



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2022

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

Paper 4: International Study with
Interpretations

Option 1C: The World Divided:
Superpower relations, 1943-90

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at www.pearson.com/uk

January 2022

Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2201_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.
---	-------	---

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.
---	-------	---

Section A: Indicative content

Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower relations, 1943-90

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that that the Cold War developed after the Second World War mainly as a result of Soviet expansionism.</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"> • While the USA followed an isolationist policy during 1945-46, the Soviet Union viewed the post-war situation as an opportunity to establish Communist regimes in previously non-communist countries • The post-war presence of the Red Army in parts of Europe enabled the Soviets to follow an expansionist policy • The extent of the devastations and chaos in Europe following the Second World War provided a significant opportunity for the USSR to extend its control into Europe • Between 1945 and 1948 the Soviet Union took the opportunity to bring under its control areas that were under already Soviet military occupation and, also, to attempt actively to extend its influence into other areas. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Soviet Union was neither expansionist nor aggressive in the post-war years and intended to abide by decisions made during the war-time conferences • The USSR did not intend to establish Soviet-style regimes and actually demobilised most of its troops at a similar speed to the USA • The USSR, having been materially devastated by the Second World War, was not in a position to extend its control beyond its agreed areas of occupation • The USSR, being very aware of the position and power of the USA in the aftermath of the Second World War, followed a foreign policy intended to be defensive and not aggressive.

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that the Cold War developed after the Second World War mainly as a result of Soviet expansionism. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It became clear in the Allied conferences of 1945 that the Soviets were unlikely to abide by the agreements made over Europe, particularly with regard to Poland • The Soviets continued to build up their military capacity after 1945; in 1948 Soviet defence spending was \$3 billion more than the US and the Soviets had 30 armoured divisions compared to one US armoured division • There was a strong belief amongst many in Moscow that the Soviet Union should take the opportunity presented to it in 1945 to further the cause of worldwide communist revolution • The Soviets sponsored a communist take-over in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and its interference in the civil war in Greece and the situation in Persia/Iran was the basis for the US commitment to the Truman Doctrine. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that the Cold War developed after the Second World War mainly as a result of Soviet expansionism. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although it did increase its influence in eastern Europe post-1945, the Soviet Union did not directly take control of any eastern European state and western Europe remained democratic or under right-wing control • The Red Army was reduced in size from a peak of 12 million soldiers in 1945 to 3 million by the end of 1948 • In 1945, Stalin was focused on protecting the Soviet borders and rebuilding the Soviet economy and society; the economy had shrunk by 20% and the USSR had suffered an estimated 20-25 million deaths • Other factors were responsible, e.g. the needs of US national security, ideological differences, economic imperatives.

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 the increasing tension between the USA and the USSR in the years 1956-62 was caused more by the USA than by the USSR.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the increasing tension between the USA and the USSR in the years 1956-62 was caused more by the USA than by the USSR should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USA exacerbated tensions in eastern Europe with their apparent support of dissident groups and anti-communist sentiment, e.g. during the Hungarian uprising (1956) • The USA's determination to follow a policy of containment under Eisenhower and the Kennedy administration's rhetoric led to brinkmanship • It was the USA's unwillingness to contemplate a solution to the problem of Berlin that provoked Khrushchev's ultimatum on Berlin in 1958 • The U2 incident (1960) was provoked by the downing of a US reconnaissance plane deliberately deployed over Soviet territory • The US involvement in the attempted invasion of Cuba, at the Bay of Pigs (1961), was linked to the Soviet agreement to provide short-range nuclear weapons to Cuba • Soviet foreign policy was based on 'peaceful co-existence' throughout this period. <p>Arguments and evidence that the increasing tension between the USA and the USSR in the years 1956-62 was caused more by the USSR than by the USA should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Soviet Union was determined to keep control of its satellite states in Europe with aggression if necessary, e.g. the brutal crushing of the Hungarian uprising (1956) • The launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in October 1957 exacerbated tensions over the consequences of Soviet technological and nuclear advancements • Khrushchev made direct attempts to resolve the situation in Berlin leading to crises in 1958-59 and 1960, ultimately leading to Soviet support for the building of the Berlin Wall by the GDR • Khrushchev's aggression at the UN in September-October 1960, and his bullying attitude toward John F Kennedy at the Vienna summit meeting in June 1961, increased tensions • Soviet support for Fidel Castro and the placement of Soviet short-range nuclear missiles in Cuba led to the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) • The US 'open skies' policy brought the possibility of negotiations over nuclear weapons and summit meetings were organised, including Khrushchev's visit to Camp David in September 1959. <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 whether, in the years 1989-90, the process of German reunification was the most significant factor in resolving Cold War tensions between the superpowers.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1989-90, the process of German reunification was the most significant factor in resolving Cold War tensions between the superpowers. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fall of the Berlin Wall (November 1989) was not only the beginning of the process of reunification but removed the ultimate symbol of the Cold War division of Europe and a long-term focal point for superpower tension • As part of German reunification, the 2+4 Treaty signed in September 1990 brought the post-war four-power occupation of Germany to an end, so reducing the likelihood of East-West confrontation • The speed with which the German reunification took place created the opportunity for US-Soviet negotiations dealing directly with the consequences of reunification and broader issues, e.g. arms limitations • The nature of reunification, in which East Germany was absorbed in the structures of West Germany, including NATO, removed one of the most significant sources of Cold War tension in the western hemisphere • Gorbachev's acceptance of German reunification highlighted the weakness of the Soviet Union, its imminent demise and its inability to actively engage in Cold War hostilities – either by arms or by words. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1989-90, other factors were more significant in resolving Cold War tensions between the superpowers should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The growth of nationalism in the USSR, along with increasing economic difficulties, diverted Soviet attention away from areas of Cold War tension in Europe and Asia, providing any opportunity to de-escalate tensions • Soviet indication in May 1989 that the Brezhnev Doctrine would no longer be implemented in Eastern Europe removed a potential source of tension in East-West relations • The collapse of communism in East Germany, which led to reunification, was just part of a wider collapse in Soviet control over its satellite states in Europe, so weakening its ability to maintain hostilities • The willingness of the US and Soviet government to engage in diplomatic negotiations and summit meetings throughout 1989-90, but particularly at Malta (December 1989), which resolved tensions • The role of Mikhail Gorbachev in directly influencing the events which would lead to the collapse of the Iron Curtain, in his acceptance of the Soviet inability to continue to challenge the West and in his negotiations. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

