GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1C)

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 or 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.

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

October 2018
Publications Code WHI04_1C_History_58206_1810_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

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 economic issues were responsible for the deterioration in US-Soviet relations in the years 1945–50. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The Marshall Plan increased tensions between the US and the Soviet Union over the 'control of Europe' • The Marshall Plan was a deliberate attempt by the US to exploit post-war economic difficulties to challenge communism • The Russians believed that the use of economic power by the US indicated that the US was no longer interested in developing post-war alliances • The Marshall Plan was a turning point in US-Soviet relations; from 1947 Stalin moved away from compromise towards a more aggressive policy. Extract 2 • Nuclear weapons played a key role in the deterioration of US-Soviet relations in the years 1945–50 • Acting from a position of strength, the US used the underlying threat of the deployment of nuclear weapons as a counterweight to Soviet power in Europe • Soviet fear of the US deployment of nuclear weapons led to a deterioration in relations from September 1945 • It was the 'presence of the bomb' that saw Stalin move away from compromise towards a more belligerent relationship with the US. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that economic issues were responsible for the deterioration in US-Soviet relations in the years 1945–50. Relevant points may include: • The urgent need for the economic reconstruction of post-war Europe created an environment for disagreement between the capitalist US and the communist USSR • Disputes between the US and USSR over the role of international economic institutions, such as the IMF and World Bank, and the provision of US aid led to deteriorating relations from 1945 onwards • The Marshall Plan created tensions within the Soviet sphere of influence in

Question	Indicative content
	Eastern Europe; both the initial offer of aid to all and the 'capitalist bias' of the accompanying qualifying conditions created discontent • The USSR condemned the Marshall Plan as 'dollar imperialism', put pressure on Eastern European states to decline financial aid and set up Cominform and Comecon to counter such US economic warfare. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that economic issues were responsible for the deterioration in US-Soviet relations in the years 1945–50. Relevant points may include: • Stalin felt insulted and aggrieved by the use of atomic weapons by the US in 1945 • The US held the upper hand in nuclear warfare development from 1945 until 1949 when the USSR successfully detonated an atomic bomb • The post-Potsdam meetings of foreign ministers were held in an atmosphere of suspicion and deteriorating relations with little agreement achieved; the final meeting was in 1947 and broke up in acrimony • Other factors: the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences; the Truman Doctrine, Soviet expansionism; political and ideological issues.

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 that, under President Kennedy, the US approach to the containment of the Soviet threat was clearly different from the approach under President Eisenhower. Arguments and evidence that, under President Kennedy, the US approach to the containment of the Soviet threat was clearly different from the approach under President Eisenhower should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Kennedy's 'flexible response' envisaged a range of strategies to achieve containment; Eisenhower's approach was dominated by the strategy of 'massive retaliation' • Kennedy's initial approach was based on a more confrontational and competitive rhetoric; Eisenhower generally abided by the concept of 'peaceful co-existence' • Kennedy's military strategy combined an increase in the nuclear arsenal with a strengthening of conventional forces; Eisenhower focused on the US nuclear capacity as a deterrent • Kennedy was willing to pay the cost of more federal money for defence and economic aid; Eisenhower believed that containment should not come at any cost, with nuclear weapons providing 'more bang for the buck'. Arguments and evidence that that, under President Kennedy, the US approach to the containment of the Soviet threat was similar to the approach under President Eisenhower should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both presidents were determined to maintain strategic military superiority over the Soviets by increasing the US nuclear arsenal • Both presidents were advocates of the use of economic aid to prevent the spread of Soviet influence both in Europe and in areas of decolonisation • Both presidents were willing to use brinkmanship as a deterrent against the Soviet threat, e.g. both were willing to use the threat of nuclear war over Berlin • Both presidents were supporters of covert operations to advance US policy, e.g. Eisenhower used the U2 spy plane and initiated the Bay of Pigs plan, Kennedy financed counter-insurgency and plots against Castro • Both presidents were willing to use negotiation to try to prevent the escalation of tension; both administrations were involved in bilateral diplomacy, summit meetings and nuclear test ban negotiations. 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 whether the superpowers remained committed to a policy of détente throughout the 1970s. Arguments and evidence that the superpowers remained committed to a policy of détente throughout the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The US and the Soviet Union both remained committed to decreasing the threat of nuclear warfare through summit diplomacy and agreements, e.g. SALT I (1972), SALT 2 (1979) • Diplomatic, trade and cultural exchanges and agreements were established between the US and the Soviet Union, e.g. trade agreement (1972), Apollo-Soyuz Mission (1974-5), new US embassy in Moscow • The US and Communist China worked together to establish greater diplomatic ties and openness, e.g. Nixon's visit to China (1972), the Chinese ping-pong tour (1972), formal diplomatic status (1979) • The negative impact of the US involvement in Vietnam both at home and abroad encouraged US presidents to pursue a policy of negotiation and détente • Developments in the USSR and its satellite states encouraged Soviet leaders to pursue détente, e.g. cost of nuclear commitments, the need for Soviet food imports, discontent in Eastern Europe. Arguments and evidence that the superpowers did not remain committed to a policy of détente throughout the 1970s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both powers attempted to manipulate and apply agreements on their own terms, e.g. using the SALT treaties to maintain their own military advantage, tensions over Basket 3 of the Helsinki Accords (1975) • The Soviet leadership maintained a commitment to the long-term victory of communism over capitalism; the Soviets refused to apply the concepts of détente in non-superpower negotiations, e.g. Vietnam, the Middle East • Proxy wars and the struggle for influence in the developing world between East and West undermined détente and created an atmosphere of superpower competition • Détente was not a feature of Sino-Soviet relations; relations remained difficult throughout the 1970s, e.g. ongoing border disputes after the 1969 conflict, Chinese intervention in Vietnam (1979) • The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) ended the period of détente; the US delayed the ratification of SALT II and cancelled forthcoming economic and cultural exchanges. Other relevant material must be credited.