon's physical retreat from the battlefield left troops demoralised and France open to attack.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the defeat of France was ultimately due to Wellington's success in Spain in 1813. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wellington's campaign forced Napoleon to commit 200,000 French troops at a time when he needed support in central Europe in the aftermath of the retreat from Russia</li><li>• Defeat in Spain opened up the Empire to attack from both the south and from British sea power</li><li>• Wellington's success not only helped to persuade Austria and Russia to challenge Napoleon but also a Russian-Prussian alliance and undermined French influence in the German states</li><li>• Napoleon himself blamed his downfall on the Spanish war claiming that all of his disasters could be traced back to Spain.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the defeat of Napoleonic France was ultimately due to Wellington's success in Spain in 1813. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Napoleon was still able to muster an army of 500,000 men in 1813 to defend the Empire, winning several major battles including Dresden</li> <li>• Most of the French army were able to escape to France and little of the captured booty found its way into Wellington's war chest</li> <li>• Despite the French defeat in Iberia, it was only in October that victory was secure enough for Wellington to invade France</li> <li>• The heavy losses at Leipzig, combined with Napoleon's decision to retreat to Paris, opened up a war weary France to direct attack from the east for the first time</li> <li>• Other factors, for example the consequences of the failure of the Continental system, Napoleon's own miscalculations, the defeat in Russia, the impact of British subsidies on its allies.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how far the provisions of the Vienna Settlement (1815) relating to Italy were challenged in the years 1815–49. Evidence of challenge and change should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The 1820–21 and 1831 revolutions had some success in challenging autocratic rule and Austrian hegemony</li><li>• In the 1830s the <i>Risorgimento</i> led a variety of nationalist ideas challenging the division of the Italian states agreed in Vienna</li><li>• In 1848–49 successful revolutionary activity occurred in the Austrian controlled and dominated Italian states; Austrian troops were forced to withdraw from some areas</li><li>• Republican activity in Venice and Rome brought radical government to Italy</li><li>• In Piedmont, Charles Albert and his successor agreed to the establishment of a constitutional monarchy; Piedmont's role in the 1st War of Independence gave hope to moderate nationalists.</li></ul> <p>To establish the extent of challenge, evidence of change and continuity should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The revolutions of 1820–21 and 1831 were short lived due to Austrian military actions and deposed rulers were restored</li><li>• Liberalism and nationalism in the 1830s and early 1840s was undermined by internal division and government repression</li><li>• 1<sup>st</sup> War of Independence failed due to the weakness of Piedmont, the strength of Austria and the actions of Pope Pius IX</li><li>• Austrian counter-revolutionary forces regained control of the Italian peninsular by the end of 1849</li><li>• By the end of 1849, apart from in Piedmont, Italy was still ruled by autocrats, under the sway of Papal conservatism and dominated by Austria.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the lack of a military force was the most significant factor in the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament (1848–49).</p> <p>The significance of the lack of a military force as a factor in the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its legitimacy as the government of Germany was undermined by reliance on the armed forces of the German princes to carry out functions such as tax collection</li> <li>• It could not defend the sovereignty of Germany against claims for land from non-German nationalities such as the Poles and the Czech</li> <li>• Unable to defend Schleswig-Holstein from Danish attack, the Parliament had to accept Prussian offers of military intervention and the disadvantageous terms that brought hostilities to an end</li> <li>• The Parliament could not defend itself from internal challenges from radical groups, relying on Prussian and Austrian troops to put down disturbances inside Germany</li> <li>• Ultimately, the lack of a defence force encouraged Austrian and Prussian counter-revolution.</li> </ul> <p>The significance of other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consequences of the swift success of the revolutions in Germany; a lack of planned policy and the machinery of government</li> <li>• Internal disagreements over the nature of German unification and the new Constitution and the consequences of the lengthy deliberations</li> <li>• Internal divisions between middle-class and radical deputies</li> <li>• External challenges from non-German nationalists and working-class protest</li> <li>• The role of Prussia and the Prussian king in undermining the authority of the Parliament</li> <li>• The consequences of the recovery of Habsburg authority by the end of 1848.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1B**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49995A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

**Answer ONE question in Section B on the option for which you have been prepared.  
You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 2** How far do the constitutional weaknesses of the League of Nations account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** How accurate is it to say that strategic considerations were more significant than ideological considerations in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

---

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1B**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49995A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Extracts for use with Section A.

**Extract 1:** From Gordon Martel, *The Origins of the First World War*, published in 2003.

The transformation of the July crisis into a world war was the responsibility of Germany. The German government decided immediately following the assassination that the perfect opportunity had arisen for Austria-Hungary to eradicate much of the internal unrest that plagued her. Simultaneously, this would reduce the Balkans to an order that suited Austro-German interests. This was not a German decision to start a world war but to achieve a diplomatic triumph in the summer of 1914 which would strengthen Austria-Hungary and attach her more closely to Germany. 5

Russia's partial mobilisation, however, indicated she would not back down this time. Faced with this determined Russian response, Germany had either to go backward (by restraining her Austro-Hungarian ally and accepting another diplomatic defeat) or go forward by threatening Russia with a general war. She chose to go forward. Germany's military leaders advised that Germany's position relative to Russia would deteriorate over the next few years. By 1914 German leaders concluded that they had been 'encircled' by Russia, France and Great Britain, and that it was impossible to break this combination by peaceful means. 10 15

German landowners and the bourgeoisie also generally believed that a great victorious war would enable them to triumph over the socialists of the industrial cities, who were opposed to their continuing domination of the German state. 20

**Extract 2:** From James Joll, *The Origins of the First World War*, published in 1984.

Those political leaders who took the decision to go to war in 1914 had a sense of the overriding importance of preserving what were regarded as vital national interests.

These national interests were partly defined in traditional territorial or strategic terms – the recovery by France of Alsace-Lorraine, the securing for Russia of Constantinople and the Straits, the British concern that the coast of Belgium should not be occupied by a hostile power. National interests were also defined in more general terms about the necessity of maintaining or changing the balance of power, about the international struggle for survival and the inevitability of war, and about the role of empire as the prerequisite for victory. 5 10

When the decision to go to war was taken, governments were able to fight the war because subjects accepted the necessity for it. To most people war appeared as an inescapable necessity if they were to preserve their country and their homes from foreign invasion; and they did not question what they had heard for generations about the glories and superior qualities of their own nation. 15

### **Acknowledgements**

Extract 1 is from Gordon Martel, *The Origins of the First World War*, 2003.

Extract 2 is from James Joll, *The Origins of the First World War*, 1984

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI04/1B)

Paper 4: International Study  
with Interpretations

Option 1B: The World in Crisis,  
1879–1945

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

---

### Section A

**Targets: AO1 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**AO3 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: A01 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p><b>Extract 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Germany strongly backed Austria-Hungary following the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand to stabilise the Habsburg Empire, strengthen their alliance, and create a more acceptable political situation in the Balkans.</li><li>• Russia's partial mobilisation indicated that the Tsarist regime would not back down and, in response, Germany rejected a diplomatic climb-down in favour of action that made war with Russia likely.</li><li>• Germany's decision for war was partly based on an assessment of Russia's military potential and the assumption that 'encirclement' by hostile powers could only be broken by force.</li><li>• Sections of Germany's ruling elite saw a successful war as a means of preserving their domestic power and undermining their socialist opponents.</li></ul> <p><b>Extract 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The leaders of the great powers decided to go to war in 1914 in order to preserve what they saw as core national interests.</li><li>• These great power national interests were partly defined in territorial/strategic ways.</li><li>• These great power national interests leading to war were also defined in wider terms, including the balance of power and imperialism ('National interests were also defined ... the role of empire as the prerequisite for victory').</li><li>• The populations of the great powers largely accepted the need for war in order to protect their nation and way of life.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the July 1914 crisis, Germany made the critical decision to give the Habsburg monarchy its unconditional support with a 'blank cheque' to confront Serbia and this led to a general European war</li><li>• Germany's decisions in 1914 were partly motivated by a determination to break out of 'encirclement' – the German perception that the Reich was hemmed in and threatened by hostile powers, notably France, Britain and Russia</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the summer of 1914, German political leaders and the German General Staff decided to launch a pre-emptive strike against Russia and France before they completed their military build-ups</li> <li>• The German ruling elite resorted to social imperialism in 1914 by pursuing an aggressive foreign policy in an attempt to resist social, political and constitutional change within the Reich.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that Germany's decisions in 1914 were primarily responsible for the outbreak of the First World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All the great powers decided to go to war in 1914 to safeguard key territorial or strategic interests (for example Russia supported Serbia in the July crisis to maintain its influence in the Balkans and Austria-Hungary saw Serbia as a dire threat to the stability of its multiracial empire)</li> <li>• Broader national interests also played an important role in provoking the conflict (for example the British decision for war was based on the assumption that a victorious Germany would dominate the continent, thus altering the European balance of power)</li> <li>• The particular issues at stake in the July crisis enabled each great power to mobilise significant public support without which war would have been impossible (for example popular domestic reaction influenced Austro-Hungarian and Russian responses after the Sarajevo assassination)</li> <li>• Important developments in the belligerent countries contributed to the general mood that made war possible by 1914 (for example the intensification of nationalist and imperialist feeling, and a growing sense that war would not be completely undesirable).</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879–1945

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the constitutional weaknesses of the League of Nations account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the constitutional weaknesses of the League of Nations account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The peace-makers at Versailles, in their determination to preserve state sovereignty and their national interests, made no binding constitutional provisions for enforcing the will of the League of Nations (for example British reluctance to intervene over the Corfu incident (1923))</li><li>• The Council, consisting of permanent great power members, together with some smaller states, could act only unanimously so that any one of its members could block all action (for example French resistance to proposed action against Italy over the Corfu incident (1923))</li><li>• The League could only with great difficulty, and as a last resort, raise a military force, which meant that, in reality, it was unable to impose its will on combatants in an armed dispute (for example Manchuria (1931–33))</li><li>• Parties to a dispute were not allowed to vote on it in the Council, but this was not enough to make sure that parties to a dispute would abide by a Council decision or plan (for example Poland's seizure of Vilnius (1920)).</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other reasons/factors account for the League's failures in resolving international disputes in the years 1920–33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• US withdrawal from the League undermined the institution from the start and had an enormous negative impact (for example American isolation made it impossible to consider any specific action over Manchuria (1931–33))</li><li>• Anglo-French differences over the purpose of the League (for example France saw the League as part of a security system but Britain regarded it as a system of conciliation) prevented it from assuming a clearly defined role regarding international disputes</li><li>• The League lacked moral authority because it was part of a post-war settlement that reflected the interests of the 'satiated' nations (for example Britain and France) so 'have not' powers (for example Germany and Russia) were likely to reject the League and the post-Versailles order</li><li>• The League's procedures successfully resolved certain disputes (for example over possession of the Åland Islands (1920–21)), which suggests that constitutional weakness alone did not account for the League's failures.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether strategic considerations were more significant than ideological considerations in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that strategic considerations were more significant in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In July 1940, Hitler maintained that an invasion of the USSR would secure Nazi dominance over Europe as a springboard for war against the British Empire, and probably the United States</li> <li>• Hitler calculated that a successful Nazi campaign against the USSR would remove the Soviet Union as a potential ally for Britain and induce the latter to negotiate</li> <li>• Operation Barbarossa was a pre-emptive strike against the Soviet Union because Stalin was planning an offensive war against Nazi Germany and this compelled Hitler to invade before Soviet military preparations were completed</li> <li>• A successful invasion of the USSR would secure for Hitler huge sources of raw materials for the Nazi war effort and ensure that there would be no interruption to oil supplies from Romania</li> <li>• Hitler reasoned that a Nazi victory over the USSR would free up Japan to pursue expansionist policies in the Pacific region and this would force the US to focus on checking Japanese ambitions in the Far East, leaving Nazi Germany with a free hand in Europe.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that ideological considerations were more significant in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union rested on the Nazis' long-term ideological goal of securing <i>lebensraum</i> or 'living space' in the east at the USSR's expense in order to establish a permanent German Empire</li> <li>• For Hitler, the attack on the USSR primarily represented an ideologically-driven anti-communist crusade, which was designed to destroy the home of 'Jewish-Bolshevism'</li> <li>• Operation Barbarossa was also based on Nazi ideological assumptions about Aryan superiority (for example Slavs as racial inferiors would offer little military resistance and would become a slave labour force under Nazi control)</li> <li>• Hitler's ideologically driven determination to invade the Soviet Union ultimately outweighed important strategic considerations (for example his desire to avoid a two-front war).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1C**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49996A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



S 4 9 9 9 6 A 0 1 0 4

**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

**Answer ONE question in Section B on the option for which you have been prepared.  
You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.**

**EITHER**

- 2** How accurate is it to say that the nuclear arms race did little to restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3** How far do you agree that neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

---

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Area with horizontal dotted lines for writing answers.

[The live question paper will contain nine more pages of answer lines.]

**TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 25 MARKS**

**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 50 MARKS**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1C**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49996A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Extracts for use with Section A.

**Extract 1:** From Melvyn P. Leffler, *The American Conception of National Security and the Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945–48*, published in 1984.

The dynamics of the Cold war are easier to understand when one grasps the American conception of national security. This included a strategic sphere of influence in the Western hemisphere, domination of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, access to the markets and resources of Eurasia, and nuclear superiority. Challenges to this concept of national security were certain to provoke a firm American response. This occurred initially when decisions were made in favour of the Truman doctrine, Marshall Plan, military assistance, Atlantic alliance, and German and Japanese rehabilitation. The 'loss' of China, Soviet detonation of an atomic bomb, and the North Korean attack on South Korea intensified the perception of a national security threat. Truman responded with military assistance to south-east Asia, a decision to build the hydrogen bomb, direct military intervention in Korea, a commitment to station troops permanently in Europe, expansion of the American alliance system, and a massive US rearmament programme. 5

One might wonder whether America's own conception of national security tended, perhaps unintentionally, to create anxieties and provoke countermeasures from a proud, insecure and suspicious USSR government. The Soviet Union was legitimately apprehensive about the rehabilitation of traditional enemies and the development of foreign bases on the periphery of the Soviet homeland. 10 15 20

**Extract 2:** From Jonathan Haslam, *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall*, published in 2011.

Stalin's reading of the international situation was intimately linked to Marxist-Leninist ideology, most notably the assumption that war under capitalism was inevitable. He wanted Soviet dominance over Europe with Germany under foot, France counted out, and Britain confined to the periphery. Quite apart from Marxist-Leninist considerations, the Soviets firmly believed that Russia had a right to dominate the entire continent after the blood sacrifice of 1941–45. And to those less ideologically committed, the idea of imperial expansion was attractive enough. 5

Predominance over Eastern Europe could have been secured, as it had been in previous centuries, without necessarily threatening Western Europe but only if the expansion of Russian power did not necessarily also mean the expansion of the communist system. It was this that so stirred Churchill and then Bevin into halting the United States' drift back into isolation. In this sense, ideology was also critical to Western assessments of the threat the USSR posed. For Stalin, pressure on Western Europe was essential to keeping the US out of the continent and by blatant exertion of pressure – through the Cominform and the Berlin blockade – he gravely miscalculated. His serious miscalculation over Korea in 1950 then ensured the US stayed and rearmed capitalist Germany as well. 10 15

### Acknowledgements

Extract 1 is from Melvyn P. Leffler, *The American Conception of National Security and the Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945–48*, 1984.

Extract 2 is from Jonathan Haslam, *Russia's Cold War: From the October Revolution to the Fall of the Wall*, 2011, © Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI04/1C)

Paper 4: International Study  
with Interpretations

Option 1C: The World Divided:  
Superpower Relations, 1943–90

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

---

### Section A

**Targets: A01 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p><b>Extract 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• After the Second World War the US had a very broad conception of its national security interests, which implicitly suggests the potential for conflict with other countries.</li><li>• Truman's determination to counter early challenges, for example Truman doctrine, Marshall Plan, to American national security interests marked important staging posts in the development of the Cold War in Europe.</li><li>• The American response to protect its national interests following events in China and Korea helped to globalise the Cold War by the early 1950s.</li><li>• US national security interests alarmed and provoked the USSR (thus fuelling the Cold War) because of Western attitudes towards Germany and Japan and Western 'encirclement' .</li></ul> <p><b>Extract 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• After 1945, Stalin was ideologically committed to the expansion of the USSR's power over the continent and felt war was inevitable under capitalism.</li><li>• Soviet expansionism was also driven by the sheer scale of the USSR's sacrifices during the Second World War and popular imperialism.</li><li>• Fear of the spread of communism prompted Western politicians to appeal to the US to counter Soviet expansionism.</li><li>• Stalin's miscalculations over the Cominform, the Berlin Blockade and Korea hardened the American stance on Europe, thereby deepening the Cold War.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The US's pursuit of a global post-war 'Pax Americana' (based on capitalist economics, an 'open door' free trade policy and liberal democracy) was almost bound to lead to conflict with its major rival, the Soviet Union</li><li>• The US attempted to use its nuclear monopoly (1945–49) as an instrument for bringing pressure to bear on the USSR (for example at Potsdam in 1945), which heightened tension between the two superpowers</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truman’s policy of containment can be seen as counter-productive (for example the Marshall Plan was viewed by the USSR as ‘dollar imperialism’ and led the Soviets to consolidate the Eastern bloc by 1948 to prevent capitalist infiltration)</li> <li>• The US’s conception of its national security interests exaggerated the challenge posed by the Soviet Union and failed to appreciate that a seriously weakened USSR was mainly concerned with security and economic reconstruction after 1945.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several of the USSR’s actions in Europe, which heightened Cold War tensions, can be seen as motivated by an ideological desire to spread communism (for example the ‘Stalinisation’ of Eastern Europe (1945–48) and the Berlin Blockade (1948–49))</li> <li>• Soviet coordination and control of the wider communist movement through the Cominform (1947) was viewed by many in the West as a threatening attempt to promote worldwide communist revolution (for example the communist ‘destabilisation’ campaign in France and Italy (1947–48))</li> <li>• Communist expansion in Asia also hardened Cold War attitudes (for example Mao’s takeover in China (1949) raised the prospect of a monolithic Sino-Soviet communist bloc that would dominate Eurasia)</li> <li>• Several of Stalin’s policies were flawed and increased Cold War divisions (for example the Berlin Blockade (1948–49) led to a capitalist West Germany and the NATO military alliance, and his support for North Korean aggression (1950) underestimated the West’s will to respond).</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the nuclear arms race did little to restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the nuclear arms race did little to restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) precipitated a spiralling arms race from the early 1950s, for example hydrogen/lithium bomb (1952–54), intercontinental bombers (mid-1950s), ICBM (1957) and SLBM (1960), China's successful nuclear test (1964)</li><li>• Fears about the perceived nuclear superiority of the other side (for example the Gaither Report and the 'missile gap' (1957–61)) also encouraged further nuclear weapon developments as a way of shoring up national prestige and influence</li><li>• The development of nuclear brinkmanship as a Cold War tactic, for example US doctrine of 'massive retaliation' against the Soviet Union and China (1950s), the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) and the US's 'nuclear option' during the 1961 Berlin crisis</li><li>• Nuclear weapons did not stop other forms of superpower competition for influence in the 1950s and early 1960s (for example Soviet economic and military aid to developing countries such as Egypt, and US support for anti-communist regimes in South Vietnam, South Korea and Taiwan).</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the nuclear arms race did restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The deterrent effect of nuclear weapons prevented direct US-Soviet confrontation during this period (for example over Berlin (1958–61) and Cuba (1962))</li><li>• The presence of nuclear weapons meant that the superpowers respected each other's sphere of influence and did not intervene (for example Guatemala (1954) and Hungary (1956))</li><li>• The superpowers had to cooperate to regulate the nuclear threat (for example the removal of nuclear missiles from Cuba and Turkey (1962–63), the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow 'hot-line' (1963))</li><li>• US and Soviet leaders were acutely aware of living in the nuclear age and acted responsibly (for example Khrushchev pursued peaceful coexistence and withdrew Soviet assistance for China's nuclear programme).</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soviet refusal to link Détente to further concessions (for example over Vietnam and the USSR's anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev's adherence to the long-term victory of communism</li> <li>• The Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (for example Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia)</li> <li>• Soviet disregard for the protection of human rights in the Eastern Bloc as set out in the Helsinki Accords (1975)</li> <li>• Both superpowers limited the scope of SALT 1 to suit their own interests (for example the US refused to negotiate on MIRVs where they held an advantage)</li> <li>• The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) and the refusal of the US Congress to ratify SALT 2 was clear evidence of the lack of superpower commitment by the late 1970s.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the USA and the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A genuine desire on the part of both superpowers to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race led to the signing of SALT 1</li> <li>• US promotion of the Nixon Doctrine (which meant withdrawal from SouthEast Asia) placed a premium on good relations with the USSR to secure American objectives</li> <li>• Wider US-Soviet economic and trade considerations were also important in promoting superpower Détente (for example to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to Western technology and grain imports)</li> <li>• A genuine Soviet desire not to be diplomatically isolated by the growing Sino-US rapprochement of the early 1970s.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Write your name here

Surname

Other names

**Pearson Edexcel**  
**International**  
**Advanced Level**

Centre Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Candidate Number

--	--	--	--	--	--

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015

**Time: 2 hours**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1D**

**You must have:**

Source booklet (enclosed)

Total Marks

## Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in the boxes** at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
- Answer the question in Section A and **ONE** question in Section B.
- Answer the questions in the spaces provided  
– *there may be more space than you need.*

## Information

- The total mark for this paper is 50.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets  
– *use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.*

## Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

Turn over ►

S49997A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**



## SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the option for which you have been prepared.  
You must start your answer to your chosen question on the next page.

**EITHER**

- 2 How far do you agree that the decisions made at the Geneva Conference were responsible for the growing US involvement in South East Asia in the years 1954–63?

**(Total for Question 2 = 25 marks)**

**OR**

- 3 How significant to the rise of the Khmer Rouge in the years 1965–75 was US President Nixon's decision to begin the bombing of Cambodia in 1969?

**(Total for Question 3 = 25 marks)**

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA



**Pearson Edexcel**  
International Advanced Level

# History

**International Advanced Subsidiary**

**Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations**

**Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90**

Sample assessment material for first teaching  
September 2015  
**Source Booklet**

Paper Reference

**WHI04/1D**

**Do not return this source booklet with the question paper.**

*Turn over* ►

S49997A

©2015 Pearson Education Ltd.



**PEARSON**

## Extracts for use with Section A.

**Extract 1:** From D Reynolds, *America, Empire of Liberty: A New History*, published in 2009.

On Saturday, 24 June 1950 Truman was enjoying a quiet weekend at home with his wife and daughter in Independence, Missouri; a rare break from the cares of the White House. As Truman later recalled the telephone rang. "Mr President... I have very serious news. The North Koreans have invaded South Korea."

5

This was about the last thing that Truman expected. The situation in Korea, though not ideal, seemed to be stabilising. However, the North Koreans had just been given the green light from Stalin for an invasion of the South. The Soviet leader had assumed from recent speeches that the Americans did not consider South Korea to be of vital importance. He also noted that Truman had done nothing to stop the communist takeover of China, a far more important country. This was a fateful error by Stalin.

10

The president flew back to Washington. With time to think aboard the plane, he felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall Communist leaders would be emboldened to override other nations. If this were allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war.

15

The 'lessons' of appeasement haunted the generation of leaders who came of age during the Second World War. So Truman took a tough line on Korea, announcing the commitment of US forces. The president was undoubtedly right that this was a test case: Stalin had expected to get away with the North Korean attack.

20

**Extract 2:** From Stephen E. Ambrose, *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938*, published in 1983.

In June 1950 Truman badly needed another crisis, one that would allow him to prove to the American people that he and the Democratic Party were not soft on Communism, to extend containment to Asia, retain American bases in Japan and rearm America. The whole package could be wrapped up and tied with a ribbon by an Asian crisis.

5

The needs were met on June 25, 1950, when North Korean troops crossed the thirty-eighth parallel in force and quickly sent the South Korean Army running.

American headquarters in Tokyo later claimed it was 'astonished', which was certainly not true. The Americans had a good general idea of what was coming and had their countermeasures prepared. Intelligence reports on North Korea had been specific enough to allow the US, days before the attack, to prepare a resolution to submit to the UN Security Council condemning North Korean aggression. Truman, too, was ready with his countermeasures. Within hours of the attack he ordered MacArthur to send supplies to the South Koreans. He also sent the U.S. Seventh Fleet to the Formosan Straits.

10

15

Since 1941 the United States had pursued a military policy of avoiding ground warfare on mainland Asia. Truman was on the verge of changing the policy and extending American military power to the Asian mainland.

### Acknowledgements

Extract 1 is from D Reynolds, *America, Empire of Liberty: A New History*, 2009.

Extract 2 is from Stephen E. Ambrose, *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938*, 1983.

Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. Pearson Education Ltd. will, if notified, be happy to rectify any errors or omissions and include any such rectifications in future editions.



Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI04/1D)

Paper 4: International Study with  
Interpretations

Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot  
War in Asia, 1945–90

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

### Section A

**Target: A01 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**A03 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li> <li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that Truman's decision to intervene in Korea in June 1950 was a spontaneous response to an unexpected invasion. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p><b>Extract 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• President Truman was spending the weekend with his family away from Washington.</li><li>• The situation in Korean had seemed to be stabilising.</li><li>• Truman decided to support South Korea on the plane back to Washington.</li><li>• Stalin used this as a test case and expected to get away with the attack.</li></ul> <p><b>Extract 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truman needed a crisis to prove his anti-communism and support containment.</li><li>• The US headquarters in Tokyo claimed that they were surprised but military intelligence had specific information with regard to an attack from North Korea.</li><li>• The US had already prepared a condemnation to submit to the UN and Truman was ready to send supplies to South Korea within hours.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Truman's decision to intervene in Korea in June 1950 was a spontaneous response to an unexpected invasion. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The North Korean army of 135,000 men invaded without warning and took the South Korean capital within days.</li><li>• Korea was not considered a Cold War 'hotspot' in 1950; neither the US nor the USSR were actively supporting the unification objectives of their respective client states.</li><li>• Truman was genuinely shocked by an invasion that he perceived to be equivalent to events in Europe in the 1930s and it took several days to formulate a response.</li><li>• The Truman administration failed to appreciate the extent to which an apparent decrease in the US commitment to South Korea in early 1950 encouraged Soviet ambitions.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Truman's decision to intervene in Korea in June 1950 was a spontaneous response to an unexpected invasion. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By 1950 a resurgence of Cold War politics had occurred due to Soviet nuclear weapons testing and Truman was aware that 're-unification' was a policy goal of the North Koreans</li> <li>• Truman may have been seeking to implement the changes to foreign policy suggested by US National Security Council policy paper 68; this advocated an 'immediate and large scale build-up of military strength'</li> <li>• Truman had been blamed by many in America for the 'loss' of China and he needed to show he was 'tough' on communism to help the Democrats win seats in the November 1950 US Congressional elections</li> <li>• Washington knew that the Soviet Union was refusing to attend UN Security Council meetings and so could guarantee UN condemnation and support</li> <li>• MacArthur in Tokyo was determined to support a strong US stance in Asia and his intelligence officials fed Washington with reports of prospective aggression.</li> </ul>

## Section B: indicative content

### Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the decisions made at the Geneva Conference were responsible for the growing US involvement in South East Asia in the years 1954–63.</p> <p>The role of the decisions made at the Geneva Conference in the growing US involvement in South East Asia in the years 1954–63 should be analysed and evaluated: Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The decisions collectively failed to create regional stability so drawing the US further into South East Asia</li><li>• The division of Vietnam encouraged the US to support Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam; his unpopular regime forced both Eisenhower and Kennedy to provide increasing levels of economic and military support</li><li>• The failure to hold the agreed unified elections in 1956 encouraged Viet Minh activity in the south; the US countered with increasing numbers of military advisers</li><li>• The granting of independence and/or self-government to Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam encouraged US involvement across the region as part of its anti-communist policy of containment.</li></ul> <p>The role of other factors in the growing US involvement in South East Asia in the years 1954–63 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cold War developments post the Second World War influenced US belief in the 'domino theory' and the policy of containment in Asia, as seen in the US creation of SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organisation)</li><li>• The presence of communist China encouraged US influence in the region – the US did not want another Korea</li><li>• Anti-communist influences in American domestic politics demanded that Presidents take a tough stance against communism, particularly Democrats such as Kennedy</li><li>• Specific events influenced US policy, for example Johnson's escalation of military support following the assassinations of both Diem and Kennedy in late 1963</li><li>• President Kennedy, in contrast to Eisenhower, was determined to be a 'Cold War warrior' and his policies escalated the American presence in Vietnam.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on significance of US President Nixon's decision to begin the bombing of Cambodia in 1969 to the rise of the Khmer Rouge in the years 1965–75.</p> <p>The contribution of President Nixon's decision to begin the bombing of Cambodia in 1969 to the rise of the Khmer Rouge in the years 1965–75 should be analysed and evaluated: Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bombing began a chain reaction of events each of which pushed Cambodians towards support for the Khmer Rouge</li> <li>• The bombing undermined the government of Prince Sihanouk leading to a coup d'état by Lon Nol and a civil war; Prince Sihanouk and his supporters began to back the Khmer Rouge</li> <li>• North Vietnamese communists hiding in Cambodia were forced deeper into the country and encouraged more people to join the Khmer Rouge</li> <li>• The bombing campaign, given the name Operation Menu, was designed to destroy agricultural production and drove the rural population towards the rurally based Khmer insurgents</li> <li>• The ferocity and 'illegitimacy' of the bombing campaign fuelled a Khmer Rouge propaganda campaign.</li> </ul> <p>To establish extent, evidence limiting the significance of the bombing and/or supporting other significant factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Khmer Rouge, although small, was already a presence in the countryside and was working to destabilise Cambodia</li> <li>• Prince Sihanouk had been responsible for inviting the North Vietnamese into Cambodia from 1965, increasing exposure to communist ideas</li> <li>• Prince Sihanouk actively encouraged his followers to work with the Khmer Rouge after he was deposed, so broadening their support base</li> <li>• It was the public invasion and blanket bombing of Cambodia by the US from April 1970, rather than the secret bombing in 1969, that increased support</li> <li>• The unpopularity of Lon Nol's regime and his use of US military aid against political opposition further encouraged Cambodians to join the Khmer Rouge in the 1970s</li> <li>• US bombing in Cambodia ended in 1973 but it was not until 1975 that the Khmer Rouge finally succeeded in taking Phnom Penh.</li> </ul>

**FOR INFORMATION ABOUT EDEXCEL, BTEC OR LCCI QUALIFICATIONS  
VISIT [QUALIFICATIONS.PEARSON.COM](http://QUALIFICATIONS.PEARSON.COM)**

**EDEXCEL IS A REGISTERED TRADEMARK 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**

**GETTY IMAGES: ALEX BELMONLINSKY**

