



## Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level  
In History (WHI04) Paper 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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

January 2019

Publications Code: WHI04\_1C\_1901\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

### Section A

**Targets: AO1 (5 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

**AO3 (20 marks):** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li> <li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li> <li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li> <li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li> </ul>
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li> <li>• A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li> </ul>

## Section B

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

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

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

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90

Question	Indicative content
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 only really began in the years 1947–48.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the years 1947–48, there was an increase in the intensity and pace of confrontation between the Western powers and the Soviets, which made the Cold War a reality</li> <li>• After the introduction of the Marshall Plan, an atmosphere of competitive confrontation emerged, with each side countering the other in tit-for-tat responses</li> <li>• During the course of 1947–48, the nature of the Cold War transformed from economic rivalry into military rivalry</li> <li>• Events in Germany in June 1948 led to the very real likelihood of open warfare in the near future.</li> </ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The origin of most of the significant events of the Cold War can be found in the six months between February and August 1945</li> <li>• In the months February–August 1945, major developments occurred that created a Cold War rivalry between the Soviets and the Western powers</li> <li>• There is evidence that there is a direct line between the Cold War events of 1947–48 and patterns of behaviour observed at the time of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences</li> <li>• The militarised battle lines of the Cold War in Europe grew out of the 'temporary' territorial agreements made by the Allied powers at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that the Cold War really only began in the years 1947–48. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Marshall Plan had been preceded by the announcement of the Truman Doctrine (March 1947), pledging support for democratic governments in Greece and Turkey</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was only from 1947 that the term 'Cold War' came to define the relationship between the Soviets and the West, until then policies on both sides had still assumed it was possible for both sides to co-exist</li> <li>• The events of 1947–48 in Europe were instrumental in the creation of NATO (March-April 1949) as part of a Western militarised defence strategy</li> <li>• After the Blockade, Berlin became the iconic symbol of the Cold War stand-off between the Soviets and Western powers; the red line in Europe that was not to be crossed.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Cold War only really began in the years 1947–48. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in US and British leadership at Potsdam changed the dynamics of the Grand Alliance; disagreements that had surfaced at Yalta about the post-War world were brought into the open permanently</li> <li>• Truman was less inclined than Roosevelt to trust Stalin; keeping the existence and use of the atomic bomb a secret (August 1945) opened up a rift between the US and Soviets and began a nuclear arms race</li> <li>• The geo-politics of the Cold War reflected the gains made in the Second World War, e.g. advances made during the invasion of German-occupied Europe, gains made by Western forces and Communist resistance in the Far East.</li> <li>• In 1946, the national security concerns raised by Kennan's 'Long' telegram and the Novikov telegram established an irreversible position, with each side viewing the other as a strategic and expansionist threat</li> <li>• Churchill had already referred to 'an iron curtain' in his speech at Fulton, Missouri in March 1946.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower Relations, 1943–90

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1953–64, developments in nuclear warfare capability increased US-Soviet tensions significantly.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1953–64, developments in nuclear warfare capability increased US-Soviet tensions significantly should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of a hydrogen bomb by the Soviets in 1953 precipitated an intense period of activity in the Cold War arms race</li> <li>• The development of new delivery systems, such as the ICBM (1957) and SLBM (1959–60), increased the ability of both sides to target nuclear weapons directly against each other, so heightening tensions</li> <li>• The Soviet use of space technology related to nuclear warfare capability, e.g. Sputnik (1957) increased tensions at the end of the 1950s, e.g. US rhetoric with regard to a 'missile gap'</li> <li>• Increased nuclear capability allowed both sides to engage in nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. the US threat of the 'nuclear option' during the Berlin Crisis (1961), the Soviet decision to send nuclear missiles to Cuba (1962).</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1953–64, developments in nuclear warfare capability did not increase US-Soviet tensions significantly should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of the development encouraged the use of diplomacy to defuse tensions created as a result of the nuclear threat, e.g. the Geneva Summit (1955), moves towards the suspension of nuclear testing (1958)</li> <li>• Knowledge of the impact of developments in nuclear warfare acted as a deterrent, e.g. US non-intervention over Hungary (1956)</li> <li>• Although developments in nuclear warfare capability encouraged brinkmanship, at no point did a Cold War incident between the two powers develop into a 'hot war'</li> <li>• The actions of US and Soviet leaders demonstrated awareness of living in the 'shadow of the bomb', e.g. Khrushchev's withdrawal of nuclear expertise from China, Kennedy's diplomacy during the Cuban Missile Crisis</li> <li>• Soviet awareness of the reality of the massive US superiority in nuclear weaponry reduced the possibility of a Russian offensive during these years</li> <li>• The specific threat to the US posed by the Soviet ability to deploy nuclear weapons in Cuba, and the subsequent Missile Crisis, led directly to a decrease in tension, e.g. the 'hot-line', Test Ban Treaty (1963).</li> </ul> <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 significance of the breakdown of Soviet control over Eastern Europe in bringing the Cold War to an end.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the breakdown of Soviet control over Eastern Europe was significant in bringing the Cold War to an end should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relative success of the challenge to Communist rule in Poland from Solidarity in the 1980s highlighted the Soviet inability to enforce the Brezhnev Doctrine and strengthened the negotiating position of the West</li> <li>• The rapid collapse of the Communist governments in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and East Germany in 1989 eroded the Eastern Bloc to such an extent that the Cold War seemed no longer relevant</li> <li>• The refugee/emigration crisis that resulted from the breakdown of Soviet control led to widespread instability in Europe, so encouraging a speedy resolution to Cold War disagreements</li> <li>• The reunification of Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall removed a major Cold War 'hot spot'; with the withdrawal of Soviet forces and the 'new' Germany a NATO member it seemed that the West had won.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the breakdown of Soviet control over Eastern Europe was not significant and/or other factors were significant in bringing the Cold War to an end should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The breakdown of Soviet control over Eastern Europe did not bring the Cold War to an end but was itself a consequence of the attempts to resolve the Cold War</li> <li>• Conference diplomacy in the years 1985–88, particularly the INF Treaty signed at the Washington Summit (1987), laid the groundwork for the end of the Cold War</li> <li>• The growth of nationalism in states on the borders of the USSR, such as Georgia and the Baltic states, threatened the integrity of the USSR and undermined its negotiating position with the West</li> <li>• Gorbachev was responsible; his reform programme unintentionally undermined Soviet power globally and his rejection of the Brezhnev Doctrine led to the dismantling of the Eastern Bloc</li> <li>• Ronald Reagan's policies of rejecting détente and building up US arms created a situation in which the Soviet Union could no longer compete with the West and so was forced to negotiate</li> <li>• By the 1980s, the Soviet economy was in such a poor position that it was increasingly unable to maintain an arms race or support proxy states/wars.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>