



Mark scheme (Results)

January 2025

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

January 2025

Question Paper P76217A

Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2501_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. 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 the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding 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.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

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.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<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 that the Cold War began as a result of a propaganda war that developed between the United States and the Soviet Union after the Second World War.</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">• In the aftermath of the Second World War, both the US and the USSR began to blame each other for escalating hostilities that were likely to lead to another war• Many Americans became convinced by those in the public sphere that Stalin was not to be trusted and was as much of a threat as Hitler had been• Both the Americans and the Russians promoted the view that only they could secure a better future for the world by dint of their own superiority• The propagation of Russian views and the aggressive means used to further their policies created tensions. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Cold War was begun deliberately by President Truman as part of a planned policy to knock the Soviet Union out of the international political arena almost immediately he became President• Truman had an anti-Soviet stance and wished to ensure that the United States emerged from the Second World War with more power than the Soviet Union• Truman and his advisers intended that the US use of the atom bomb would frighten the Soviets so much that they would withdraw from international affairs• Truman's misunderstanding of the Soviets, and miscalculation of the effect of threatening to drop the atom bomb, led to an ongoing escalation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that the Cold War began as a result of a propaganda war that developed between the United States and the Soviet Union after the Second World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Grand Alliance had come together to fight the threat of Nazi Germany and fascist ideology but had little else in common; the USA and Britain championed liberal and social democracy, and the USSR communism• Post-war, the US people were more sympathetic to the USSR than many in politics and public life. A growing fear of the Soviets developed through negative propaganda in the press and from the Truman administration• In the US, Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe were portrayed as akin to that of Hitler and, in 1947, a US Cold War mission developed out of

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="395 154 1417 188">Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan</p> <ul data-bbox="347 203 1382 300" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 203 1382 300">• The Soviets portrayed their geopolitical actions as being self-defensive: the Western allies had access to nuclear weapons and threatened to undermine the USSR's existence by offering economic 'bribes' in Europe. <p data-bbox="300 315 1393 445">Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that the Cold War began as a result of a propaganda war that developed between the United States and the Soviet Union after the Second World War. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 461 1409 898" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 461 1409 562">• Although somewhat conciliatory at Potsdam, by July 1945, Truman had been convinced by Secretary of State Byrnes that Stalin was purposefully breaking the agreements made at Yalta and needed to be stopped <li data-bbox="347 577 1409 678">• Truman's move away from Roosevelt's belief that Stalin would be open to concession once the world war had ended was unexpectedly reinforced at Potsdam by the views of Bevin, the new Labour British Foreign Secretary <li data-bbox="347 694 1409 795">• Truman provoked Stalin at Potsdam by hints of a new 'super' weapon, and then made US superiority clear by using nuclear weapons against Japan in August 1945 <li data-bbox="347 810 1409 898">• Truman failed to comprehend that, despite the horrific impact, Stalin would be more likely to stand up to the US once it had used nuclear weapons and was already actively seeking to develop a Soviet weapon.

Section B: Indicative content

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 how accurate it is to say that under President Kennedy (1961-63) there was a significant change in US-Soviet relations from the US-Soviet relations that existed under President Eisenhower (1953-60).</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that under President Kennedy (1961-63) there was a significant change in US-Soviet relations from the US-Soviet relations that existed under President Eisenhower (1953-60) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• On coming to power in 1961, President Kennedy's rhetoric and actions, e.g. his inaugural address, his sponsorship of the Bay of Pigs invasion, indicated a more hostile stance towards the expansion of Soviet influence• Relations changed between the leaders; Khrushchev was no longer dealing with a President from the more familiar age of the early development of the Cold War but with a self-declared representative of a 'New Frontier'• After the 1961 Vienna Summit, Khrushchev appeared to be more willing to move away from his policy of peaceful co-existence, particularly over Berlin. Khrushchev perceived Kennedy to be too young and inexperienced• Kennedy's apparent commitment to preventing the advance of communist influence, wherever the US perceived it to exist, increased the global extent of US-Soviet hostility, e.g. Asia, Africa• The increasing hostility of 1961-62 led to the first immediate threat to the US mainland from the USSR and real likelihood of nuclear confrontation, when the Soviets placed nuclear weapons on Cuba. <p>Arguments and evidence that under President Kennedy (1961-63) there was not a significant change in US-Soviet relations from the US-Soviet relations that existed under President Eisenhower (1953-60) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Under both Presidents, the US viewed the USSR with suspicion and scepticism• Khrushchev remained generally committed to a policy of peaceful co-existence under both Presidents, as indicated by the behind-the-scenes agreements made to resolve the Cuban Missile Crisis• The US-Soviet crises that Kennedy found himself confronted with 1961-63 had already been in the making under Eisenhower, e.g. tensions in Berlin, the U2 incident, postponement of the Paris summit, 1960• US commitment to contain communism globally was constant, e.g. Eisenhower's commitments in Asia and the Bay of Pigs' planning, and did not significantly change, e.g. ground troops were not committed in Asia• The 'shadow of the bomb' across the period meant that both sides ultimately resolved disagreements and crises in such a way that nuclear confrontation was avoided. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
<p>3</p>	<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 whether, in the years 1985-90, the most significant factor in bringing the Cold War to an end was the impact of economic problems within the USSR.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1985-90, the most significant factor in bringing the Cold War to an end was the impact of economic problems within the USSR should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic stagnation after decades of centralisation meant that, in the late 1980s, the Soviet Union had to be realistic that it was unable to finance the technological developments required to maintain its Cold War position • A general decline in the standard of living in the USSR, combined with rising expectations linked to Gorbachev's reforms, increased discontent, forcing the USSR to focus on domestic policies rather than the Cold War • The ongoing Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the Chernobyl crisis (1986) severely depleted Soviet finances, making it more difficult for the USSR to uphold the Brezhnev Doctrine in Eastern Europe • Soviet domestic economic problems meant that the Comecon states were adversely affected by decreasing investment from, and trade with, the USSR, so encouraging Eastern bloc states to look to the West. <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1985-90, other factors were more significant in bringing the Cold War to an end should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of a more positive diplomatic relationship between Western leaders and Gorbachev created a climate in which negotiation and discussion could take place, both at high level and behind the scenes • The military-technological superiority of the USA over the USSR meant that Reagan and Bush were able to make policy and negotiate from a position of strength, in a way that was acceptable to the US public • The appointment of Gorbachev as the Soviet leader in March 1985; early on, he began to restructure Soviet foreign policy, e.g. meeting NATO leaders and Reagan in 1985, and being 'realistic' with the Eastern bloc • The political problems arising from Gorbachev's reforms and the growth of nationalism in the USSR affected Soviet political stability, so undermining the ability of the USSR to concentrate on maintaining the Cold War • The crumbling of communism in the Eastern bloc, originating in Poland in the early 1980s, and particularly the events in East Germany, undermined the foundations of Cold War hostility in Europe • The individual contributions of political leaders and world figures outside of the USA and USSR, e.g. Margaret Thatcher, Deng Xiaoping, Pope John Paul II. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

