GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

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 2020
Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2020_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright.
© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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
	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.

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

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.

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 geopolitical concerns of the USA and USSR explain the development of the Cold War after 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 • Once the Second World War had ended, both the USA and the USSR were concerned about the potential consequences of each other's influence in Germany • Soviet insecurity was increased due to American access to atomic weapons and American economic power • The Soviets feared US intentions in Eastern Europe and Japan • The USA was concerned about Soviet actions in Eastern Europe and the spread of Soviet-inspired unrest in Western Europe. Extract 2 • The end of the Second World War saw the development of the Cold War as an ideological conflict between the 'Free World' and the 'Soviet bloc' • In the years 1946-47, a bi-polar world developed which was based on ideological conflict • Both the USA and the USSR were determined to expand their influence by championing their own social systems • In 1947, President Truman defined the Cold War as a battle of freedom versus totalitarianism while the Soviet authorities focused on the battle of communism versus capitalism. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the geopolitical concerns of the USA and USSR explain the development of the Cold War after the Second World War. Relevant points may include: • In the years 1946–49, Germany became the crucible of post-war geopolitics. This was reflected most clearly in the Berlin Blockade (1948–49) • The Americans, having kept their development of a viable atomic bomb secret from the Soviets in 1945, maintained an atomic monopoly until 1949 using it as leverage in the unfolding Cold War • The Soviets felt threatened by the US offer of economic aid, in the form of the Marshall Plan, to all European countries, including those in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself • The Soviets encouraged post-war political divisions in some western

Question	Indicative content
	European countries, e.g. France, Italy, and the Soviets intervened in the politics of Eastern Europe, e.g. in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that the geopolitical concerns of the USA and USSR explain the development of the Cold War after the Second World War. Relevant points may include: • The Second World War united the opponents of fascism in a Grand Alliance but, with the defeat of fascism, after 1945 the western democracies found themselves increasingly at odds with a communist USSR • Cold War rhetoric emphasised ideological differences, e.g. the 'Iron Curtain' was seen as a barrier separating those under the 'iron fist' of Stalinism from those living in the 'free world' • Germany became a focus for ideological conflict; the western Allies looked to prevent the return of fascism by guaranteeing freedoms and democracy while the Soviets looked to establish socialism and centralised control • The US emphasised its prosperity and the benefits of a consumer society while the Soviet Union emphasised the inequalities found in the West in comparison to the equalities associated with a socialist society • The US policy of containment was underpinned by a desire to prevent the Soviet Union from initiating the ideological spread of communism.

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 whether the period of détente between the superpowers, in the years 1963–79, was primarily motivated by the fear of nuclear warfare. Arguments and evidence that the period of détente between the superpowers, in the years 1963–79, was primarily motivated by the fear of nuclear warfare should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The setting up of the Washington-Moscow 'hotline' was a direct acknowledgement by the leaders of the USA and USA as to how close the world had come to nuclear war during the Cuban Missile Crisis • The Test Ban Treaty (1963), and subsequent attempts in the 1960s to limit the escalation of nuclear weaponry, was an acknowledgement of the public fear generated by the Cuban Missile Crisis, particularly in the US • The emergence of China as a nuclear military power after 1964 brought uncertainty to the theory of MAD; the real possibility of Sino-Soviet conflict pushed the USA towards détente with China • In the 1970s, détente centred around strategic nuclear arms limitation as the emergence of new nuclear military powers, and the development of SLBMs and ABMs, further undermined the theory of MAD • Political leaders, particularly in the West, became more inclined to reduce Cold War tensions as public knowledge of the potential devastating effects of nuclear warfare became more widespread in the 1970s. Arguments and evidence that the period of détente between the superpowers, in the years 1963–79, was primarily motivated by other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The policy of MAD defined by the USA, but also accepted by the USSR, acted as a deterrent to nuclear warfare throughout the period and so fear of nuclear war had a limited impact on détente • Full-scale military Sino-Soviet confrontation (1969), led to improved US relations with China and Soviet attempts to maintain relations with the USA to relieve pressures caused by the split • In the USA, the impact of Vietnam, and in the USSR stagnation and food shortages meant that neither side could afford to see an increase in Cold War tensions • US and Soviet fear of being drawn into wider direct confrontation: the US wanted to avoid another Vietnam and the USSR, despite establishing the Brezhnev doctrine (1968), to avoid disputes over Eastern Europe • The willingness of political leaders to engage in détente, particularly Nixon and Mao in the early 1970s. 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 significance of the emergence of Solidarity in Poland in 1980 in the development of the Cold War in the years 1979-90. Arguments and evidence that the emergence of Solidarity in Poland in 1980 was significant in the development of the Cold War in the years 1979-90 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The popularity, and initial effectiveness, of Solidarity in one of the largest and most strategically important Eastern bloc countries challenged the geopolitics of the Cold War • The insistence by the Soviets that the Polish authorities dealt with Solidarity, rather than intervening themselves, was the first direct indication that Soviet ability to control Eastern Europe was diminishing • The emergence of Solidarity, combined with the response of the Soviet-sponsored Polish authorities, heightened Cold War tensions in the early 1980s by providing a focus for western pressure • The emergence of Solidarity in 1980, and the tenacity it showed in continuing to exist as a presence in Polish politics throughout the 1980s, provided an example of resistance to other Eastern bloc countries • Solidarity enabled Pope John Paul II to use the situation in his 'home country' to highlight the issue of human rights in the communist world, so adding to the strains of the Soviet ability to continue the Cold War. Arguments and evidence that the emergence of Solidarity in Poland in 1980 was not significant in the development of the Cold War in the years 1979-90 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The fact that Solidarity was primarily a socialist trade union meant that Western leaders, particularly Reagan and Thatcher, did not use utilise its emergence during the 'Second Cold War' as effectively as they might have • It was not until it had won the Polish elections of 1989 that the Solidarity movement finally had a direct impact on the collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe and the ending of the Cold War • It was not until the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985 that the Soviet Union abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine for the 'Sinatra Doctrine' • It was the Polish-born Pope John Paul II's criticism of the Polish authorities and his visit to Poland in 1979 that was responsible for the creation of the Solidarity trade union in the first place • The emergence of the Solidarity movement was a reflection of the changing Cold War environment at the beginning of the 1980s, i.e. Soviet decline and western confrontation, rather than a cause of change • Other factors had a more significant impact, e.g. the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the foreign policies of Thatcher and Reagan, Andropov's obsession with a western first strike, economic decline in Eastern Europe. Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom