



**Pearson**  
**Edexcel**

## Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2021

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

Paper 4: International Study with  
Historical 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2021

Question Paper Log Number P65829A

Publications Code WHI04\_1C\_rms\_20210604

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.

## 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>

<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>

<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<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: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90

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 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 that the announcement of the Truman Doctrine was a fundamental turning point in the development of the Cold War.</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"><li>• The announcement heralded a significant and wide-reaching commitment to the prevention of the spread of Soviet influence and expansion by the US</li><li>• The US approach to foreign policy was transformed from one of non-intervention to intervention</li><li>• The announcement did not just begin a new US foreign policy but transformed the international situation from one of co-operation between allies to increased conflict and tension</li><li>• The announcement began a chain reaction of events which pitted the USA and the USSR against each other.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Truman Doctrine was initially announced in response to the threat posed by the specific situation in Greece and Turkey in 1947</li><li>• The significance of the Truman Doctrine for international relations was not as great as it might appear, e.g. Stalin did not appear to be worried by the announcement</li><li>• The US government made it clear that the announcement was not intended to be the beginning of an interventionist anti-communist foreign policy</li><li>• The announcement of 12 March was intended to provide aid to Western Europe.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support that the announcement of the Truman Doctrine was a fundamental turning point in the development of the Cold War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Truman administration had essentially begun to develop a containment policy from 1945 (Potsdam, atom bomb) but it was only after March 1947 that a distinct policy emerged</li><li>• The post-World War II negotiations effectively came to an end with the breakdown of the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in 1947; there were no further meetings of Grand Alliance representatives</li><li>• After March 1947 a series of events developed that escalated Cold War tensions; Truman's speech led to Marshall Aid, which was a factor in the Berlin Crisis of 1948-49 and the permanent division of Germany</li><li>• Truman's speech was articulated in the language of ideology in which he painted a picture of the United States being responsible for upholding the values of the 'free world' against the 'evils' of communism.</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 announcement of the Truman Doctrine was a fundamental turning point in the development of the Cold War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truman's speech did not introduce a planned policy but was a response to the specific issues of containing communism in south-east Europe; he used ideological rhetoric in order to be able to gain funds from Congress</li><li>• There was little initial reaction to Truman's speech from the Soviet Union, and it was the fallout a year later from the Marshall Aid programme that really led to a deterioration of relations with Stalin</li><li>• The US did not begin a policy of military intervention after March 1947, e.g. it did not intervene in the Chinese Civil War, the Berlin Blockade was resolved by an airlift of supplies</li><li>• There was a huge increase in US defence spending in 1948 following the pro-Soviet coup in Czechoslovakia</li><li>• It was not until 1950 that the US openly intervened militarily in the Cold War and, even then, the US intervention in Korea was carried out under the auspices of the UN.</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 which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that, in the 1970s, war by proxy significantly undermined détente between the superpowers.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the 1970s, war by proxy significantly undermined détente between the superpowers should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• War by proxy created a global environment of permanent superpower tension; with the US, USSR and China supporting factions in independence struggles and civil wars in Africa, South America and the Middle East</li><li>• War by proxy often led to human rights violations, e.g. US support for military regimes in South America, which undermined the key aspects of the détente process, such as the Helsinki Agreement (July 1975)</li><li>• War by proxy increased the danger of the USA and the USSR being drawn into a 'hot war', particularly in the Middle East, e.g. the Yom Kippur War (1973).</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the 1970s, war by proxy did not significantly undermine détente between the superpowers should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• War by proxy facilitated détente by allowing the superpowers to continue to showcase their ideological and geopolitical ambitions while carrying out diplomacy that would decrease the likelihood of nuclear war</li><li>• The tensions between the USSR and China created by war by proxy facilitated improved relations between the USA and the two communist superpowers as each looked to the USA for support against the other</li><li>• Throughout the 1970s, détente remained the most significant feature of superpower relations, with great effort put into coming to agreements over post-World War II borders, arms limitations, human rights</li><li>• Throughout the 1970s, war by proxy did not prevent the leaders of the superpowers directly participating in summit meetings, e.g. Nixon/Mao meeting (1972), Brezhnev/Carter meeting (1979)</li><li>• There was increased co-operation between the superpowers in a variety of different areas, e.g. sporting collaborations and space exploration, the signing of the SALT II agreement (1979).</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
----------	--------------------

3

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.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether political problems in the USSR were mainly responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end in the late 1980s.

Arguments and evidence that political problems in the USSR were mainly responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end in the late 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Weaknesses in the leadership of USSR premier Andropov in the early 1980s resulted in a loss of prestige for the USSR on the world stage
- From 1985, political policies and reforms, such as glasnost, introduced by Gorbachev to strengthen the USSR increasingly undermined political stability so deflecting Soviet attention away from Cold War issues
- Political problems in the USSR were directly responsible for Gorbachev's 'Sinatra Doctrine' which allowed unrest in Eastern Europe to go unchecked, resulting in the collapse of the Soviet bloc
- The growth of nationalism in the USSR undermined communist rule and social stability so forcing Gorbachev to concentrate on domestic matters rather than the Cold War.

Arguments and evidence that other factors were mainly responsible for bringing the Cold War to an end in the late 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Economic problems in the USSR; economic stagnation and rising expectations as result of Gorbachev's policies, increased social unrest which destabilised the position of the Soviet Union as a Cold War power
- The strength of the USA; the impact of Reagan's early uncompromising ideological policies and the military-technological superiority of the USA made it impossible for the USSR to compete with the USA
- Diplomacy; from 1985 Gorbachev's rejection of 'old-style' Soviet diplomacy combined with Reagan's more moderate policies created a foundation for improving East-West relations
- The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and, in particular, the symbolic impact of the fall of the Berlin Wall, saw a withering away of the root cause of much traditional Cold War hostility
- The role of significant individuals, e.g. the influence of Pope John Paul II; Margaret Thatcher's links with Gorbachev and influence on, and support for, Ronald Reagan; the death of Mao; the rise of Deng Xiaoping.

Other relevant material must be credited.