



# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

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](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 2023

Question Paper Log Number P71815A

Publications Code WHI04\_1C\_2306\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## **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.

## 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>
<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: 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>

<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<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
<b>1</b>	<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 the power of the USSR was greatly threatened by the US monopoly of the atomic bomb in the years 1945-49.</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>• US possession of the atomic bomb undermined the prestige of the Soviet Union by making it look technologically behind and questioning its right to be deemed a major world power</li><li>• The monopoly over the atomic bomb created an imbalance in power between the US and the USSR and, by the time the Soviets had gained a bomb of their own, it was too late to resolve the issue</li><li>• Stalin felt threatened by the US possession of the atomic bomb, believing that the US might use the A-bomb as leverage to gain what it wanted in the negotiations to create a new world order after the Second World War</li><li>• Soviet foreign policy in 1945-46 reflected Stalin's beliefs that US possession of the atomic bomb was a threat to post-war Soviet power and his determination to make a stand.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Soviets were not panicked by the US monopoly of nuclear weapons and neither were they concerned that the US would use it to pursue future foreign policy</li><li>• At Potsdam, Stalin greeted the news of the existence of the atomic bomb positively and, at the time, did not view it as an attempt by the USA to gain advantage over the Soviet Union</li><li>• The years 1945-49, when the US had the monopoly over the bomb, were the exact years when the Soviet Union was expanding its control over eastern Europe and communism was spreading globally</li><li>• The presence of the atom bomb made no difference to Soviet security considerations with regard to its relations with the US; conflict was unlikely as the Soviets were demobilising and reconstructing the economy.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the power of the USSR was greatly threatened by the US monopoly of the atomic bomb in the years 1945-49. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truman's knowledge of US atomic capacity had a direct impact on the final 'Big Three' conference of the War; the Potsdam Conference timing was delayed and Truman informed Stalin of the atomic weapon at the meeting</li><li>• The use of the atomic bomb in Japan brought to an end the war on the Asia-Pacific front and so undermined Soviet post-war strategy in the Far East</li><li>• In the years 1945-49, the Soviets had to take into consideration the potential for the US to use its atomic weaponry at a time of crisis, e.g.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="395 154 1294 188">considering the US response when deciding on the Berlin Blockade</p> <ul data-bbox="347 203 1390 266" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 203 1390 266">• In 1946, the USSR tried to influence the newly-formed UN to ban the use of atomic weapons.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 282 1406 409">Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the power of the USSR was greatly threatened by the US monopoly of the atomic bomb in the years 1945-49. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 427 1398 831" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 427 1398 524">• The Soviets already knew of the US atomic capability in 1945, and the Soviet Union, through a combination of Soviet scientists and Soviet espionage, developed its own atomic weapon in the years 1945-49</li> <li data-bbox="347 542 1398 638">• The Soviets gained influence over most of Eastern Europe in the years 1945-49 by sponsoring communist-led governments, e.g. Poland, East Germany, and backing this up with military power, e.g. Czechoslovakia</li> <li data-bbox="347 656 1398 719">• During this period, the US at no point directly threatened the Soviets with using the atom bomb</li> <li data-bbox="347 736 1398 831">• The Russian economy had been devastated during the Second World War, with most of its major cities and industrial complexes requiring rebuilding and millions of its people dead.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### O 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 the statement that the Soviet Union implemented an aggressive foreign policy along the European Iron Curtain throughout the years 1953-64.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that that the Soviet Union implemented an aggressive foreign policy along the European Iron Curtain throughout the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Soviet Union maintained a direct, armed military presence in the central and eastern European states along the European Iron Curtain throughout the period</li><li>• The establishment of the Warsaw Pact, with the Soviet Union as the dominant power, created a more concrete division of Europe along the European Iron Curtain into two armed camps</li><li>• The brutal suppression of the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 showed the Soviet intent to maintain its control along the European Iron Curtain by force, and acted as a warning to the satellite states and the West</li><li>• In 1958, Khrushchev precipitated a three-year crisis over the status of Berlin, when he demanded that the western Allies withdraw from West Berlin within six months</li><li>• In 1961, the Soviet Union facilitated tensions along the East German-West German border for the foreseeable future, by aiding in the building of the Berlin Wall and closing down the border.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that that the Soviet Union did not implement aggressive foreign policy along the European Iron Curtain throughout the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Soviet foreign policy along the European Iron Curtain was mainly influenced by a defensive strategy to secure its borders; from the mid-50s Khrushchev attempted a policy of peaceful co-existence with the West</li><li>• In 1955, the Soviet Union withdrew its troops from Austria and negotiated Austrian independence with its wartime allies</li><li>• The creation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 was a defensive measure to protect the Soviet sphere of influence from perceived NATO aggression; the USSR did not place nuclear weapons along the European Iron Curtain</li><li>• Soviet military intervention in the East German uprising (1953) and the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 was short-term; such intervention was seen as defending the USSR rather than threatening the West</li><li>• The Berlin crisis of 1958-61 came out of a desire by Khrushchev to solve the remaining post-war issues over Berlin, and the Soviets only reluctantly agreed to support the GDR's request to build the Berlin Wall.</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 the statement that, in the years 1962-79, the main consequence of the Cuban Missile Crisis for superpower relations was a commitment to reduce the spread of nuclear weaponry.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1962-79, the main consequence of the Cuban Missile Crisis for superpower relations was a commitment to reduce the spread of nuclear weaponry should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cuban Missile Crisis brought the world within hours of a major nuclear confrontation and the enormity of the situation forced both the US and USSR to consider the realities of a nuclear exchange</li> <li>• The US and USSR entered almost immediately into negotiations over the development of current nuclear weapons, resulting in the Test Ban Treaty (1963)</li> <li>• Negotiations to prevent the spread of nuclear capability, beyond existing nuclear states, took place in the late 1960s, resulting in the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty (1968)</li> <li>• The Cuban Missile Crisis had highlighted the reality of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD); no country was willing to be the first to deploy nuclear weapons</li> <li>• In the 1970s, continued commitment to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons led to the signing of the SALT 1 agreements (1972), with further negotiations leading to SALT 2 (1979).</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1962-79, a commitment to reduce the spread of nuclear weaponry was not the main consequence of the Cuban Missile Crisis for superpower relations should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neither the USA nor the USSR were committed to ending the development of nuclear weapons and both continued to develop new nuclear weaponry and expand unregulated nuclear capability throughout the period</li> <li>• The Cuban Missile Crisis did not dissuade China from carrying on with its first nuclear bomb test in October 1964</li> <li>• The difficulties of carrying out diplomatic activity during the crisis, in such a rapidly escalating situation, led to the creation of a 'hot-line' of open communication between the leaders of the USA and USSR</li> <li>• The enormity of the Crisis led to a desire to prevent any further crisis emerging again, resulting in a period of détente that saw a greater willingness to negotiate and co-operate, e.g. Helsinki Accords, summits</li> <li>• Détente emerged because both sides could claim that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a victory – the USA had maintained its security and the USSR had secured Castro in Cuba – and so could bring the matter to an end</li> <li>• War by proxy replaced the direct confrontation of the Crisis, as the superpowers looked for other non-direct Cold War arenas in which to promote their ideologies, e.g. influence in Latin America and Africa.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

