

Mark scheme

International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI04/1C)

Paper 4: International Study  
with Interpretations

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

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

### Section A

**Targets: A01 (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.

**A03 (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
<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 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: A01 (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

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 that 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. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p><b>Extract 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the Second World War the US had a very broad conception of its national security interests, which implicitly suggests the potential for conflict with other countries.</li> <li>• Truman's determination to counter early challenges, for example Truman doctrine, Marshall Plan, to American national security interests marked important staging posts in the development of the Cold War in Europe.</li> <li>• The American response to protect its national interests following events in China and Korea helped to globalise the Cold War by the early 1950s.</li> <li>• US national security interests alarmed and provoked the USSR (thus fuelling the Cold War) because of Western attitudes towards Germany and Japan and Western 'encirclement' .</li> </ul> <p><b>Extract 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After 1945, Stalin was ideologically committed to the expansion of the USSR's power over the continent and felt war was inevitable under capitalism.</li> <li>• Soviet expansionism was also driven by the sheer scale of the USSR's sacrifices during the Second World War and popular imperialism.</li> <li>• Fear of the spread of communism prompted Western politicians to appeal to the US to counter Soviet expansionism.</li> <li>• Stalin's miscalculations over the Cominform, the Berlin Blockade and Korea hardened the American stance on Europe, thereby deepening the Cold War.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The US's pursuit of a global post-war 'Pax Americana' (based on capitalist economics, an 'open door' free trade policy and liberal democracy) was almost bound to lead to conflict with its major rival, the Soviet Union</li> <li>• The US attempted to use its nuclear monopoly (1945–49) as an instrument for bringing pressure to bear on the USSR (for example at Potsdam in 1945), which heightened tension between the two superpowers</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truman's policy of containment can be seen as counter-productive (for example the Marshall Plan was viewed by the USSR as 'dollar imperialism' and led the Soviets to consolidate the Eastern bloc by 1948 to prevent capitalist infiltration)</li> <li>• The US's conception of its national security interests exaggerated the challenge posed by the Soviet Union and failed to appreciate that a seriously weakened USSR was mainly concerned with security and economic reconstruction after 1945.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, in the years 1945–53, the Cold War developed as a result of US national security needs. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several of the USSR's actions in Europe, which heightened Cold War tensions, can be seen as motivated by an ideological desire to spread communism (for example the 'Stalinisation' of Eastern Europe (1945–48) and the Berlin Blockade (1948–49))</li> <li>• Soviet coordination and control of the wider communist movement through the Cominform (1947) was viewed by many in the West as a threatening attempt to promote worldwide communist revolution (for example the communist 'destabilisation' campaign in France and Italy (1947–48))</li> <li>• Communist expansion in Asia also hardened Cold War attitudes (for example Mao's takeover in China (1949) raised the prospect of a monolithic Sino-Soviet communist bloc that would dominate Eurasia)</li> <li>• Several of Stalin's policies were flawed and increased Cold War divisions (for example the Berlin Blockade (1948–49) led to a capitalist West Germany and the NATO military alliance, and his support for North Korean aggression (1950) underestimated the West's will to respond).</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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that the nuclear arms race did little to restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the nuclear arms race did little to restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) precipitated a spiralling arms race from the early 1950s, for example hydrogen/lithium bomb (1952–54), intercontinental bombers (mid-1950s), ICBM (1957) and SLBM (1960), China's successful nuclear test (1964)</li> <li>• Fears about the perceived nuclear superiority of the other side (for example the Gaither Report and the 'missile gap' (1957–61)) also encouraged further nuclear weapon developments as a way of shoring up national prestige and influence</li> <li>• The development of nuclear brinkmanship as a Cold War tactic, for example US doctrine of 'massive retaliation' against the Soviet Union and China (1950s), the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) and the US's 'nuclear option' during the 1961 Berlin crisis</li> <li>• Nuclear weapons did not stop other forms of superpower competition for influence in the 1950s and early 1960s (for example Soviet economic and military aid to developing countries such as Egypt, and US support for anti-communist regimes in South Vietnam, South Korea and Taiwan).</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the nuclear arms race did restrain the Cold War policies of the superpowers in the years 1953–64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The deterrent effect of nuclear weapons prevented direct US-Soviet confrontation during this period (for example over Berlin (1958–61) and Cuba (1962))</li> <li>• The presence of nuclear weapons meant that the superpowers respected each other's sphere of influence and did not intervene (for example Guatemala (1954) and Hungary (1956))</li> <li>• The superpowers had to cooperate to regulate the nuclear threat (for example the removal of nuclear missiles from Cuba and Turkey (1962–63), the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow 'hot-line' (1963))</li> <li>• US and Soviet leaders were acutely aware of living in the nuclear age and acted responsibly (for example Khrushchev pursued peaceful coexistence and withdrew Soviet assistance for China's nuclear programme).</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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the suggestion that neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soviet refusal to link Détente to further concessions (for example over Vietnam and the USSR's anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev's adherence to the long-term victory of communism</li> <li>• The Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (for example Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia)</li> <li>• Soviet disregard for the protection of human rights in the Eastern Bloc as set out in the Helsinki Accords (1975)</li> <li>• Both superpowers limited the scope of SALT 1 to suit their own interests (for example the US refused to negotiate on MIRVs where they held an advantage)</li> <li>• The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) and the refusal of the US Congress to ratify SALT 2 was clear evidence of the lack of superpower commitment by the late 1970s.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the USA and the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A genuine desire on the part of both superpowers to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race led to the signing of SALT 1</li> <li>• US promotion of the Nixon Doctrine (which meant withdrawal from SouthEast Asia) placed a premium on good relations with the USSR to secure American objectives</li> <li>• Wider US-Soviet economic and trade considerations were also important in promoting superpower Détente (for example to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to Western technology and grain imports)</li> <li>• A genuine Soviet desire not to be diplomatically isolated by the growing Sino-US rapprochement of the early 1970s.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>