



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2022

Pearson Edexcel International A Level in
History (WHI04 1C)

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 2022

Publications Code WHI04_1C_2201_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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.

Further resources that may be of use are the *Applying Criteria* and *Developing Student's Understanding of Historical Interpretations* documents to be found on the Pearson Edexcel History GCE website along with the Principal Examiner Reports for Paper 1 of the Pearson Edexcel History GCE. The *Applying Criteria* document gives guidance with regard to the application of criteria for the different AOs tested at A Level. The GCE Paper 1 Reports will be particularly useful for exemplification of AO3 interpretations skills (but please be aware that there are slight differences within the general level descriptors).

General Comments

In light of the ongoing global pandemic, and the challenging circumstances in which students are being prepared for public examinations, it is not possible, or indeed helpful, to make comments about series-on-series developments. However, there are some general observations that can be made about candidate performance (see below for more specific feedback):

Selection and deployment of knowledge - Candidates, in general, produce interesting responses that it is a pleasure to read and reward. The candidates were usually very well prepared in relation to knowledge of the specification and centres are to be commended for this. Candidates have good, detailed knowledge of the specification content and this is a facet that often stands out. Many responses were well-informed and well-written. However, there does need to be more discrimination in the selection and deployment of knowledge in both Section A and Section B. Some candidates write 'all they know' about a topic without selecting and deploying information and evidence relevant to the question being asked. In Section A, to reach the higher levels, the use of own knowledge is required to discuss the views being presented in Extracts, not as stand-alone information, and in Section B, to reach Level 5, knowledge should be '*precisely selected*' (L5-BP2).

Conceptual understanding and application of skills - Despite good knowledge, candidates were not always able to access high Level 3 marks and above due to a limited understanding of the conceptual focus of questions and the application of analytical skills. Some candidates are still not using the Extracts as the basis of their response in Section A and candidates do need to reach a judgement on the given view to access the higher levels. In Section B, lower-level responses often lack focus on the wording of the question and/or the second-order concept being targeted.

As in previous reports, 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 an aspect of a particular

strand, for example reaching a judgement in bullet point 3 for Q1, this will be reflected in the mark rewarded.

Some candidate responses reflect the wording of the generic descriptors and the format of the indicative content in such a way that it becomes detrimental to the overall analysis and organisation of the response. 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. The indicative content is also not intended to provide a scaffold and is organised to give examiners an overview of what evidence might be included in a response.

Despite the ongoing challenges faced by candidates, very few failed to attempt both Sections, and most were able to produce two balanced responses, so enabling them to show their ability across AO1 and AO3 skills.

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

Section A

Please note: it would be particularly useful to access [the 2019 Examiner Report](#), where the detailed general commentary on Section A responses continues to be extremely relevant.

It is important that candidates read the Extracts carefully and are able to determine the overarching view being put forward before analysing more closely some of the more nuanced points being made. It is clear that some candidates only use the first few sentences of the Extracts and/or select some sentences out of context without fully reading the whole Extract. There is sufficient time available at IAL to consider the Extracts carefully before planning an answer based on the differing viewpoints being presented.

Question 1

Question 1 is a compulsory question.

For WHI04 1C, most candidates were aware that they were required to discuss the Extracts in relation to the view given in the question. However, some only utilised Extract 1 effectively and a small, but significant number, did not use the Extracts at all. Although AO1 is assessed in Section A, the majority of the assessment is focused on AO3 skills relation to historical interpretations and this meant that candidates who only used own knowledge could not be rewarded beyond Level 2 at best. A few candidates wrote a formulaic response about the development of the Cold War with no reference to the enquiry focus on Soviet expansionism at all.

Extract 1 suggested that Soviet expansionism fuelled the Cold War after the Second World War while Extract 2 suggested that Soviets were not expansionist and not in a position to fuel the development of the Cold War. Candidates who utilised both Extracts were able to discuss the validity of both views, using the evidence from the Extracts and their own knowledge, and reach a judgement on both views in the course of the essay and/or in a conclusion. Those candidates who only referred to Extract 1 often provided an alternative

quickly tried to counter this by creating the Truman Doctrine and then the Marshall Plan (1947).

The Soviets viewed these plans ~~as~~ as invasive and countered with their own economic plans such as Comcon which held the Eastern European blocks under their control.

The Extract also states ^{that} the territories were ~~all~~ nearly all brought under Moscow's political control and did not have any autonomy from the ~~the~~ rest of the USSR. ~~The~~ Any political opposition was crushed ~~was~~ was seen in the 1950s in Hungary and Poland.

~~The~~ ~~was~~ ~~also~~ ~~also~~ The attempt to also ~~also~~ interfere with ~~of~~ countries outside of the Eastern Bloc, such as Turkey, Iran and Greece was viewed ~~as~~ as ~~expansionist~~ expansionist and caused more tension which contributed to the development of the Cold War.

However there are counter views in Extract 2 which need to be discussed. The Soviets originally did not expand past the agreements made in 1943-1945 conferences. The Soviets did expand in the Eastern bloc countries but this was more in fear of a German retaliation and wished to establish a stable economic and social structure in these countries. The Soviets had been economically destroyed by the Second World War and were more concerned with rebuilding their economy than

creating conflict and wars with the Americans. The Soviets ~~opposed and that the~~ created ~~the~~ economic and social changes within the eastern bloc to control the populations but also help ^{and rebuild} develop the USSR.

The ^{second} extract also states that the Soviets were afraid of the USA due to its wealth and power and were acting at this time in defence.

The Americans at this point ~~that~~ early after the Second World War had a major advantage of the Soviets due to its nuclear weapons and growing economy. The Soviets at this point had no nuclear weapons and were trying to rebuild an economy that was destroyed by the Second World War.

In conclusion the view ~~of~~ that the Cold War developed ^{mainly} due to the Soviets expansion after the Second World War is not completely ~~the~~ true. The Soviets had limited ~~resources~~ ~~and at this point could not fight against the Americans~~ ~~of it~~ ~~can~~ ~~to~~ ~~use~~ resources and were trying to rebuild their economy. The Soviets did expand into Eastern Bloc countries but more to establish ~~a~~ ~~social and economic structure~~ ^{for their resources} and to use these countries to ~~the~~ ~~rebuild~~ ~~and~~ ~~develop~~ the Soviet's economy.

Commentary - this is a Level 3 response. There is some analysis of both extracts by selecting information and key points and indicating differences. Knowledge is used to link to and expand some of the views given in the extracts. A judgement is related to the views in the Extracts.

SECTION A

Answer Question 1. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 How far do you agree with the view that the Cold War developed after the Second World War mainly as a result of Soviet expansionism?

Explain your answer using Extracts 1 and 2 and your knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

The ~~development of~~ Cold War was the inevitable result of the interplay of multiple complex factors, mainly having to do with the clash of 2 superpowers with rival ideologies. While the main reason for development of the cold war can be said to have been Soviet expansion, there is also reason to believe otherwise. Extracts 1 and 2 contradict each other in the way in which they explain the position of the USSR post World War 2.

Extract 1, published in 1969, ~~was~~ roughly 20 years post WWII, takes a stand in which USSR and its expansionist nature led to the rapid development of hostility and confrontation. The extract paints USA in a non-threatening, peaceful light, deeming the superpower 'isolationist'. ~~Suggests~~ The writer therefore suggests that USA was not an initial aggressor and kept to herself much like she did post WWII and the way in which the country chose not to join the League of Nations ~~to~~ as a way to not get involved in Europe's conflicts. The suggestion that USA was a peaceful

nation and did not instigate any of the ~~hostile~~ hostilities that led to the Cold War would mean that only USSR was the initial aggressor and hence the main reason for the development of the Cold War.

Adding on to the narrative of Soviet expansionism, the extract states that the military strength of their nation led to the belief ~~that~~ of the Soviet Leaders that they could ~~use~~ ^{use} this opportunity to spread communism. It ~~is~~ is evident that Soviet ambitions did lie in establishing a communist Regime, starting with eastern Europe and then expanding from there on. Moreover, under Stalin's totalitarian rule, such ambitions were aimed to be achieved ~~to~~ at whatever cost. Considering Stalin's ambitious personality and his ^{numerous mentions of his} hatred towards USA and capitalism, it is easy to believe that the Soviet Union had such ambitions.

Proof of it lies in the several Satellite States that they had mobilised and ~~be~~ brought under the regime. Their ~~military strength~~ ^{proof} Evidence of their military strength lies in the fact that the USSR single handedly held off the German troops on the eastern front.

Soviet military strength lies in the ~~power~~ ^{strength} of the Red army and the extract refers to the advantage this put the communist state at, especially considering the state the rest of Europe was in. World War 2 left the European countries in shambles. Millions of lives lost

and the military capacity of previous superpowers like France and Britain were seriously limited. More importantly, the economy of the rest of Europe had suffered a lot of damage and recovery would not come early. Hence for these reasons, the Soviet state was put at an advantage in which they were the most superior in Europe, giving them the opportunity to spread capitalism. The satellite states ~~made~~ ^{gave} the Soviet Union a lot of resources to work with including land as well as labour, adding to the capabilities in terms of military and economic strength.

Soviet responsibility in the development of the Cold War as a result of Soviet expansion also greatly lies in the personality and ambition of their leader Stalin. He was ~~was~~ evidently hostile ~~as~~ due to his conviction communist ambition with capitalism and also due to the fact that they received little to no help ~~and~~ in the Eastern part. His hostile leadership and ambition meant that Soviet expansionist attitude was highly likely and hence to blame for the development of the Cold War. The extract adds onto this point as it states that on February 9th 1946, Stalin referred to a possibility of conflict between capitalism and communism. This is very quickly after the end of the Second World War and hence suggests that he was confident enough

in the capabilities of the Soviet Union and its red army against capitalistic Europe and Capitalistic giant USA.

More proof of ^{not just} expansionist ambition but expansionist action lies in the behaviour of ~~A~~ and actions of the Soviet Union post WW2. In addition to the mobilization of control of several Eastern European states and bringing them under communist rule, the extract ~~also~~ states that territories that they had gotten post WW2 was also brought under Moscow's the communist capitalist, political control. Soviet control was also attempted to be extended into Turkey, Iran and Greece, states the extract and this stands as not only a suggestion but proof of Soviet expansion. And inevitably, the spread of communism and increasing soviet control stands as a threat to USA and capitalism, leaving them with little to no choice but to respond. Hence, ~~there~~ aligning with the nature of Extract 1, there is reason to believe that Soviet expansion, ~~was~~ was the main reason for the development of the Cold War.

Extract 2, not only contradicts the aforementioned statement but also provides significant proof as to why the Soviet Union did not have the capacity to be expansionist. Much like the rest of Europe, the extract states that 'The USSR emerged from a war in ruins, tired and ~~to~~ ~~streets~~ exhausted, with its productive economy in shreds.' Suggesting that the USSR was not economically

sufficient enough to fund its expansionist ambitions. It could not afford to be aggressive. It is also important to consider that its peacetime economy was not flourishing either. While perhaps comparatively better, Soviet economy under Stalin was via capitalism was struggling long before WW2. People starved, five year plans were barely successful and Stalin focused all of USSR money and resources towards military expansion. Peacetime Soviet economy was hardly doing any good, but post war Soviet economy was not nearly good enough for them to be able to afford aggression against the capitalist west or atleast aggressive enough to be the main reason for development of the Cold War.

The extract also provides proof of USSR commitment to agreements made at Yalta and Potsdam. ~~Not~~ They stayed true to their word in terms of not extending communism beyond territories under their control in accordance to the agreements and contradicting extract 1, extract 2 states that the USSR was specifically committed to not building states 'on the model of the USSR'. This line suggests that not only was USSR non-aggressive, they were also not aggressive in the promotion and spread of communism.

The extract goes as far as to say that USSR was not aggressive but indeed defensive, adding to the narrative that the USSR was

perhaps a non-aggressive victim. ~~It~~ Contrasting the first extract it paints USA in a threatening light, going as far as to ~~say~~ say, USA's wealth and power made the USSR afraid. USSR did in fact have a lot of wealth and power. War time profits and the fact that the country was the central of capitalism meant that the war made them richer whereas the rest of the countries ~~so~~ suffered. And the fact that the extract states that USSR knew capitalism would continue for a long time and that remained true and remains true to this day.

Both extracts are true to an extent. While USA was isolationist for a while post WW2, it is undeniable that they possessed immense wealth and power. Possession of such power coupled with the fact that ^{most} US politicians at the time were hostile towards USSR and its communist agenda is bound to make USSR uneasy and defensive. Soon after came the Iron Curtain speech and this was bound to make USSR defensive as well. USSR and USA had conflicting interests and ideologies. Both could not co-exist and USA was large and threatening. USSR had little to no choice but to remain aggressively defensive. However, extract 2 paints USSR in an extremely victimized light which cannot be entirely agreed with. Stalin, the aggressive totalitarian Soviet leader, 100/

had ambition to expand communism. Moreover, they did not respect agreements made at Yalta and Potsdam as they actively attempted to extend Soviet control into Turkey, Iran and Greece. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union and their expansionism is not ~~to blame for the~~ the main reason for the development of the cold war. USA and their intimidation to communism coupled with Soviet determination and escalation of hostilities due to the racism of their respective countries is the main reason for the escalation of the cold war.

Commentary - this is a low Level 5 response. The issues raised in the Extracts are analysed and understanding is demonstrated of the arguments offered by both authors. There is an understanding of the nature of historical debate. Knowledge is integrated with the issues raised and selected to explore the matter under debate. There is a sustained evaluative argument that reaches a substantiated judgement in the conclusion. It should be noted that knowledge of the historiography of the development of the Cold War is not required in Section A answers.

Section B

Please note: it would be particularly useful to access the 2019 Examiner Report, where the detailed general commentary on Section B responses continues to be extremely relevant.

Candidates have a choice of one question from two - Question 2 or Question 3. Candidates answered both questions but Question 2 on increasing tensions between the USA and USSR in the years 1956-62 was more popular than Question 3 on the resolution of Cold War tensions in the years 1989-90. Most candidates had good knowledge but differentiation in marks was mainly determined by the ability to deploy focused knowledge effectively in relation to the second-order concepts being assessed. Centres should note that an understanding of chronology is important in the organisation of responses and that some candidates showed insecure chronology at times, both within responses and in relation to the time period of the question.

Question 2

Question 2 required candidates to determine whether the USA was more responsible than the USSR for increasing tensions between them in the years 1956-62. A small, but significant,

minority of candidates addressed the question in regard to the years 1945-49, deploying both irrelevant and inaccurate knowledge in support of their argument. A few candidates wrote an extended narrative of the history of the Cold War from 1943-90, meaning that only limited parts of the response could be rewarded. It is vital that candidates are aware that they need to address the specific question wording and conceptual focus.

Most candidates produced responses of Level 3 and above that addressed key issues related to US-USSR relations in the period 1956-62. There were a variety of arguments put forward with some agreeing that the USA provoked tension, while others suggested that it was the USSR or that both sides were equally to blame. There were some excellent responses that understood the nuances of the different approaches to the Cold War under Eisenhower and Kennedy and the variable attitude of Khrushchev. Responses referred to the summit diplomacy of the early period, the Hungarian Uprising (1956), the U2 incident, the Berlin crisis and the situation in Cuba. Some candidates were unsure of the chronology of the situation in Cuba and conflated the Berlin Blockade crisis with the crisis leading to the building of the Berlin Wall. Many candidates were able to come to a substantiated judgement and to organise an interesting, discursive response in coming to a conclusion.

Question 3

Question 3 required candidates to determine whether the process of German reunification was the most significant factor resolving Cold War tensions in the years 1989-90. There were a few candidates who confused the beginning of the Cold War with the ending of the Cold War but most candidates had a good knowledge of the situation in 1989-90. Candidates were able to discuss the general international climate at the time and were confident in their discussion of the role of Gorbachev in the process of resolving tensions. However, many were unsure of the role of German reunification and so were unable to discuss the given factor in anything more than general terms; this meant that most responses were rewarded in Level 3.

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

Chosen question number: Question 2 Question 3

2. During the years 1956 - 1962, ~~which was the first~~ period of 'the thaw', several ~~scenarios~~ ~~still~~ ~~to~~ ~~developed~~ scenarios or several factors had increased despite 'the thaw'. The USA had contributed in several ways. One ~~way~~ ^{factor} is ~~through~~ its ~~own~~ foreign policy under ~~President~~ the president Dwight Eisenhower. Policies such as Brinkmanship and Massive Retaliation, which was constituent of the New ~~to~~ Look policy, had ~~not~~ encouraged confrontation with the USSR. ~~Another way was through Kennedy's foreign~~ ~~policy~~ ~~was~~ followed by Kennedy's 'massive ~~retaliation~~ ~~to~~ Another factor was the actions taken by John F. ~~the~~ Kennedy, which had resulted in the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962. However, the USSR had also contributed to the increasing ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~scenarios~~. One way ~~to~~ ^{was} through its developments in the arms race, which was reinforced by Khrushchev's bold attitude of boasting the power of the USSR. Another way was through the suppression of ~~the~~ mass demonstrations in eastern Europe.

Under the presidency of Eisenhower, the USA had increased scenarios by continuing its attitude of confrontation with communism. Under the New ~~to~~ Look policy of Eisenhower, the USA had significantly increased its nuclear warhead

Kennedy, and the number of soldiers in the US army had also increased. Kennedy also sent advisors to Vietnam which ~~may~~ shows that Kennedy was involved with foreign interventions. Developments on espionage methods, such as the U2 spy plane, had a crucial impact on ~~the~~ the Cold War. ~~It was~~ The plane was involved in many confrontations, such as the capture of pilot Gary Powers in 1961, and the Cuban Missile Crisis. It shows that the USA was willing to confront communism, ~~at~~ no matter the method. A major event which highlighted US aggression was the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, which had led to the Cuban Missile Crisis^{in 62, when Cuba demanded support}. It shows ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ^{of the USSR} the desire of the USA of keeping Cuba as its sphere of influence, but ~~the~~ ^{to guide} consequences was ~~gone~~ ^{to} it had led to the consequence of a nuclear war. Therefore, the USA had a major role in avoiding confrontation.

On the other hand, US aggression was also met with Soviet aggression. Although ~~the~~ ^{the} like the USA, the USSR was also heavily involved with the arms race. ~~It~~ ⁱⁿ The USSR ~~was~~ produced the world's first ICBM in 1957, which shows the desire of achieving nuclear superiority by the USSR. This desire can also be seen in Khrushchev's attitudes towards the west, ~~where~~ ^{bluffed} where he constantly ~~bluffed~~ about Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons. It shows that the USSR ~~was~~ ^{was} intense on confrontation. Another

Soviet development in 1957 which was sending the first satellite Sputnik into space had increased western fears, as they were apprehensive of a ^{potential} nuclear strike from space. The Soviet commitment to keeping up ^{with} the arms race had maintained tensions with the west.

~~The Top~~ Finally, the Soviet suppression of mass protests in eastern Europe in 1956 also greatly increased tensions with the west. Most notably, the Hungarian Uprising, ^{inspired by the Poznan protests in Poland,} had resulted in ~~the~~ Soviet troops ~~confronting~~ ^{confronting} civilians, ending with over 2,000 deaths. It had led to the condemnation ^{by} Eisenhower, as well as gaining sympathy for the eastern European populations under communist suppression. It shows that the USSR was willing to send its army to maintain its control.

Overall, both the USA and USSR were to blame for causing tensions. Both were involved in the arms race, ^{and} the Cuban Missile Crisis. Moreover, respectively the USA and the USSR had contributed to increasing confrontation in different ways. ^{For example,} The USA was involved with Bay of Pigs, whereas the USSR was involved with Hungary. In other words, ~~both were to~~

Commentary - This is a low Level 5 response. The response securely meets the descriptor for Level 4 by addressing key issues with sufficient knowledge to demonstrate an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question and reaching a substantiated judgment, however, there are limited but clear elements of the Level 5 descriptor to be rewarded at low Level 5. The analysis is sustained and the knowledge is selected to support a sustained and reasoned judgement.

Paper Summary

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

Section A (AO3/AO1)

- Candidates should use the time available to read both Extracts carefully all the way through before planning their answer; the information in the Extracts should be the foundation upon which the answer is constructed
- 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.

Section B (AO1)

- Candidates should provide more precise contextual knowledge as supporting evidence. Use knowledge to provide evidence to support a sustained evaluation in relation to the conceptual focus of the question. Secure chronological knowledge enables candidates to produce a logical and coherent answer.
- Read the wording of the questions carefully, particularly if the time period of the question is stated; responses that refer to the wrong time period deploy irrelevant and inaccurate knowledge that does not directly address or only implicitly addresses the question.
- Use conclusions to state the judgement reached clearly and to show the relative significance of or the inter-relationship between key issues discussed in the main body of the essay; leave the examiner in no doubt as to what your judgement is and why.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom