



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel  
International Advanced Level  
In History (WHI04)  
Paper 4: International Study with Historical  
Interpretations

Option 1C: The World Divided: Superpower  
Relations

## **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)

Summer 2019

Publications Code: WHI04\_1C\_1906\_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>
<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>

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>

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 it was the US commitment to an ideological struggle that was fundamentally responsible for the development of the Cold War.</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>• Truman's speech to Congress on 12 March 1947 committed the US to providing more than just physical aid to countries threatened by communism</li> <li>• Truman's speech was a turning point in the Cold War, in that it categorically defined the Cold War as an ideological struggle between the US and the Soviet Union</li> <li>• Truman outlined a policy which meant that the US would purposefully and aggressively promote American ideals in competition with Soviet ideals</li> <li>• Truman's speech committed the US to a global policy that would protect and promote democracy across the world unconditionally.</li> </ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The situation was so complicated that neither the US nor the Soviet Union could be held singularly responsible for the developments that occurred</li> <li>• Officials in both the US and the Soviet Union formulated policy based on a variety of considerations, of which ideology was only one, that contributed to the development of the Cold War</li> <li>• Both the US and the Soviet Union were left with circumstances at the end of the Second World War that were beyond their control and a variety of internal issues, which complicated relations further</li> <li>• The attempts to establish international security at the end of the Second World War created compromises, which led to irreconcilable differences between the two sides.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it was the US commitment to an ideological struggle that was fundamentally responsible for the development of the Cold War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 12 March 1947 speech was the public announcement of the Truman Doctrine, which committed the US to containment, i.e. supporting nations resisting internal and external threat from communism</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In June 1947 the Marshall Plan was unveiled to aid European countries devastated by the Second World War; the Soviets perceived that aid was being offered in return for allegiance to the West and capitalist values</li> <li>• The Soviets had influenced elections in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania but the Soviets were probably not in any position to take advantage of the power vacuum created by the British withdrawal from Greece</li> <li>• The Truman administration was always more inclined to see the post-war world as an ideological battleground than Roosevelt; it was the US state officials most inclined to this view who 'won out' post-1945</li> <li>• It was the US that was reluctant to contemplate the possibility of negotiating a united Germany in the years 1946–49.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it was the US commitment to an ideological struggle that was fundamentally responsible for the development of the Cold War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments occurred outside of the control of either side, e.g. the Potsdam Conference was heavily affected by the death of Roosevelt and the election of a Labour government in Britain</li> <li>• Influences on Cold War attitudes in the US included the beginning of a new 'red scare', the coming presidential election of 1948, the desire to maintain nuclear supremacy after the attack on Japan</li> <li>• Influences on Cold War attitudes in the Soviet Union included the psychological impact of the German invasion in the Second World War, the scale of the devastation caused by the war and Stalin's growing paranoia</li> <li>• Each side was defending its right to maintain national security; the US providing economic security to western Europe and the Soviet Union extending political influence over eastern Europe.</li> <li>• Other factors were responsible: Soviet commitment to combat the threat of capitalism; the declining power of Britain.</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 whether the Cuban Missile Crisis was a turning point in the development of US-Soviet relations in the years 1953–68.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a turning point in the development of US-Soviet relations in the years 1953–68 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It saw a reduction in the role of the 'brinkmanship' politics that had increasingly become a feature of US-Soviet relations, e.g. Berlin; the Prague Spring (1968) did not lead to confrontation</li> <li>• It led to the creation of a direct line of communication between the leaders of the USA and Soviet Union, e.g. the telephone 'hotline'</li> <li>• It ushered in a period of détente from 1963</li> <li>• It led to specific agreements to limit the nuclear weaponry, e.g. Nuclear Test Ban Treaty 1963</li> <li>• In the aftermath of the Crisis, Khrushchev's influence over Soviet foreign policy, which had been increasing since 1953, declined.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Cuban Missile Crisis was not a turning point in the development of US-Soviet relations in the years 1953–68 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The period of détente from 1963 was really just an extension of the policy of 'peaceful co-existence' and 'thaw' that had been the dominant underlying trend since 1953</li> <li>• Fundamental ideological differences between the US and the Soviets continued to dominate relations</li> <li>• The arms race continued with development of conventional weapons, nuclear weapons and the space race, e.g. both sides developed ABMs, testing continued underground, US space programme</li> <li>• Confrontation continued by moving away from areas of direct threat such as Cuba, Europe and Turkey to 'war by proxy' in Latin America, the Middle East and Africa</li> <li>• The perceived humiliation suffered by Khrushchev during the Crisis meant that new Soviet leadership in some ways became more even convinced of the need to continue to challenge US policy.</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 whether the most significant feature of superpower relations in the years 1964–79 was war by proxy.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant feature of superpower relations in the years 1964–79 was war by proxy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The superpowers confronted each other at arm's length in their economic, political and, sometimes military, support of ideologically 'friendly' regimes or their opponents in developing countries across the world</li> <li>• In Latin and Central America US economic, political and covert military aid was given to right-wing regimes while the Soviets provided Cuba with support to aid socialist governments/opposition</li> <li>• In Africa and Asia, despite apparent détente, US policy continued to be that of the 'containment' of communism while the Soviets/Chinese actively promoted the spread of communism</li> <li>• The Soviets and the Chinese often vied between themselves to support independence movements in Africa e.g. in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) military support was provided by the Soviets to ZAPU and the Chinese to ZANU</li> <li>• In the Middle East, US support for Israel and Soviet support for Arab states and the PLO was a key feature; direct Soviet interference contributed to the outbreak of the Yom Kippur War (1973).</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant feature of superpower relations in the years 1964–79 was not war by proxy/other features were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1964–79 was predominantly a period of détente in which the superpowers looked to create a permanent relaxation in tensions particularly in regard to nuclear arms limitation e.g. SALT</li> <li>• Relations between the USA and China improved dramatically with both Nixon and Ford visiting China and Carter formally recognising the People's Republic of China as a legitimate state</li> <li>• Relations between the USA and the Soviet Union improved leading to summit meetings, trade deals and co-operation in space exploration</li> <li>• The Helsinki Agreement (July 1975) saw the final acceptance of the post-war borders in Europe and Soviet acknowledgement of human rights</li> <li>• Sino-Soviet relations deteriorated further and by the end of the 1970s it appeared that each side was competing with the other for US support in the struggle to lead the 'communist world'.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

