



# Mark scheme (Results)

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International  
Advanced Level in History (WHI04)

Paper 4: International Study with  
Interpretations

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

**Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications**

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com), [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) or [www.lcci.org.uk](http://www.lcci.org.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)

**About Pearson**

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2017

Publication Code WHI04\_1C\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## 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

**Target: 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 judgment 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>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<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>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing</li> </ul>

		<p>the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><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 policies of the USA, in the years 1945-53, were motivated by an ideological mission to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness'.</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>• America foreign policy was embodied in the Truman Doctrine which saw the post-war world as divided into 'free and enslaved worlds'.</li> <li>• The US reaction to Cold War events was seen as a defence against the USSR's aim to enslave the world.</li> <li>• The permanent US military build-up suggested by NSC 68 was seen as being part of a 'global crusade against communism'.</li> <li>• President Truman himself believed that his presidency was dominated by an ideological struggle to defend freedom against slavery.</li> </ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the richest and strongest nation in the world, the USA emerged from the Second World War willing and able to exert its economic influence.</li> <li>• The aim of the US contribution towards reconstruction was to further the interests of American business.</li> <li>• The aim and objective of American foreign policy was economic - to sustain and reform. capitalism.</li> <li>• American leaders were not trying to contain communism but to increase the power of the United States to further its own economic interests.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Cold War policies of the USA, in the years 1945-53, were motivated by an ideological mission to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-war Soviet influence and sponsorship of pro-communist governments in eastern Europe was viewed by the US as actively undermining political freedom and liberty</li> <li>• The Truman Doctrine (March 1947), in response to events in Greece, was a specific declaration of US intent to support 'free peoples who are resisting subjugation'</li> <li>• The US involvement in Cold War events was promoted as defending liberty e.g. the orchestrating the Berlin Airlift, leading the UN forces in Korea</li> <li>• The US State Department developed a policy of containment (Keenan's <i>Long Telegram</i>, NSC 68) which viewed the USSR as a hostile state from</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="395 185 1251 215">which the US and the rest of the world needed to be protected.</p> <p data-bbox="300 237 1394 365">Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Cold War policies of the USA, in the years 1945-53, were motivated by an ideological mission to defend 'liberty against the forces of darkness'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 387 1378 788" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 387 1378 524">• The economic position of the US at the end of World War II had been based on war production, to prevent post-war recession it was in the interest of the US to aid reconstruction to sustain economic production and ensure new markets</li><li data-bbox="347 535 1378 636">• The Marshall Plan (1947) committed the US to providing large-scale financial aid to Europe in return for the opening up of European markets to US business interests; the USSR regard this as a hostile action</li><li data-bbox="347 647 1378 748">• The Berlin Crisis (1948-49) developed in response to the creation of a unified economic area (Trizonia) in the occupied western zones of Berlin and its introduction of a new currency</li><li data-bbox="347 759 1378 788">• Other motivations such as US security needs, Truman's personality etc.</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 the suggestion that superpower relations between the USA and USSR improved greatly during the years 1962-79.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that superpower relations between the USA and USSR improved greatly during the years 1962-79 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the wake of the Cuban Missile Crisis relations improved with the setting up of a 'hot line' communication between Washington and Moscow and the conclusion of a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty</li> <li>• Fear of nuclear confrontation led to a series of discussions and agreements, such as Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Strategic Arms Limitation talks, SALT I, and SALT II</li> <li>• Diplomatic ties were enhanced in the early 1970s with Nixon visiting Moscow (1972 and 1974) and Brezhnev visiting Washington (1973)</li> <li>• Trade negotiations took place, including agreements to export US wheat to Russia</li> <li>• The détente of the 1970s was symbolised by the Helsinki Agreement which saw the USA and USSR accept the post-World War II European borders including the permanent division of Germany.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that superpower relations between the USA and USSR did not improve greatly during the years 1962-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the period the nuclear arms race continued, as did the build-up and increased sophistication of conventional weaponry, leading to tensions between the USA and USSR</li> <li>• The USA and USSR carried out a virtual war by proxy by intervening in independence and power struggles in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Americas</li> <li>• The Americans continued to criticise the lack of human rights and direct Soviet intervention (Czechoslovakia, 1968) in Eastern bloc territories</li> <li>• In the 1960s many Soviet politicians believed that the USSR should take a more hard-line direction than Khrushchev advocated and these men became more influential in the 1970s</li> <li>• By the late 1970s, USA-USSR détente came under strain as the situation in areas such as Iran, Afghanistan and Central America made it increasingly difficult to maintain diplomacy and particularly nuclear talks.</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 suggestion that the Reagan presidency was the most significant contributory factor to the heightening of Cold War tensions in the early 1980s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Reagan presidency was the most significant contributory factor to the heightening of Cold War tensions in the early 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reagan came to the Presidency with the reputation of being a hard-line right-wing politician with a particular hatred of communism; he viewed the USSR as an 'evil' empire</li> <li>• Reagan had based much of his election campaign on the perception that President Carter had been unable and unwilling to confront increasing Soviet aggression, particularly in Afghanistan</li> <li>• Reagan increased defence spending on both nuclear and conventional weapons and developed the Strategic Defence Initiative specifically to challenge the military power of Communist states</li> <li>• Reagan gained the support of other anti-communist western politicians e.g. Margaret Thatcher agreed to allow US nuclear weapons to be based in Britain</li> <li>• The Reagan Doctrine was designed specifically to combat communist influences in less developed areas of the world e.g. supplying military aid to anti-communist forces (Nicaragua) or supporting anti-communist regimes (El Salvador, Philippines).</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Reagan presidency was not the most significant contributory factor to the heightening of Cold War tensions in the early 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cold War tensions had increased sharply in 1980 before Reagan's election e.g. President Carter's withdrawal from SALT II and the US-led boycott of the Moscow Olympics</li> <li>• The Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan was the event most responsible for triggering the 'second Cold War'</li> <li>• The Soviets heightened tension in Europe considerably by deploying a new range of battlefield nuclear weapons</li> <li>• A succession of short-term and/or ill leaders (Brezhnev, Andropov, Chernenko) saw an inability to respond swiftly to events and a return of Soviet inflexibility in foreign policy</li> <li>• Events and influences in Eastern Europe undermined the security of the Soviet Union e.g. Solidarity in Poland, the popularity of Pope John Paul II, economic problems in the Eastern bloc, access to western culture.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>