



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson International Advanced Level
In History

WHI04: 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 2018

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the **candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.**
- 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: 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
	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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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 the Cold War developed after the Second World War due to US fear of the Soviet Union.</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"> • US foreign policy initiatives, such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, were introduced because of fear of the Soviet Union. • US foreign policy makers were worried that the Soviet Union would take advantage of the political and economic issues facing the world at the time. • The US feared both the Soviet military and the ideological challenge posed by Communism. • The US became the dominant world power in order to ensure international security, including economic security, ideological security and territorial integrity. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change in US policy when Truman became president was due to a conscious decision to promote US interests. • It was the US that failed to take into account the possible fears of the Soviet Union post-1945. • US policy makers moved away from conciliation to policies which provoked and/or frustrated the Soviets. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Cold War developed after the Second World War due to US fear of the Soviet Union. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US policy of containment developed in response to concerns about the spread of Soviet influence post-1945, e.g. US defence expenditure had fallen by 1948 • US fear and suspicion of Soviet intentions began to surface towards the end of the Second World War and were exacerbated at the Potsdam

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="472 264 1398 293">Conference, where Truman replaced the more conciliatory Roosevelt</p> <ul data-bbox="424 320 1398 510" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 320 1398 383">• Post-war political and economic instability in Europe led to fears of growing communist influence in western Europe, e.g. France, Italy <li data-bbox="424 409 1398 510">• Stalin's actions in eastern Europe, e.g. delays in implementing the Potsdam agreement in Poland, seemed to be aggressively promoting communism and to be deliberately provocative to the US. <p data-bbox="373 537 1453 629">Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Cold War developed after the Second World War due to US fear of the Soviet Union. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="424 656 1485 1048" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 656 1485 748">• Truman was determined to be more assertive with the Soviets and to ensure US national security interests from the outset, e.g. his frank encounter with Molotov during the Potsdam Conference <li data-bbox="424 763 1485 855">• US belief in capitalist economics and 'open door' trading policies to support liberal democracy required a proactive US foreign policy, which actively sought to spread US influence <li data-bbox="424 873 1485 943">• The Marshall Plan could be seen as an act of 'economic aggression' towards a USSR financially and economically devastated by war <li data-bbox="424 958 1485 1048">• The USA attempted to use its nuclear monopoly as a means to bring pressure to bear on the USSR from the Potsdam meeting and the dropping of atomic weapons on Japan through to 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 the statement that ideological differences were mainly responsible for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations in the years 1953-64.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence ideological differences were mainly responsible for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 1956, China's leadership were concerned about the impact of Soviet de-Stalinisation • Increasing Soviet commitment to a policy of 'peaceful co-existence' with the USA clashed with Mao's willingness to confront the USA, as part of the communist ideology of 'continuing revolution' • Competing claims with regard to the leadership of international communism created tensions, particularly in Asia (Korea) and Eastern Europe (Albania, Romania) • Ideological differences over the role of the peasantry in communist revolution led to disagreements over the nature of the support given by the USSR and China to independence movements outside of Europe • Soviet criticism of the ideas behind Mao's Great Leap Forward policies created tensions. <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were responsible for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal rivalry between Mao and Khrushchev; each leader personally criticised the policies and actions of the other, e.g. de-Stalinisation, the Great Leap Forward, the Cuban Missile Crisis • Competing national interests, particularly territorial, e.g. Sino-Soviet border disputes, India, suspicions over Russian demands for a radio base in China • Nuclear rivalry, particularly, the Soviet response to China's commitment to, and development of, nuclear weapons • The failure of diplomacy, including the breakdown of official visits and summit meetings, e.g. failure of Khrushchev's visit to China (1958), China's walkout from the Moscow Conference (1961) • The legacy of China's relationship with Soviet Russia prior to 1953, e.g.

	<p>the strained relationship between Mao and Stalin.</p> <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 statement that Nixon's official visit to China in 1972 led to a significant change in superpower relations.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence Nixon's official visit to China in 1972 led to a significant change in superpower relations should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nixon's visit officially acknowledged China's legitimacy for the first time since 1949 and opened up the way for future co-operation between the US and China • It created a shift in the balance of power; the visit recognised China as a major world power, thus acknowledging a tri-partite (US, USSR, China), rather than bi-partite (US, USSR) international environment • Concerns over US-Chinese friendship, after several years of increased tension (Czechoslovakia 1968, Brezhnev Doctrine), encouraged the USSR to consider a move towards 'détente' in relations with the US • Closer ties between China and the US both opened up the possibility of greater co-operation between the nuclear powers over disarmament and pushed the USSR into nuclear negotiations, e.g. Moscow Summit 1972 • China's agreements with the USA and Russia's fear of the relationship led to agreement between the two over Vietnam; both sides worked together to encourage the North Vietnamese to negotiate a ceasefire. <p>Arguments and evidence that Nixon's official visit to China in 1972 did not lead to a significant change in superpower relations should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US did not officially recognise China diplomatically until 1979, as part of Carter's 'normalisation' policy • US policy towards China had been benign for much of the previous decade, and both Kennedy and Johnson had encouraged improved diplomatic relations • Sino-Soviet relations, already at a low point as a result of physical conflict in 1969, did not noticeably worsen as a result of the visit • US-Soviet relations had been moving towards détente since the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 • The visit did nothing to change the concept of MAD, which was the underlying influence on the move towards greater strategic nuclear arms

	limitation during the 1960s and early 1970s. Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---