GradeMax

edexcel

Mark scheme

International Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1C)

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, www.btec.co.uk or 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

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

November 2017

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

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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
4	**15–20**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	**21–25**	• 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	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. 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 the probability was very high that friction would develop in the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union, with the end of the Second World War. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Friction was likely to emerge between the USA and the Soviet Union because of the differences in their political systems and ideologies; both had ideologies that were expansionist in nature. • There were elements on both sides that believed their view would ultimately win out and so USA and the Soviet Union would come into conflict sooner rather than later. • The relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union began to show signs of breaking down almost immediately after the meeting at Yalta in 1945. • In 1945 both President Roosevelt and President Truman had had concerns about Soviet actions. Extract 2 • In 1946 there was little reason for there to be friction between the USA and the Soviet Union. • The Americans and the Russians had both reduced the strength of their manpower and so were not in a position to challenge each other. • The Russian economic situation meant that Stalin was not in a position to create new conflict and he did not attempt to do so. • Opinion in the US was not overtly hostile to the Soviet Union in the immediate aftermath of the war. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the probability was very high that friction would develop in the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union, with the end of the Second World War. Relevant points may include: • Both the USA and the Soviet Union believed that their respective political systems, democracy and communism, would be the most effective form of government in the post-Second World War world • Inherent differences in the ideologies of western capitalist democracy and

Question	Indicative content
	communism had already been apparent both before and during the Second World War • Tension rose between the USA and the Soviet Union during the closing months of the Second World War over the situation in Europe, particularly with regard to Soviet intentions towards Germany and Poland • The last Allied conference of the Second World War at Potsdam reflected growing differences between the USA and the Soviet Union, and two days after its end the US dropped atomic bombs on Japan. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the probability that friction would develop in the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union, at the end of the Second World War, was very high. Relevant points may include: • Neither the USA nor the Soviet Union necessarily wanted conflict at the end of the War; the Soviet Union had been physically devastated and the US public opinion wanted a return to normality • American politicians who had initially welcomed Churchill's speech, including President Truman, were forced to backtrack to some extent by an American public still supportive of the Soviet wartime contribution • US mistrust of the Soviets was not inevitable; US President Roosevelt had been determined to maintain a working relationship in peacetime and it was only after his death that US policy became more confrontational • Although the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union after 1945 developed into a tense Cold War, any friction between the two did not develop into a fighting conflict.

Section B: indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that, in the years 1953–61, the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union was one of peaceful co-existence. Arguments and evidence that the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union, in the years 1953–61, was one of peaceful co-existence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Soviet and American leaders, Khrushchev and Eisenhower, moved away from the confrontational relationship which had developed under Truman and Stalin in the post-war years • A peace agreement ending the Korean War was signed in 1953 leading to a thaw in relations • Conciliatory moves in Europe in the mid-1950s, e.g. Soviet agreement over Austrian independence and recognition of West Germany, US acceptance of the existence of East Germany • The development of the 'Geneva spirit' which was based on east-west summit diplomacy and which culminated in the visit of Khrushchev to the USA in 1959 • There were increased scientific and cultural ties between the US and USA, e.g. exchange visits for Soviet and American scientists, the American National Exhibition in Moscow (1959). Arguments and evidence that that the relationship between the USA and the Soviet Union, in the years 1953–61, was not one of peaceful co-existence should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Ideological differences remained and both the USA and the Soviet Union continued to promote their separate ideologies, e.g. the Eisenhower doctrine and Khrushchev's belief in the long-term victory of communism • The accelerating nuclear arms race, which was conducted in secret, promoted fear on both sides, e.g. the development of the hydrogen bomb and ICBMs • Technological developments brought a competitive edge to US-Soviet relations and created suspicion on both sides, e.g. the launch of Sputnik (1957), the US spy plane incident (1960) • New areas of superpower conflict and confrontation emerged throughout the world as the pre-Second World War empires decolonised and the US and Soviet Union vied for influence • Towards the end of the period the 'Geneva' spirit began to decline with the Paris summit (Khrushchev-Eisenhower) and the Vienna summit (Khrushchev-Kennedy) both ending in disappointment • In the later part of the period, Cold War rhetoric and confrontation began to reappear, e.g. the tense stand-off in Berlin (1958–61), new US President (Kennedy) promised to defend the West from communism. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the Cold War was brought to an end in the late 1980s mainly because of the growing economic problems within the Soviet Union. Arguments and evidence that the Cold War was brought to an end in the late 1980s mainly because of the growing economic problems within the Soviet Union should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Communist economic policies led to a lack of industrial and technological competitiveness with the West, causing economic stagnation and forcing the Soviet Union to concentrate on its own domestic situation • The policies of Mikhail Gorbachev, designed to help overcome growing Soviet economic problems, undermined Soviet control of Eastern Europe • Growing economic problems led to a decline in the standard of living in the Soviet Union and increased social unrest which destabilised the position of the Soviet Union as a world superpower • The dire state of the Soviet economy meant that the Soviet Union could no longer afford to commit resources to the Cold War, e.g. Afghanistan, or to sustain communist control in Eastern Europe, e.g. Sinatra Doctrine. Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons why the Cold War was brought to an end in the late 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The growth of nationalism in the Soviet Union undermined communist rule and social stability so forcing Soviet leaders to concentrate on domestic rather than international affairs • Popular protest, unchecked by Soviet military force, led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, so necessitating a new international order • It was Ronald Reagan's uncompromising ideological policies in the early 1980s, combined with an aggressive military-technological challenge to the Soviet Union, which forced the Soviets to abandon the Cold War • Gorbachev's rejection of 'old-style' Soviet diplomacy combined with Reagan's more moderate policies after 1985 created a foundation for bringing the Cold War to an end by improving East-West relations • The role of significant individuals, e.g. the influence of Pope John Paul II in Poland, Margaret Thatcher's support for Ronald Reagan, etc. Other relevant material must be credited.