



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
In History (WHI04) Paper 1C
International Study with Historical Interpretations
The World Divided: Superpower Relations,
1943-90

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2018

Publications Code WHI04_1C_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Please note: that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within WHI04 1A-1D and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also highly recommended that centres read the general Introduction and Section A and B introductions in the Principal Examiner Reports for June 2017. These generic introductions outline the assessment requirements for WHI04 and give an indication of the skills required.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

2018 is the second June series of the WHI04 paper. There has been an increase in entries over this time period and it is clear that the majority of centres have taken note of the feedback provided in previous Principal Examiner reports. Candidates were usually well prepared in relation to knowledge of the specification and centres are to be commended for this. Candidates have good knowledge and they often include material which is interesting and thought provoking. Many responses were well-informed and well-written. There was a definite improvement in the understanding and appreciation of the skills required for the Section A Historical Interpretation question which assesses AO3/AO1. Section B responses were also generally stronger with many more responses clearly showing the qualities of Level 4, and indeed Level 5. However, lower Level responses continue to exhibit the weaknesses highlighted last year in regard to a lack of focus on the wording of the question and/or the second-order concept being targeted and a tendency for candidates to write about everything they know rather than to select material relevant to the question.

It is worth noting that the responses are marked using a 'best-fit' process. Each bullet point strand within the generic mark scheme is considered to create an overall sense of Level and a mark applied within the Level. If a response has qualities which exemplify a variety of Levels or a strand is missing then this will be reflected by applying a 'best-fit' Level and mark. For responses which do not address one particular strand, for example a lack of contextual knowledge for Section A Strand 2, it is not possible to reward the strand and so this will be reflected in the mark rewarded.

There is also a tendency for a significant minority of candidates to write responses which seem to thread their knowledge into the language of the mark schemes. The descriptors reflect the qualities examiners would expect to see in an essay answering the question set rather than a scaffold on which responses should be built. It is the examiner who determines whether criteria are valid or if the analysis is sustained rather than the candidate by asserting 'so it can be seen by the valid criteria I have used...' or ' In conclusion, this sustained

analysis...'. This does not necessarily add value to the response and can be detrimental if this assertion is clearly not substantiated. This is also the case in responses that assert 'It is a compelling argument...' when that argument is not well organised or even contradicts itself.

Once again, candidates were, in general, clearly aware of both the structure and the timing of the examination paper; there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

General candidate performance on each Section and specific performance on individual questions for Paper 1C are considered below.

Section A

It was genuinely pleasing to see the improvement in the application and understanding of the skills required to answer the Interpretation question successfully. There were clearly more responses being rewarded Level 4 and some excellent responses in Level 5. There is sufficient time to read the extracts carefully and plan an answer (see below) but some high Level responses reflected an outstanding ability to address the viewpoint through superb analysis of the interpretations presented while integrating detailed historical knowledge in the time provided. The best responses are invariably those that are built around the views expressed in the extracts throughout the response. These responses were often thoughtful discussions of the viewpoint in the question and resulted in interesting answers that were very enjoyable to read.

The question requires candidates to make a judgement on a stated viewpoint, through the analysis of two extracts from historical works which address the historical issue and their own knowledge of the historical debate. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the three bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- interpretation and analysis of extracts
- deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate
- evaluation of and judgement about the interpretations

The best responses reflected the qualities of each strand outlined in the Level 4 and Level 5 descriptors. However, it is worth noting that, although some candidates now clearly better understand what is required and write answers that can achieve Level 4, there are many candidates failing to reach high Level 4 or Level 5 because they are writing very long responses that include everything they know and develop a confused or contradictory argument/overall judgement as a result. There is sufficient time to plan a response of sufficient length which interprets the extracts with 'confidence and discrimination' and in which the

knowledge is 'sufficient' and 'precisely selected and deployed' to explore the view under debate.

There are also some candidates who are able to access Level 4/Level 5 for interpretation and analysis of the extracts but who either do not deploy knowledge of the issues related to the debate or do not come to a judgement in relation to the view in the question. Many responses reflected a structure that analysed Extract 1 and Extract 2 with some skill but then wrote a conclusion which just restated an understanding of the view in Extract 1 and the view in Extract 2 without coming to a judgment at all – so making it difficult to reward strand 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates exhibited great knowledge of the debate central to the overall focus of the question but ignored the extracts altogether perhaps referring to them briefly to exemplify a point being made.

There are still a significant number of candidates whose responses reflect the qualities outlined in the lower Levels of the mark scheme. These responses often showed the following characteristics:

- answering the question without reference to the extracts at all or only using the views implicitly
- paraphrasing the extracts or just stringing together quotations from the extracts using connecting words or terms
- do not include any relevant historical knowledge to support the analysis
- use AO2 skills of source analysis to evaluate the extracts with regard to aspects of provenance.

Candidates at all Levels tend towards using the term 'source' rather than 'extract' when referring to the material under discussion. If candidates are to see the material as interpretations, rather than sources of evidence, centres should encourage candidates to refer to Extract 1 or Extract 2 or the names of the authors. Candidates should be encouraged to see the sources evaluated in WHI02 and WHI03 as the building blocks which create the interpretations and views being discussed in WHI04. One extract will mainly reflect the view given in the question statement while the other will mainly reflect a counter argument to be discussed in the course of coming to an overall judgement.

As in the previous Reports please note the guidance given in the *Getting Started* document. *Students are not expected to be familiar with the writing of the selected historians but they should be familiar with the issues that make the question controversial. Reference to the works of name historians, other than the material in the extracts provided is not expected but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their arguments.*

Once again, many candidates appeared to create their discussion by reference to only the first few lines of each extract and so lost an opportunity to develop key points made later in the extracts. Candidates have sufficient time to

consider the extracts carefully and to draw out a variety of different key points in order to compare and contrast the interpretations presented.

Finally, centres should note that the response is set up for candidates to discuss the view put forward in the question in relation to the views being expressed in the extracts rather than using the extracts to exemplify the debate.

Q1

There were some excellent responses to this question which were really pleasing to read. As with the previous series candidates for this Option were almost universally well-prepared in relation to both their knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding the origins of the Cold War. Candidates were clearly aware of different views and the best responses were able to deploy this in discussing the extracts and using their understanding to reach a judgement on the view stated in the question. Fewer candidates ignored the view stated in the question and went on to develop a discussion of the stated view reflected in the extracts provided. A significant number of candidates, however, wrote long responses which could have been more effective with some judicious planning.

Most responses were able to contrast the view in Extract 1 that it was Stalin's actions that created the conditions leading to the Cold War with the view in Extract 2 that it was not the actions of an individual but the interaction of principles and mutual suspicions. Some responses noted that Extract 1 and Extract 2 both mention the Soviet need for security and suggested that this mitigated Stalin's responsibility. Other responses used views expressed in both Extracts to show that both Stalin and Truman were to blame. Unfortunately, there were some well analysed responses that just summed up the two Extracts in a conclusion and came to no judgement about the view so limiting the opportunity for reward for Strand 3 of the mark scheme.

Many candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to explain and evaluate the views presented. Candidates used their knowledge of the disagreements at Yalta and the actions of the Soviets in post-war eastern Europe to exemplify and discuss suggestions that Soviet actions were 'high-handed' in Extract 1 and the actions of the Americans in developing the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan to explain the 'dilemma' identified in Extract 2.

Some candidates were able to identify 'traditionalist' and 'post-revisionist' views in the extracts, and did so with confidence, but it must be reiterated that extracts are not chosen to reflect specific historiographical viewpoints within the Cold War debate and it is not intended that the response discuss the historiography. Indeed, the responses that fail to address the view in the question often take the form of a historiographical discussion of the general causes of the Cold War. Also, although the title of the writing from which the extract comes may be relevant, this is not an exercise in source evaluation. Some candidates used the title of Schlesinger's article to suggest that the

extract provided a view that supported the given statement because it was about Leninist ideology.

Source 1 clearly outlines its view that a "paranoid" Stalin led to the Cold War due to his desires of "world conquest" and disrespecting of agreements at Yalta. This is a greatly convincing argument considering that perhaps if Stalin had kept his word and allowed free-elections across Europe, then the "machinery of suspicion" which consolidated the Cold War may not have occurred. However, a more compelling argument is that the start of the Cold War can be attributed to the actions of both the USA and the USSR, rather than only Stalin, which is a view Source 2 presents by ~~st~~ acknowledging the role conflicting national interests and ideological differences played in creating a Cold War. Therefore, while Stalin certainly contributed, probably more than any other individual, ^{as Source 1 states} to the Cold War's beginning, a more accurate explanation considers the needs of both the USA and USSR, as argued in Source 2.

Firstly, Source 1 attributes primary significance

to Stalin in ^{causing} ~~creating~~ the Cold War, by emphasising his breaking of the Yalta agreement. Indeed, it states that Stalin "had no intention of giving up Poland" and that he "refused to reorganise the Polish government", which suggests he was instrumental in breaking the Yalta agreement and thus created tensions which developed into a Cold War. Source 1 suggests the possibility that Stalin had an active part in this policy by stating he "failed to realise" or "the shock of the west". Although Source 2 does not place primary significance on Stalin's actions in causing the Cold War, it does acknowledge Stalin's need to "undertake defensive measures" which led to suspicion from the USA who ~~believes~~ misunderstood security needs for expansionism. To this extent, the sources seem to suggest that Stalin played a major role in causing the Cold War because his actions created an American reaction which led to the ultimate conflict. This argument is supported by the fact that Stalin ~~was~~ was responsible for creating suspicion and rivalry, for example by breaking the terms of Yalta. If Stalin had obeyed agreements to fairly control Eastern Europe and allow free elections, there seems little reason to believe that the USA would feel "betrayed" and "shocked", as Source 1 states. Indeed, if Stalin had handled

the post-war division of Europe with more neutrality, the Americans likely would not have "asserted their interests in the zone that the Russians deemed vital", which is Europe, and thus tensions likely would not have developed into a Cold War. To this extent, the Sources present convincing views that Stalin had an active role in causing the Cold War, and therefore could be responsible for its beginning.

However, this view fails to acknowledge the wider context in which Stalin acted, which is crucial to understand the origins of the Cold War. Source 2 presents this view by acknowledging the national needs of both powers. Mainly, "each felt compelled to undertake defensive measures" and "adopt policies which the other" would "regard as a threat". This implies a shared responsibility between the USSR and the USA in causing the Cold War, as they both followed policies which provoked the other. This seems to suggest that rather than Stalin, the conflicting national interests of the two powers created the Cold War. Source 1 acknowledges this argument by stating perhaps Stalin "had no choice" but to break the Yalta agreement, which implies the role of the USA in pressuring the USSR into defensive policies ~~also~~.

such as consolidating communist control in Eastern Europe, which further developed tensions and created a Cold War. Source 1 also supports the view that responsibility for the Cold War was shared between the powers by recognising ^{how} the USA's "dismissed" Stalin's "security problem" as "lies" and a desire for "world conquest". Indeed, while Stalin and the USSR disobeyed Yalta, arguably Truman also disrespected the alliance when he used ~~to~~ two nuclear bombs on Japan without consulting Stalin. As a wartime ally, arguably Stalin had a right to be informed. This created tensions and arguably made Stalin feel he had "no choice" but to consolidate his own power in Europe. Therefore, this view seems more compelling than placing blame solely on Stalin, as clearly both sides played a role in creating mistrust and therefore leading the other to "undertake defensive measures" which served only to exacerbate tensions. Source 1 seems to agree with this to the extent that it acknowledges how Stalin's security needs may have been misunderstood, and Source 2's focus on the blame "each" deserve supports this view also. To this extent, Stalin cannot be blamed for the Cold War as a complicated web of "suspicion and counter-suspicion" made both ~~own~~ powers undertake

policies which the other saw as aggressive.

The Sources suggest an alternative explanation for the Cold War, which is the role that ideological differences played in causing conflict. Source 2 argues how "each side believed that stability depended on the success of its own conceptions" which highlights the view of each power in believing their economic and political systems were superior. Source 1 mentions the "American illusion" which could suggest the belief of the USA that it was all-powerful and that its system was flawless. Indeed, ideological differences pre-date Stalin, as arguably the USA's support of the white's in the Russian Civil War demonstrates, this suggesting ideology to be more important than Stalin. Convincingly, however, ideology can also be seen as the motivator of Stalin, if he did seek "world conquest", which could be supported by his use of the Comintern, Cominform and Comcon to strengthen communist ideology. Although it is accurate to see ideology as a root cause of the Cold War, it was the series of misunderstandings and subsequent suspicion between the two powers after World War 2 which led to the Cold War, which were

the cause of both nations' pursuit of policies which seemed aggressive to the other, as Source 2 argues. Nonetheless, both arguments negate the importance of Stalin as a sole individual in causing the Cold War to develop.

On the whole, while Source 1 accurately places blame for the Cold War on Stalin's ~~disregard~~ disrespecting of Yalta and decisions to create "security" for the USSR, overall this can not be the main factor in causing the Cold War, as both the USA and USSR were responsible for threatening the other and creating suspicion, which ultimately developed into the Cold War. Source 2 presents this convincing interpretation by highlighting the need for both countries to maintain national interests and ideologies in Europe, and Source 1 also recognises that perhaps Stalin was not acting aggressively but defensively.

This is a Level 5 response. It brings together a confident and discriminating analysis of both extracts with integrated knowledge of the historical context to come to a judgement on the views stated in the question. It is the discussion of the view with regard to the interpretations in the extracts which drives the response. Note that substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts are established both in the main body of the response and in the conclusion.

Plan:	Stalin responsible	America	Personality misunderstand
S1	✓ line 1-12	✓ - line 17	✓ line 20
S2		✓	✓✓

S2 - misunderstanding of each superpower
 ↳ knowledge ↳ YES - Americans saw
 Stalin's need for security as a sign
 of expansionism / Stalin saw American
 involvement in Europe - a way for them
 to stimulate their economy as a sign
 of 'American imperialism'

S1 - Stalin was responsible 'no intention
 of giving up Poland' but recognises
 that misunderstanding on the part
 of the Americans also contributed.
 Line of argument ↳ Misconceptions &
 misunderstandings certainly
 started the CW.

Both sources take contrasting views on whether Stalin was responsible for the beginning of the Cold War. Source 1 takes the view that Stalin's unwillingness to negotiate on Poland 'shattered the American illusion'. Source 1 does recognise that indeed as well as Stalin's unwillingness to negotiate was mixed with the Americans' inability to recognise Soviet fears. This ^{view} argument about misconceptions takes a central focus in the argument laid out by Source 2 that sees that the misconceptions of each superpower ultimately began the Cold War. Indeed this is a more compelling argument. Stalin's need for security was seen by the Americans as expansionism and the Soviets misunderstood the intentions of the American government. Thus Source 2's argument is more compelling.

Clearly Source 1 takes the view that Stalin was responsible for the Cold War, although the ~~text~~ author does recognise that misunderstandings played a role. This view

that Stalin was solely responsible is too simplistic and overlooks the role of more significant factors. Source 1 argues that Stalin 'had no intention of giving up Poland' (line 4). Indeed Stalin did have no intention of giving up Poland but this was not to 'suppress freedoms' (line 7) rather it was a way to ensure Soviet security. Russia had been invaded three times in the 20th century, one of which was through Poland, thus it makes sense that Stalin was unwilling to see an unfriendly government in a country of high strategic value for the security of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Source 1 argues that 'they would not give (line 10) Eastern Europe up', ^{as mentioned as well in source 2 (line 3)} indeed ~~as mentioned~~ Stalin needed to create a buffer zone to ensure the survival of the Soviet Union, notably after the brutal Second World War that cost the Soviet Union 20 million lives and the destruction of 1700 cities and towns. It is understandable to see why he felt the need to hold onto Eastern Europe. Moreover, the source argues

that they kept the 'West out completely', ^(line 11) Indeed Stalin did not trust the West, this originated when the British sought a policy of appeasement with Nazi Germany, thus this shows that Stalin would not want West dominance in Eastern Europe when he could not trust the West. Therefore, this shows that ^{the argument in} Source 2 is too simplistic as it was not Stalin's desire to dominate Eastern Europe rather protect the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, Source 1 does recognize that American 'dismiss [a] 'line 17) did develop the Cold War. ~~Indeed~~ This argument is also seen in Source 2 'The Americans [...] responded by asserting their interest' (line 57), indeed the Americans felt that the previous President Roosevelt, was too soft on Communism, and this Truman took a hard-line approach that refused to recognize Soviet intentions as anything but signs of expansionism, as mentioned in Source 1 'denounced him as a paranoid

whose aim was world conquest" (lines 17-18)
However, Source 1 and Source 2 contrast
on the level of misunderstanding.
Source 1 appears to take the view
that Stalin began the Cold War and
consequently, American misconceptions
developed it. Whereas, Source 2, the
more compelling argument, sees that
it was 'a dilemma' (line 1) between
both superpowers and both of their inability
to understand one another began the
Cold War.

Clearly, ^{the view in} Source 2 ~~is~~ is that
it was American misconceptions of
the Soviet Union and the need to
protect American interests. Source 2
argues that the constant need to
'adopt policies which the other could not
but regard as a threat to the principles of
the peace' ^{lines 27} which consequently lead to
each side ensuring 'defensive measures'.
Indeed, ~~the~~ Truman felt that he
must take a more hard ~~line~~ approach
with the Soviet Union as ~~the~~ McCarthyism
was increasing in America. This led to a

policy of containment whereby the American Government would ensure to contain communism as seen in the Truman Doctrine of 1947. Truman stated that it was the duty of Americans to "free peoples resisting subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures" illustrating that they would not accept communism. Consequently leading to the Americans 'asserting their interest in the zone that the Russians deemed vital to their security' mentioned in Source 1 (line 7). This led to the Russian misconception that 'the West was resuming its old course of capitalist encirclement mentioned in Source 2 (line 9), because ^{the} Soviet aim was safeguarding the future of the Soviet Union this concerned them a great deal to presence of the West in Europe. Leading to communism to keep control of Soviet satellites. Therefore, Source 2 view that it was each Superpower needing to protect their assets and increase defence, along with the misconception to more compels, than the view that Stalin was responsible for the cold war.

To conclude, ^{the view in extract} ~~Source 1~~ ¹ that Stalin began the Cold War is too simplistic as Stalin was not seeking domination rather protection and although ~~Source 1~~ ^{extract} 1 recognizes that American misunderstanding ~~also~~ played a role it fails to recognize how each side's need for defence and both sides' misconceptions caused the Cold War. As these are argued in ~~Source 2~~ ^{extract 2}, this is the most compelling argument over when began the Cold War.

This is also a Level 5 response. This is a succinct response which is particularly strong in Strand 1. The supporting evidence is not detailed but it is precisely selected to explore the discussion and reaches a judgement in relation to the views in both of the extracts. This is a response which uses the concept of a 'compelling argument' with some effect. Note the plan at the beginning.

Stalin was responsible for the cold war in that his actions following the ~~Potsdam~~ Yalta and Potsdam conferences, including the way he spread Soviet influence across ~~the~~ eastern Europe, Poland in particular, as pointed out by ~~source~~ ^{extract} 1; resulted in US concern ~~which~~ over what they deemed expansionism which they in turn responded ~~with~~ to by increasing their influence in Europe, annexing the Soviet Union and ~~also~~ laying the seeds of the cold war, as ~~seen~~ ^{extract 2} dictates. This means that Stalin was responsible for the cold war as he was the prime mover behind the chain of responses ^{between nations} that was the cold war.

Source 1 shows this ~~the~~ when it claims Stalin "...shut the west out" of ~~the~~ eastern Europe, despite the idea that ~~the~~ the US wanted to "~~hold~~ ^{hold} the Grand ~~Force~~ Alliance together..." showing how

it was Soviet aggression that sparked the cold war as the west still desired friendly relations.

However, it is not necessarily possible to exclusively attribute the expansion into ~~the~~ eastern Europe to Stalin. The war damages and casualties of the USSR were unparalleled by any other country in World War 2, as such they needed a buffer zone ~~to~~ as another attack could potentially be fatal. This means Stalin was reasonable in trying to ~~ex~~ establish friendly governments in Poland and eastern Europe. As such, America dismissing this "statement as lies" and calling him paranoid as source 1 shows is quite unjustified and as such it may not in fact be Stalin, but an overly aggressive US that was responsible for the cold war.

This is supported by the fact that Stalin did not intervene and support Greek communists when the US intervened to prevent revolution, showing how he clearly was not expansionist as he allowed some nations ~~to~~ within his reach to not ~~intervene~~

have a friendly government. This means American fears of a paranoid expansionist Stalin may be responsible for the cold war but not perhaps Stalin himself and his actual actions, but rather interpretations of Stalin's actions.

Extract 2 supports this in the lines 2 and 3 where it claims that the nations both viewed the actions of the other as acts of aggression when they themselves viewed their own actions as justified and compelled to, which then led to responses which mandated further response etc. Meaning that Stalin started the cold war by spreading into eastern Europe, not as an aggressive act in itself, but because the US viewed it as such and so responded in a fashion the USSR seemed aggressive, spawning the cold war.

However, it's worth noting, that were it not for the fundamental ideological difference between the nations due to 1917 ideals of World Revolution against the Wilsonian liberalist policy of foreign intervention to ensure democracy it would be highly unlikely for the two nations to interpret

actions of the other as hostile, meaning that whilst the actions of Stalin were key in the start of the cold war, these actions were only of importance in the development of the cold war due to the fundamental underlying ideological divide.

In conclusion, whilst Stalin was key in the beginning of the cold war by expanding into ~~the~~ eastern Europe which the US deemed expansionist which led to a machinery of ~~so~~ suspicion and counter suspicion, essential in the beginning of the cold war, it was the fundamental ideological divide which ~~led~~ caused this hostile reading of Stalin's actions, that fundamentally laid the framework for the cold war.

This is a Level 4 response. It addresses the view in the question and analyses both extracts but the analysis and understanding of Extract 2 is less confident meaning that the qualities of the response 'best-fit' Level 4.

Section B

There was a significant improvement in the quality of the answers produced by candidates this series. In particular, well-informed candidates were more able to respond to the focus of the question directly and to use the wording of the questions to create discussion and debate. There were some knowledgeable and well-organised responses. Once again, there was little evidence to suggest that the range and depth of essays were affected by the time taken to consider the two extracts in Section A.

It is important to note that questions can cover content which stretches across the key topics as well as within the key topics. In order to ensure that candidates are prepared to answer any question set centres should cover all the content outlined in the specification.

The question requires candidates to explore and discuss the given question while coming to an overall judgement. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- analysis and exploration of key features and characteristics of the period in relation to the second-order conceptual demands of the question
- selection and deployment of knowledge
- substantiated evaluation and judgement
- organisation and communication of argument

Most candidates are clearly well-prepared and have good knowledge of the content of the specification with Strand 1 and Strand 2 often the strongest elements of the responses seen. However, knowledgeable candidates are often writing detailed responses which include too much unfocussed supporting material and which often results in confused or contradictory arguments being developed. Level 5 Strand 2 refers to 'sufficient knowledge precisely selected and deployed'. Good responses are also often undermined by a lack of precision in the use of vocabulary when formulating an argument or establishing valid criteria. Some responses begin every paragraph by saying 'x is significant to some extent...' or 'x is the main reason...' or begin a conclusion by stating that 'I agree with the statement...' and then give an overall judgement that contradicts this. Many responses begin with 'It is a compelling argument...' and then argue the opposite. It is important that judgements are substantiated and arguments developed with logic, coherence and precision and so candidates should use discursive language relevant to the argument being proposed with thought.

Weaker responses were often those that did not address the question carefully, described the key features rather than explained or explored, wrote a response set within the wrong time period or included major inaccuracies. Many

candidates seemed to be prepared for specific potential set questions and edited these to 'fit' the focus of the question asked resulting in Level 3 responses that showed some relevance but were not really suited to the focus of the question.

Q2

This was the less popular of the two questions set. Most candidates were able to discuss the events which took place along the European Iron Curtain in the years 1953-64 but there were a significant number who clearly had little awareness of the situation in Europe and included Cold War events in other parts of the world. Some responses placed most of the response before 1953 and many did not take the response up to 1964. A significant number of candidates appeared to fashion a response about the general Cold War policy of 'peaceful co-existence' into a response about Soviet control some of which worked better than others. Those responses which were most successful were those that focused on events along the Iron Curtain during the specified years and were able to come to judgement with regard to success. The use of language in creating an argument and coming to a judgement raised in Section B above is of relevance here. Some candidates suggested that the Soviets lost control completely during this period and so had very little success at all; these responses also rarely took the response up to the end date of 1964. Although evidence for challenge is clear and the extent of Soviet influence is questionable assertions of complete failure were difficult to substantiate. Some nuanced responses took stock of the situation in 1964 in relation to the challenges faced during the 1950s suggesting that while the Soviet Union was in physical control of the states east of the Iron Curtain overall influence was less certain.

In 1953 Stalin's death meant that a new Soviet leader had to be chosen. The new Soviet leader after Stalin was Khrushchev and unlike Stalin he had a different perspective on Communism and the relations between the USSR and the USA. This change in power had a big effect over the influence and control over the states along the European Iron Curtain. The biggest effect it had was the relations between the USSR and China as it dramatically declined.

In 1953 when the Korean war had ended, it could be seen how the Soviet support of planes (MIG 15)

and war commanders helped the North Korean and Chinese under the Sino-Soviet pact to establish a Communist government in North Korea. This shows how the USSR was successful at maintaining its influence and control over the European Iron Curtain.

In 1956 the Hungarian uprising occurred, right after Khrushchev also known as Stalin's best pupil left. Many students in the street would go out and throw petrol grenades (malatany) to protest and to get rid of the government. Khrushchev saw this as unacceptable and ordered Soviet ~~land~~ troops and tanks to crush the uprising. The next person in power in Hungary, Nagy was also

removed by the Soviet Union and was sent on exile as he wanted Hungary to be democratic and also to leave the Warsaw Pact and attempt to join the UN.

This demonstrated how the Soviet Union would use violence in order to have control and influence on the countries that were inside the Soviet sphere of influence.

One of the methods the Soviet Union used in 1955 ~~was~~ in order to keep under control all ~~the~~ Eastern Europe countries was to introduce the Warsaw Pact. This could also be seen as a response to the US for introducing NATO in 1949. What the Warsaw Pact did was make all countries under the Soviet sphere of influence to not be able to

leave and so to become
strongly dependent ~~of~~
on the Soviet Union.

On the 5th of August of 1961,
Khrushchev ordered to
create a wall in East
Berlin. This was better
known as the Berlin Wall,
or the wall of shame in
the west. This enabled the
USSR to have more control
over East Berlin. This
was mainly because
a most of the citizens
preferred to 1961 where
leaving from East Berlin
to West Berlin, to the
zone owned by the
Allies. The main reason
why people normally
left was because
life conditions were
much better in West
Berlin which was a
democratic Capitalist country.

So in this aspect, the Soviet union was successful at gaining more control over East Berlin. However this developed a great amount of tension with the USA.

In 1962, after the Cuban revolution, the USSR aided Cuba annually with an amount of 4 billion dollars. This allowed the Soviets to have a big influence over them as Cuba was dependant of this money and also to make sure that the communist government would last long after the Cuban Missile Crisis.

On the other hand, when Khrushchev came into power he gave a speech of de-Stalinisation. This angered the Chinese government as they saw Stalin as an example to follow. Khrushchev was looking to have a much better relation with the USA after Stalin's death, this period of relaxation was called the Thaw. These decisions angered north Chinese government as they blamed the USSR for breaking Communism into smaller groups which made capitalism stronger. As a consequence this deteriorated the influence of the USSR over China.

The end of the Sino-Soviet pact also showed how the Soviet union where having influence and control over its ~~states~~ Communist states. This also led to a battle between the Chinese and the USSR in a river in 1969 where the Chinese were accused of attacking the Soviets, 300 Chinese died and only 16 Soviets died. This showed how the Soviet union was losing control over states inside the Iron Curtain.

In conclusion, the Soviet union was significantly unsuccessful at maintaining its influence and control over states along the

European Iron Curtain.
An example of this was
~~how~~ the Hungarian
uprisings which shows
how the Soviets would
do anything in order
to still exert control
over Hungary. However,
~~it was~~ the Soviet
Union was not
entirely successful as
it can be seen in
the cancelling of the
Sino-Soviet pact. This
shows how they
lost influence over
~~of~~ one of the biggest
Communist countries.

This is a Level 3 response. It explains some of the key features relating to Soviet control along the European Iron Curtain but lacks a clear understanding of the European focus and wanders into a wider discussion of Soviet control and influence. There is an overall approach of explanation rather than exploration in coming to a judgement. Some responses were able to link the breakdown in Sino-Soviet relations and the situation in Cuba to influence in Europe but these were rare.

mobilize soldiers in order to use them as peacekeepers in an attempt to ease tensions and to protect the USSR's interests. Although peaceful at first, the majority of rebellions ultimately ended in brutal fighting. Whilst revolutionaries had small arms, the Russians invaded cities with tanks and an overwhelming amount of soldiers. For example, Hungary's attempt to dethrone the Communist ideals resulted in around 8,000 deaths and caused the leader to be hanged and replaced. Although the use of force may suggest that the USSR would not be able to maintain power without force, it is difficult to argue that the Soviets weren't highly successful in maintaining its influence across the European Iron Curtain. Based on the criteria, although at several instances, anti-Soviet was high and attempts were made to undermine the Communist institution, that ultimately the Soviet Union was able to maintain power effectively when dealing with insurrections and influence the people of Eastern Europe through fear.

Moreover, it can be argued that the USSR was highly successful in maintaining its control and influence over the states along the Eastern European

It can be argued ~~if~~ whether or not the Soviet Union ~~was~~ ^{were successful} in maintaining its influence and control over the states along the European Iron Curtain. Factors such as the Warsaw Pact argue the Soviet were highly successful whereas ~~the~~ factors such as uprisings argue their grasp on the iron curtain was not as tight as believed. To determine how successful the Soviet Union was in maintaining its influence and control over the states along the European Iron Curtain, we can use a criteria based on, Soviet Sentiment in Eastern Europe as well as challenges by the West to undermine the Soviet's influence.

Firstly, it can be argued that the Soviet Union was highly successful in maintaining its influence over the European Iron Curtain in the years 1953-1964, because of their ability to quash rebellions instigated by nationalists of ~~the~~ Eastern European nations. In both 1953 and 1956, there were instances of rebellion in Poland and Hungary respectively. Initiated by students and citizens, the movements aimed to overthrow the Communist parties that were forcibly placed in power post-Second World War. Eventually, the Soviet would.

Iron Curtain, as they were able to unite all such nations, under the Warsaw Pact. In 1954, the US developed Nato, which occupied a main goal of providing mutual military assistance to all non-communist nations in the event of an attack. In retaliation to this, the USSR created a similar ~~organization~~ organization under the Warsaw Pact of 1955, with the goal of uniting the Eastern European nations in the event of an attack by the West, as well as economic co-operation to ensure that the nations thrive. Ultimately, this led to countries in Eastern Europe to depend on the USSR for protection as well as agricultural and economic aid. For example, Russia's potato surplus in the late 1950s helped feed countries such as Bulgaria. Based on the criteria, anti-soviet sentiments were eased as a result of dependency Eastern European countries towards the USSR. Moreover, as a result of a signed agreement, the West was limited in its approaches when attempting to derail communism, as they were now under threat of military action.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the USSR was actually unsuccessful when attempting to maintain its influence across the states of the Eastern European Iron Curtain, because of the

presence of leaders willing to soften communist ideals and support by their people. For example, prime minister Nagy of Hungary who was part of the Hungarian Soviet Party. Although he was deeply connected to the communist movement, in 1956 he began campaigning for more relaxed variations of the communist ideology - such as free elections and freedom of speech. As a result, the Hungarian people changed their view on the reformed Communist party and an uproar of rioting spread throughout the streets. Eventually, Brezhnev and the communist council felt Nagy was 'Anti-communist' and hung him before replacing him with a more dictator-like candidate. Instances such as this proved that countries in the Eastern Europe were not totally ready for self determination but alluded to great anti-soviet sentiment that could prove dangerous in the future. Based on the criteria, as a result of the USSR killing a heavily like figure, anti-soviet sentiment became quite prolific in certain countries of Eastern Europe. Moreover, although the west was not directly undermining the Soviet influence, Eastern European countries were using American values when undermining the USSR, arguing the Soviets were not very successful in maintaining order.

Finally, it can be argued that the USSR was not very successful in maintaining its influence and control over the states along the European Iron Curtain in the years 1953-1964 because the Soviet government was too preoccupied with events around the world, which caused them to delegate maintenance responsibilities to weaker leaders. ~~the~~ As a result of the arms race in the 1950's as well as Eisenhower adopting a policy of brinkmanship, the threat of mutually-assured-destruction (M.A.D.) meant the US and USSR would have to engage in de-nuclearisation talks - such as the Geneva Summit in 1955 that aimed to reduce the amount of hydrogen bombs being created. Ultimately, being tied up with diplomacy and concerns elsewhere, the USSR left the hands of Eastern European to weaker leaders who were afraid to challenge their own people. The consequence was powerful opposition and the inability to stabilize conditions as a result of inexperience and ignorance in politics. Based on the criteria, incompetent leaders left to govern by the USSR were inefficient causing local populations to rise up and fight against them - creating anti-soviet sentiment. Also, ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~attacked~~ collapsing of governments allowed the US to intervene logistically, undermining the USSR and reducing their sphere of influence.

In conclusion, despite the ~~the~~ strength of the USSR's army which was effective in policing and maintaining control in Eastern Europe, that ultimately the USSR was limited in its success to maintain ~~in~~ its influence along the iron curtain. In my opinion, the revolutions, insurrections and emergence of opposing political figures ~~was~~ conveyed to the true opinion ^{of} Eastern European countries had towards the USSR. On one hand, technically, the USSR maintained control over the runnings of the Eastern European nations. On the other hand, the USSR only obtained police control and wasn't able to spread the popularity of its ideology to the countries of Eastern Europe. Therefore, as a result of anti-Soviet sentiment, the Soviet Union ~~is~~ was only successful ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~de~~ ~~jure~~ in the De Jure maintenance of control in the East, but not De facto.

This is a lower Level 5 response. It is explicitly focused on the wording and time period of the question and throughout attempts to measure the extent of success in relation to the aims of the Soviet Union. Although some of the evaluation in Strand 3 has weaker elements, the conclusion it comes to a judgement based on relative success.

Q3

Many candidates were well-prepared to compare the significance of Gorbachev to that of other individuals in the shaping of Cold War relations in the 1980s. These candidates mainly referred to individuals named in the specification such as Reagan, Thatcher and Pope John Paul II but also to other individuals such as Lech Walesa and Helmut Kohl. There was good knowledge of the impact of Gorbachev on Cold War relations but, as pointed out in Section B above, many

wrote long descriptions or explanations of Gorbachev's domestic policies rather than using their knowledge of these policies to explain their connection to the shaping of Cold War relations. Many responses would have benefited from more selective use of knowledge to explore the question. Some responses also discussed other factors rather than directly addressing the focus on the role of the individual. There were some excellent responses, however, which analysed Gorbachev's contribution to Cold War politics in relation to the role of others. Most of these suggested that although Reagan and Thatcher were also significant it was the combined weight of Gorbachev's domestic policies on eastern Europe and his willingness to negotiate with the West internationally which made him the most significant individual. There were also some responses that put forward a 'triumphalist' view of Reagan; that it was Reagan who dominated Cold War relations in the 1980s and that it was his hard-line approach in the early 1980s that forced Gorbachev to the table in the later 1980s.

Throughout the 1980s, the Cold War relations were very fluctuating. At the beginning of the late 1980s, relations during the Cold War were highly negative and there existed many hostilities. After Gorbachev's becoming leader in 1985, relations appeared to improve but to a certain extent. Gorbachev improved Cold War relations to a great extent, however there were other factors such as Reagan and individuals in Eastern European states which further improved relations.

To begin with, it is very evident that Gorbachev did play a significant role in shaping relations in the 1980s in a positive manner. Gorbachev's election in 1985 indicated a significant change in Cold War relations as he indirectly bolstered the end of the Soviet Union which contributed to the end of the Cold War. It is worth mentioning that Gorbachev's new policies contributed to improved relations with the West. His attempts to modernise the USSR appealed to the Western powers as he did not appear as an individual who did not want to communicate with the West. Policies such as glasnost and perestroika of 1985 encouraged many Soviets to voice their opinion within the Soviet Union and this portrays Gorbachev's

way of modernising the USSR. Therefore, through his new attitude with the USSR as seen with his policies, one can argue that they encouraged the West and the USA to negotiate with him. As a result, Gorbachev was able to improve the relations within the cold war tensions. A number of summits took place in the 1980s between Gorbachev and Reagan, the US President. These summits were significant and emphasised the positive relations between the USA and the USSR that were developing. The Geneva Summit of 1985 ~~was~~ did not result in any agreements, however it was pivotal in establishing good relations between Reagan and Gorbachev. What is more, the Washington Summit of 1987 was highly significant as the INF Treaty was signed which was a positive step forward in cold war relations as it was the first time there was an agreement for ~~the~~ arms reduction rather than arms limitation. Therefore, Gorbachev's negotiative nature enabled there to be improved relations ~~with~~ between the USA and the USSR.

What is more, Gorbachev's policies ~~was~~ were a catalyst in the fall of communism in Eastern Europe and thus it can be argued that the fall of communism in Eastern Europe played a crucial role in shaping cold war relations as it led to somewhat

Improved relations. With communism collapsing and Gorbachev not getting involved, Cold War relations improved as it conveyed to the Americans that communism was weak and that the ~~Americans~~ USA was superior and eventually the winners of the Cold War. By withdrawing the Brezhnev doctrine in 1985, Gorbachev triggered revolution and uprisings to occur around Eastern Europe and the eventual establishment of democracy. Poland's Solidarity movement of ~~1989~~¹⁹⁸⁹ ended in Walesa being elected as President. & furthermore, the Velvet Revolution of ~~1989~~ 1989 ended in a democracy being set up. Therefore, Gorbachev's actions were catalytic and thus bolstered the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe which in turn resulted in improved relations and lessened tensions with the USA.

Throughout the 1980s, the US President Reagan who was elected in 1981, played a role in shaping Cold War relations, however in a negative aspect until 1985. His policy of militarised counter revolution in 1985 ~~aimed at~~ encouraged increased military spending on arms and nuclear weapons which he hoped would cause the USSR to go bankrupt as they would not have been able to ~~see~~ close the arms gap with the USA. Reagan was a hard line anti communist and

he was very public ~~eyes~~ about it. Furthermore, his Reagan doctrine magnified his anti-communist nature. By sending aid to anti-communist governments in the third world countries and Latin America, ~~he~~ Reagan hoped this would undermine Soviet ~~sp~~ influence from spreading. Thus, Reagan was a pivotal individual in shaping Cold War relations negatively. Nevertheless, he was willing to negotiate with Gorbachev as exemplified in the summits of the late 1980s. It can be argued that it was due to Gorbachev's co-operative nature that the summits took place between them which once again highlights the importance of Gorbachev.

It is true that Gorbachev's leadership led to positive relations with the ~~the~~ USA, however there were other individuals such as Walesa and the Pope John Paul II which help deteriorate Cold War tensions. By having individuals in Eastern Europe that favoured reforms, Cold War tensions diminished to a great extent, thus improving relations with East and West. Pope John Paul publicised the uprising in Poland by lending his support in 1988 and thus contributed to the demise of the communist leadership in Poland and this was further facilitated by Lech Walesa leader of Solidarity. What is more, ~~Kreisz~~ Krenz who replaced Honecker

as leader of East Germany played a pivotal role in ending communism in Germany. Krenz gave the instruction to ~~de~~ destroy the Berlin Wall in 1989 and this ~~is~~ was highly significant as the collapse of the Berlin Wall symbolised the end of East and West ~~relet~~ divisions and thus the end of any existing hostilities. ~~Therefore~~ It is evident that Gorbachev encouraged reforms however he did not enforce them. It is due to reformists such as Walesa and Krenz who facilitated the end of Cold War tensions, therefore Gorbachev interlinks with these individuals.

Overall, one can conclude, ~~the~~ that it is highly obvious that Gorbachev shaped the tension of the cold war by improving relations with the USA through his modern policies and encouraged negotiation. However, individuals such as Reagan, although he negatively affected relations at the start, he was still willing to compromise which is extremely important in improving relations. Individuals such as Walesa, the Pope, and Krenz were very pivotal in ending Cold War tensions as they encouraged the collapse of communism and thus improved relations with the West and the USA in an indirect manner.

This is a Level 5 response. It is firmly focused on the role of individuals in shaping Cold War relations and debates the relevant significance of Gorbachev's contribution in relation to others. In particular, this response does not just describe or explain Gorbachev's domestic reforms but shows their impact on Cold War relations. There is also coverage of the whole time period but it is worth noting that occasional inaccuracies in chronology or accuracy will not undermine the requirement for 'sufficient knowledge' in Strand 2.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should use the time available to read and consider both extracts carefully before planning their answer
- Candidates should read the question carefully and make sure that they address the view specifically stated in the question preferably beginning with the introduction
- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors
- Candidates should come to an overall judgement with regard to the view stated in the question; it is not sufficient just to summarise the views presented in the extracts
- Interpretations should be referred to as Extracts or by the author's name; the material presented are interpretations and not a sources of evidence.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the argument being presented is well organised
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Some Level 4 responses included too much information which led to contradiction and confusion in the overall argument being presented
- Candidates should think carefully about the language they use to evaluate the second-order concepts being assessed; do not use 'to an extent' to mean both 'a little' and 'a to a large degree' rather state the extent explicitly
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision

- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.