



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2021

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1)

Paper 4: International Study with
Interpretations

Option 1C: 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

January 2021

Publications Code WHI04_1C_msc_20210304

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

General Marking Guidance

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

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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.• 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.• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.• 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.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.• 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.• 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.

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.• 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.• 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.
---	-------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• 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.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	9-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• 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.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	15-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• 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.• 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.

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• 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.• 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.• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.
----------	--------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Section A: Indicative content

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

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 which 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.</p> <p>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 the result of a struggle between 'two different sets of ideological principles'.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relations between the Soviet Union and the West, particularly the USA, were based on ideological differences• The anti-democratic actions of the Soviet Union, and the potential for increasing communist influence across the world, led to a change in the relationship between the USSR and the USA• The 'Truman Doctrine' speech portrayed future international relations as a struggle between 'good and evil'• Ideological differences between the USA and the USSR inevitably became a struggle for power based on spheres of influence. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Soviet Union was not primarily concerned with spreading communist ideology across the world but with preserving its own security• The Soviets wanted to prevent the Germans and the Japanese becoming powerful again and limit the threat of an increasingly powerful USA• The actions of the USA exacerbated an already tense relationship with the USSR, which led to the expansion of the Cold War into a global struggle for power• The geopolitical struggle in Europe centred on control of Germany, where the Soviet Union looked to maintain its security. <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 the result of a struggle between 'two different sets of ideological principles'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As the Second World War came to a close, there was still a possibility that the Grand Alliance would come to an agreement with regard to future international relations• The death of President Roosevelt in 1945 brought in the Truman administration, which was more inclined to distrust the motives of the Soviet Union with regard to the spread of communist influence• Truman's 1947 speech appeared to commit the USA to the role of 'policing' the world against the spread of Communism, as well as offering aid to those countries materially affected by the Second World War• In the years 1947-50, Europe increasingly became politically and

Question	Indicative content
	<p>physically divided into a capitalist, democratic Western Europe and communist, one-party state Eastern Europe.</p> <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 the result of a struggle between 'two different sets of ideological principles'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 383 1369 477">• The Soviet Union was geographically still vulnerable to attack from both west and east, should the post-1945 settlement not fundamentally weaken the German and Japanese ability to rearm<li data-bbox="347 495 1409 555">• The devastating impact of the Second World War on Russia meant that the priority for the Soviet leadership in 1945 was reconstruction and defence<li data-bbox="347 573 1401 674">• The USA ended the Second World War in a position of unrivalled economic power and Truman's use of atomic bombs in Japan in August 1945, without informing Stalin, outlined its military superiority<li data-bbox="347 692 1337 786">• Increasing Cold War tensions in Germany after 1947, particularly the Berlin Blockade, meant that the provisional 1945 division of Germany became permanent in 1949.

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 which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether, in the years 1953-60, President Eisenhower's approach to foreign policy resulted more in confrontation between the USA and the USSR than co-existence.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1953-60, President Eisenhower's approach to foreign policy resulted more in confrontation between the USA and the USSR than co-existence.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eisenhower's 'New Look' policy, with its commitment to the development of nuclear weapons at the expense of conventional forces, saw an escalation in the nuclear arms race• Eisenhower manipulated events to make the Soviets appear to lack commitment to their own policy of 'peaceful co-existence', e.g. Khrushchev's rejection of the 'Open Skies' policy• In the wake of the Suez Crisis and events in the Middle East, the Eisenhower Doctrine, proposed in 1957, committed the US to a stand against communist influence in the Middle East• Eisenhower's support for covert activity in 'developing nations' led to growing tensions between the USA and USSR and the development of 'war by proxy', e.g. activity in Iran, Guatemala• The Paris Peace summit took place in acrimonious circumstances, as US deployment of U2 spy planes over Russia was revealed, and broke down when Eisenhower refused to apologise for US actions. <p>Arguments and evidence that modify or counter the statement that, in the years 1953-60, President Eisenhower's approach to foreign policy resulted more in confrontation between the USA and the USSR than co-existence should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eisenhower's 'New Look' policy, introduced in 1953, prevented direct confrontation with the USSR through the use of nuclear deterrence• Eisenhower was willing to engage in summit diplomacy and, in July 1955, the 'spirit of Geneva' saw the first meeting of US-Soviet leaders since 1945• Despite often aggressive rhetoric, Eisenhower was unwilling to become involved in flashpoints of potential direct confrontation, e.g. support for the Hungarian uprising in 1956• The concept of 'peaceful co-existence' was extended when Khrushchev accepted an invitation to visit the US and attend a summit meeting at Camp David in September 1959• In the late 1950s, Eisenhower became committed to attempting to establish a nuclear test ban treaty, e.g. discussion with Khrushchev in 1959 regarding limits to testing, on-site inspections etc. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p>3</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 which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether, in the years 1964-79, the threat of nuclear war between the superpowers greatly decreased.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1964-79, the threat of nuclear war between the superpowers greatly decreased should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of the creation of 'hot line' between Washington and Moscow meant that a communications channel was developed to prevent the likelihood of tensions leading to direct nuclear confrontation • The concept of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) acted as a deterrent to the use of nuclear weapons as a military solution to Cold War tensions between the superpowers • In July 1968, the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty was signed as an international agreement to halt the spread of nuclear capabilities across the globe; by 1970, over 50 countries had signed with many following • Strategic arms limitation talks between the USA and the USSR took place from 1969 onwards; the SALT I Treaty was signed in 1972 with a SALT II finally agreed in 1979 <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1964-79, the threat of nuclear war between the superpowers did not greatly decrease should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chinese conducted their first successful nuclear tests in October 1964 and increasing Sino-Soviet tensions in the late 1960s made nuclear warfare a possibility • Nuclear arms limitations agreements and talks did not prevent an increase in the deployment of nuclear weapons, e.g. the development of MIRVs saw the US and USSR add 12 000 warheads to their combined arsenals • In the 1970s, the US began developing a neutron bomb in response to the massive expansion in ground troops available to Soviet Union in Europe • It took seven years of negotiation before SALT II was signed in June 1979 and by the time of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 it had not yet been ratified by the US Congress • In the 1970s, a series of nuclear scares occurred, e.g. a computer glitch led to US forces accidentally preparing for a retaliatory strike. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>