



Mark scheme

January 2020

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

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 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 2020

Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2001_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

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

Placing a mark within a level

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

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

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

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

Section A

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

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	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
----------	--------------	--

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 President Truman was the individual most responsible for the development of the Cold War after 1945.</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">• Truman's beliefs and attitudes about American superiority and his own personal insecurities over foreign policy leadership contributed to the developing Cold War• Truman's wish to appear decisive in his actions created global division in which nations were viewed as either 'free' or 'totalitarian'• Truman created a hostile international environment in which he blamed the Russians for all the problems appearing on the world stage• Truman's style of leadership prevented diplomacy being used to solve international issues and promoted confrontation. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Winston Churchill played a crucial role in the development of Cold War tensions, particularly in 1946• It was Winston Churchill who personally persuaded Truman to follow a more anti-Soviet foreign policy• Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech helped to stimulate anti-Soviet feelings amongst the American public• Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech created disquiet in the Soviet Union and was influential in determining the response of Stalin to Cold War tensions. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that President Truman was the individual most responsible for the development of the Cold War after 1945. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• After 1945, Truman, no longer living in the shadow of Roosevelt and backed up by US nuclear weapons, reoriented US foreign policy from one of accommodation with the Soviets to one that was more confrontational• The announcement of the 'Truman Doctrine' (March 1947), in response to events in Greece and Turkey, committed the US internationally to defend the 'free world' and significantly ratcheted up Cold War tensions• Truman was responsible for widening Cold War divisions in Europe through the concept, and implementation of, the Marshall Plan (1948); the Soviets felt forced to respond to what they perceived as economic warfare• Churchill may have influenced Truman's foreign policy but he was not in a position of real power in the pivotal years of Cold War development; American state officials influenced Truman's policy transition more.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that President Truman was the individual most responsible for the development of the Cold War after 1945. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 304 1406 398">• It was Churchill who was determined to ensure that the US, as the post-war leader of the 'free world', would develop a foreign policy that reflected his belief that Stalin and the Soviet Union could not be trusted<li data-bbox="347 405 1406 499">• In his 'iron curtain' speech, Churchill proclaimed that an expansionist Soviet Union was responsible for creating a barrier from the Baltic to the Adriatic that divided democratic from communist Europe<li data-bbox="347 506 1406 600">• It was Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech that triggered the pattern of Cold War tit-for-tat actions; the Soviets reacted angrily, escalating their belligerence in the Iran crisis which that was ongoing at the time<li data-bbox="347 607 1406 633">• Other individuals were responsible, e.g. Stalin, Bevin, Mao.

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 the developments along the European Iron Curtain, in the years 1953–64, increased the level of confrontation between the USA and the USSR significantly.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the developments along the European Iron Curtain, in the years 1953–64, increased the level of confrontation between the USA and the USSR significantly should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Hungarian Rising (1956) created an increased climate of confrontation when the USSR intervened directly to defend a 'buffer state' and the US gave strong verbal support to the new government led by Nagy• In 1958 Khrushchev's ultimatum over the future of Berlin kick-started a three-year period of brinkmanship politics between the USA and USSR• At the 1960 Paris Summit, Kennedy's rhetoric and refusal to compromise over Khrushchev's demands over East Berlin resulted in increased US military spending and NATO activity in Europe• The refugee crisis of 1958–61, and the building of the Berlin Wall (1961), with Soviet support, resulted in the build-up of US military forces in Germany and the threat of limited nuclear confrontation• After 1961, Berlin remained a potential 'flashpoint' for US-Soviet confrontation, e.g. President Kennedy heightened tensions when he visited the Berlin Wall (June 1963). <p>Arguments and evidence that the developments along the European Iron Curtain, in the years 1953–64, did not increase the level of confrontation between the USA and the USSR significantly should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Austrian State Treaty (1955) removed the potential threat of confrontation over spheres of influence in Europe and indicated a desire for mutual cooperation• Tensions over the Hungarian Rising (1956) ultimately came to nothing as the US failed to gain UN support for a decisive response to Soviet actions and it was overshadowed by events elsewhere, i.e. the Suez Crisis• Khrushchev's 1958 Berlin ultimatum resulted in increased diplomacy between the USA and the USSR, e.g. Khrushchev's visit to the USA, Camp David talks• The building of the Berlin Wall brought an end to the refugee crisis, which had been the origin of the specific escalating confrontation in the years 1958–61, and so reduced the potential for further confrontations• Despite the confrontational rhetoric and strategic build-up of forces, neither the USA nor the USSR attempted to intervene directly in territory along the European Iron Curtain beyond their 'spheres of influence'. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which China's relationship with the USSR and the USA changed in the years 1964–90.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that China's relationship with the USSR and the USA changed in the years 1964–90 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1972, the visit of President Nixon to China brought a major change in relations between China and the USA; this rapprochement led to a fundamental improvement in diplomatic, economic and cultural relations • In 1979 China's relationship with the USA improved even further moving from rapprochement to normalisation when the US and China agreed to full diplomatic recognition of each other • Normalisation ended the specific disagreement between China and the USA over Taiwan; the USA recognised Taiwan as 'part of China' and China acknowledged US ties with Taiwan • A change in Chinese policy under Deng from the promotion of 'world revolution' to 'world peace', and his desire to be seen as an international statesman, enabled a degree of rapprochement between China and the USSR • In the mid-1980s, under Deng's leadership, and with the emergence of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, the likelihood of nuclear confrontation between China and the USSR receded considerably. <p>Arguments and evidence that China's relationship with the USSR and the USA did not change in the years 1964–90 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relations between China and the Soviet Union remained tense throughout the period; there was outright hostility in the years 1964–79, e.g. Sino-Soviet conflict (1969), with continuing mutual suspicion in the 1980s • Tensions continued between China and the Soviet Union over issues relating to China's security, e.g. Afghanistan, Mongolia, Taiwan, nuclear weapons • China and the Soviet Union continued to be rivals in support of international Communism, particularly in south-east Asia and Africa • China was in competition with both the Soviet Union and the USA in the field of international development throughout the period • Areas of disagreement between China and the USA, and the potential for confrontation, continued throughout the period, e.g. Taiwan, nuclear technology, access to technological advancements. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

