Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2023

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

Paper 4: International Study with 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

January 2023
Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2301_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.

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 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.

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 Churchill's Iron Curtain speech had the most significant impact on the development of the Cold War in the years 1946-49. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The Iron Curtain speech defined the symbolic image of the ideological and governmental split between West and East that would dominate the Cold War • The speech had an immediate impact on the policy-making of both the US and British governments with regard to Russia and relations between themselves • The speech provided the backdrop for the two major US foreign policy developments of 1947 – the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan • Despite other factors influencing the situation, it was Churchill's speech which was the most significant in highlighting Cold War differences to the world and influencing governmental policies • The North Atlantic Treaty of April 1949 had a direct link to Churchill's appeal to the US and western European nations to maintain solidarity. Extract 2 • The Marshall Plan was the moment that the US became committed to policies that would confirm the division of Europe between west and east • The Marshall Plan committed the US to a policy which would enable western Europe to develop along capitalist lines and lead to the creation of a separate west German state • The Soviet Union felt threatened by US actions and believed that it needed to respond swiftly • The Marshall Plan led to the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) as a dual platform to strengthen and defend the economic and ideological values underpinning western values.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Churchill's Iron Curtain speech had the most significant impact on the development of the Cold War in the years 1946-49. Relevant points may include: • Churchill drew a geographical word map of the threat of communist Russia in Europe, which powerfully invoked a graphic image that would have been familiar to those who had experienced the Second World War • In March 1946, the popularity of the USSR in the USA was still high, in the aftermath of the wartime alliance, and Churchill was able to articulate suspicions of Russia that Truman was unable to at that specific time • Other individuals, such as Kennan and Bevin, were voicing the same concerns but it was Churchill speaking in the US, with a reputation for prescience in foreign policy, who was able to bring them to the world • Truman was able to build on the growing concern of threat of Stalin engendered by the speech to formulate and introduce his new foreign policy strategy of containment in 1947 with some hope of success • In 1947-48, Russian actions in eastern Europe focused the US and the British more acutely on collective defence measures; the NATO treaty did not specify but envisaged Russia as its major threat. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Churchill's Iron Curtain speech had the most significant impact on the development of the Cold War in the years 1946-49. Relevant points may include: • At Fulton, Churchill was speaking as a private citizen and had no direct influence in the politics of the Cold War. Truman publicly distanced himself from the speech, which was more rhetoric than substance • Truman had been contemplating a shift in policy since 1945 and a move towards a containment strategy before the Iron Curtain speech, particularly after Kennan's Long Telegram in February 1946 • The introduction of the Marshall Plan forced the Soviets to insist that eastern Europe reject the offers of economic assistance, so creating a clear and permanent division between west and east • The announcement of the Marshall Plan began the chain of events that defined the early Cold War, e.g. the creation of Cominform, the Berlin Crisis, the creation of West Germany and the NATO alliance • Other developments, e.g. the Truman Doctrine; the Berlin Blockade, the Czechoslovakian crisis, the failure of the Moscow foreign ministers' conference (1947), the creation of NATO, the onset of the Red Scare.

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 China was more responsible than the USSR for the Sino-Soviet split in relations in the years 1953-69. Arguments and evidence that that China was more responsible than the USSR for the Sino-Soviet split in relations in the years 1953-69 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Mao behaved in a belligerent manner towards the Soviet leadership throughout the period, particularly Khrushchev, as Mao believed after the death of Stalin he should be seen as the most senior communist leader • Mao condemned Khrushchev's policies of de-Stalinisation in Russia and eastern Europe and attempted to interfere in the Russian sphere of influence, e.g. support for Albania • China threatened to undermine Khrushchev's foreign policy of 'peaceful co-existence' by condemning Khrushchev's summit diplomacy with the USA and through Mao's unilateral and aggressive policy towards Taiwan • China undermined diplomatic relations between the two, e.g. treatment of Khrushchev during the 1958 visit, the 1967 Red Guard attack on the Soviet Embassy • China's insistence on contesting disputed border territory led to Sino-Soviet clashes. The dispute over the border with Xinjiang province led to a brief border war in 1968-69 • Russia continued to provide trading rights, economic aid and scientific resources, including nuclear knowledge, for most of the 1950s despite Mao's increasingly hostile attitude. Arguments and evidence that Russia was more responsible than China for the deterioration/both were equally responsible for Sino-Soviet split in the years 1953-69 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Russians treated China as the junior partner throughout the existence of the Mutual Friendship Treaty and expected China to accept their decisions • Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin after Stalin's death threatened to undermine Mao's ideological position in China and this made Mao determined to uphold the principles of Stalinist communism • Russia seemed hostile in relation to ideology, e.g. Khrushchev's criticism of the Great Leap Forward (1959), and security, e.g. support for India in the 1962 border dispute, massive military build-up in the 1960s

	• In the early 1960s, Russia withdrew scientific aid and thousands of technicians at the height of the Great Leap Forward and denied China access to nuclear weapons technology that had previously been promised • Russia's policy of 'peaceful co-existence' seemed to place more weight on Russia's relationship with the West than its friendship with China, e.g. Khrushchev's praise for Eisenhower in his visit to Beijing of 1959 • Ideological divisions and competing national interest meant that both China and Russia were equally to blame, as each side reacted to and countered each other's policy actions, e.g. 1968-69 border war. 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 how different US-Soviet relations in the years 1980-85 were from US-Soviet relations in the years 1964-79. Arguments and evidence that US-Soviet relations in the years 1980-85 were different from US-Soviet relations in the years 1964-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the years 1980-85, a period of global tension, initiated by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979), developed after the stalemate and détente of the years 1964-79. The potential for a 'hot war' grew considerably • In 1980-85, the leadership of both the US and the Soviet Union were less favourable towards diplomacy and co-operation than in 1964-79; Reagan wanted to 'rollback' communism and Russian leaders looked more inwards • In the years 1980-85, after the US refusal to ratify SALT II (1980), there was a move away from the desire for strategic arms limitation that was a feature of the years 1964-79 • In the years 1980-85, the spirit of co-operation and 'friendly' competition that had existed in several fields in the 1970s, e.g. space, sport, became

	more adversarial and negative, e.g. Olympic boycotts of 1980 and 1984 • In the years 1980-85, the potential for US-Soviet confrontation in Europe increased as both sides built up their nuclear capacity and US rhetoric began to take advantage of decreasing Soviet control of the eastern bloc. Arguments and evidence that US-Soviet relations in the years 1980-85 were similar to US-Soviet relations in the years 1964-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Throughout both periods, tensions remained between the US and the Soviet Union with both sides increasing and developing their military capacity in both traditional and nuclear weaponry • Throughout both periods, the likelihood of a complete breakdown in relations was unlikely, as the hot-line communication link set up in 1963 was maintained and the concept of MAD continued to be influential • Throughout both periods, the US and the Soviets maintained tensions through war by proxy, providing support in regional conflicts, e.g. Angola, Vietnam, Afghanistan, for anti-communist and communist belligerents • Both sides carried on a propaganda war against each other throughout both periods, using news media, sport and culture to champion their own ideologies and challenge each other's superiority • Throughout both periods, despite some fluctuation, the US and the Soviet Union continued to have a trading relationship, with the Soviets maintaining a trade deficit. 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