Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04)

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 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75145A
Publications Code WHI04_1C_MS_2401
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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 Stalin was to blame for 'the post-Second World War breakdown in co-operation between the Big Three wartime allies'. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • It was Stalin's decisions as leader of the Soviet government that can be blamed for the post-War breakdown relations between the Soviet Union, the USA and Britain • The USA was supportive of co-operation, and this can be seen by the initial decision to open up Marshall Aid recovery payments to all European nations • It was Stalin who began the Cold War by the decisions he made to reject a range of economic and military initiatives to encourage co-operation in 1946, and his rejection of Marshall Aid in 1947 • In 1947–48, the Soviets began an active policy of aggression on a global scale. Extract 2 • At the end of the War, Stalin wanted to co-operate with the USA, and it was not Soviet policy to create an environment of hostility with the West • The new US President was not as determined as Stalin was to resolve issues without conflict and was determined to promote US supremacy in a post-War world • Truman projected a policy of US strength from the beginning and, by 1946, Truman's foreign policy had developed into one of an ideological war against the USSR and the spread of communism across the globe • Truman carried out policies that provoked Stalin, such as cancelling aid and attempting to undermine the previous agreement between Stalin and Churchill to establish post-war spheres of influence in Europe. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Stalin was to blame for 'the post-Second World War breakdown in co-operation between the Big Three wartime allies'. Relevant points may include: • Stalin was determined to be proactive in protecting the future security of the Soviet Union. Stalin maintained a Soviet military presence in Europe and was able to take advantage of the rapid demobilisation of US troops • In February 1946, Stalin made a public speech in Moscow in which he made it clear that communism and capitalism were fundamentally opposed and indicated that, as such, a future war was a probability

Question	Indicative content
	• Stalin refused almost all overtures of co-operation from the USA. He rejected the 1946 Baruch plan for the oversight of the future development of nuclear weapons and planned a Soviet version of Marshall Aid • In the years 1946–48, the Soviet Union intervened in or looked to influence the political situation across the globe, e.g. Berlin, Czechoslovakia, Iran, China, creating concern amongst its old allies. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Stalin was to blame for 'the post-Second World War breakdown in co-operation between the Big Three wartime allies'. Relevant points may include: • Truman felt that he could make his mark, as a new presence in the alliance, by being less accommodating than Roosevelt, who had been committed to a policy of co-operation and negotiation with Stalin • Truman's aggressive attitude and dismissive tone with Soviet Foreign Minister, Molotov, at a meeting in April 1945, was a provocation to Stalin • The seeds of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan were sown in 1947, so indicating that the USA was willingly involved in an ideological battle with the Soviet Union for global influence • Stalin was particularly frustrated by Truman's attempt, along with Churchill, to undermine the concept of spheres of influence in Europe; the suggestion had come from Churchill and Stalin had complied in Greece • Others were to blame: the new British Labour government was unexpectedly hostile towards Stalin; it was Molotov not Stalin who promoted a Soviet hard-line; out-of-office Churchill antagonised Stalin.

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, in the years 1953–62, summit meetings and official visits did more to hinder than to help US-Soviet relations. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1953–62, summit meetings and official visits did more to hinder than to help US-Soviet relations should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Success often depended on the personalities of the leaders involved, and so could exacerbate existing tensions, e.g. Vice President Nixon's 'kitchen debate' with Khrushchev in Moscow, June 1959 • The Paris Summit (1960) led to a deterioration in US-Soviet relations, as the failure of Eisenhower to apologise for the U2-spy plane incident, scuppered potential agreements on nuclear weapons, Berlin and Cuba • The Vienna Summit (1961) failed to achieve any notable Cold War agreements, particularly in relation to Berlin and Cuba, and led to both the USA and USSR becoming more entrenched in mutual hostility • The Vienna Summit (1961) may have contributed to both the Berlin Wall and the Cuban Missile Crisis, as Khrushchev came away from the meeting believing that Kennedy was a naïve politician who could be brow-beaten • During the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), it was the backdoor channels of communication to the Soviets rather than official meetings, e.g. Gromyko, Dobrynin, that led to the breakthrough in events. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1953–62, summit meetings and official visits did more to help than to hinder US-Soviet relations should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Geneva Summit (1955) was the first time since the development of the Cold War that the major powers were able to come together to discuss areas of strategic interest and concern • The Geneva Summit (1955) created a sense of relative optimism for future discussions, introduced leaders to each other and opened lines of communication at a time of high tension in the post-Stalin Cold War • The visits of high-ranking government officials from both the USA and the USSR to each other's countries at a time of high nuclear tension brought the hope that détente might be achievable • Khrushchev's official visit to the USA in September 1959 was seen by many as heralding the continuation of the 'Geneva spirit' of 1955 and paved the way for future talks about the situation in Berlin • These types of meetings allowed both the personal behind-the-scenes relationships between key figures and lower diplomatic communications to be established that could be useful at times of crisis. 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 Mao Zedong had only a limited influence on the shaping of superpower relations in the years 1953–76. Arguments and evidence that Mao Zedong had only a limited influence on the shaping of superpower relations in the years 1953–76 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The USA's insistence on not recognising the legitimacy of Mao's China in the 1950s and 60s meant that Mao's influence on higher level diplomacy was limited • Communist China's absence from the UN until 1971 meant the Mao rarely had the opportunity to participate in, or contribute to, wider global influences shaping superpower relations • Mao's influence on the overall geographical spectrum of Cold War relations was less significant than that of Soviet and US leaders, who directly impacted developments in both Europe and Asia more concretely • Mao's direct personal influence on tripartite superpower relations lasted only a relatively short time, from c1969–c1974 • In the very last years of Mao's rule, his deteriorating health and grasp of political control in China meant that his influence declined. Arguments and evidence that Mao Zedong strongly influenced the shaping of superpower relations in the years 1953–76 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Mao's decision to 'open up' China diplomatically in the early 1970s brought ground-breaking changes to superpower relations; US President Nixon's visit to China in 1972 dramatically changed the diplomatic landscape • Without Mao's involvement, the détente of the 1970s would have been almost impossible to achieve. Mao's policies brought improved US-Sino relations and US-Soviet relations • Mao, as a high-profile communist leader, affected the overall tenor of US Cold War policy superpower throughout the period; US policy always had to be based on the existence of a tripartite superpower environment • Mao's relationship with the Soviet Union was central to superpower relations; the more positive relationship of the 1950s fuelled US fears of communist expansion while the Sino-Soviet rift aided détente in the 1970s • Mao's foreign policy decisions had a global impact in relation to Cold War developments. China became directly and indirectly involved in the Cold War in South-East Asia and in the wars-by-proxy being fought in Africa. 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