Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

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

Summer 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75804A
Publications Code WHI04_1C_2406_MS
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 the post-1945 development of the Cold War can primarily be explained by the US decision to exploit its economic power. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • In response to the economic crisis after the Second World War, the US chose to use its economic power to achieve its foreign policy goals in Western Europe • US policy determined that the reconstruction of western Germany was essential if non-communist Europe was to recover post-1945 • Post-1945, the US began purposefully to move away from a policy of wartime co-operation towards a policy of expanding its economic power to challenge the Soviet Union • The introduction of the Marshall Plan was designed both to prevent communist advances in Western Europe and to promote capitalism. Extract 2 • The primary explanation for the escalation of the Cold War was the commitment of the Soviet Union to an ideological battle of Marxist-Leninist communism against the threat of capitalism • There was nothing that US leaders could do to prevent the development of the Cold War because, gripped by their ideology, Soviet leaders were convinced that the US was determined to destroy the Soviet Union • As a result of their ideology, the Soviets viewed every American action as being purposefully harmful to the existence of the Soviet Union • The expansion of Soviet Power was driven by the Soviet belief that all societies were destined to become communist. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the post-1945 development of the Cold War can primarily be explained by the US decision to exploit its economic power. Relevant points may include: • The US ended the Second World War as the dominant economic power in the world; the mainland US had not been subject to direct war damage and its economy had expanded as a result of supplying the war effort • US policymakers viewed the post-war world as a potential lucrative market both in terms of the need to reconstruct and as a consumer of US export goods • President Roosevelt had envisaged a post-war environment of continued co-operation amongst the Grand Alliance but President Truman,

Question	Indicative content
	particularly after 1946, became more inclined to challenge the Soviet state • The Marshall Plan came into action in April 1948 and for four years provided aid to reconstruct war-torn Europe. It was offered to all countries in Europe regardless of the ideology of the government • The Cold War 1948-49 crisis in Berlin was directly related to US use of its economic power in western Germany; in response to the impact of reconstruction policies Stalin attempted to cut off supplies to West Berlin. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the post-1945 development of the Cold War can primarily be explained by the US decision to exploit its economic power. Relevant points may include: • As the Second World War drew to a close, the Soviets began to encourage communist-controlled governments in Eastern Europe and to argue for a Soviet, and so communist, 'sphere of influence' to be established • From 1945, US foreign policy, e.g. over Germany, Poland, Japan, was increasingly seen by Stalin as aggressive; this was compounded by US unilateral development of the A-bomb and the 'betrayal' of socialist Britain • Stalin rejected the offer of Marshall Plan aid as a capitalist expansionist tool and ordered the communist-led government in Czechoslovakia to withdraw from the Plan, after its initial acceptance • The Soviets used international organisations such as Cominform (1947) and Comecon (1949) to spread the influence of Soviet communist political and economic principles • In the years 1945-50, the Soviet Union consolidated its control over Eastern Europe and began to spread its political influence into the Middle East, e.g. Iran, and Asia, e.g. Korea.

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 progress in détente between the superpowers in the 1970s was due mainly to the impact of the Vietnam conflict. Arguments and evidence that progress in détente between the superpowers in the 1970s was due mainly to the impact of the Vietnam conflict should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The material and psychological impact on America of fighting a 'hot war' in Vietnam meant that American governments in the 1970s looked to détente, rather than containment, as a foreign policy goal • In the early 1970s, President Nixon hoped that improving relations with Communist China would aid in persuading the North Vietnamese to agree to a final resolution of the war in Vietnam • With the American withdrawal from Vietnam, there was less chance that events would escalate into a full-scale global confrontation and greater reason for the superpowers to work together • All of the superpowers had effectively wasted vast amounts of money on a war that had brought little overall advantage to any of them and at a time of growing economic problems; détente now seemed more cost effective. Arguments and evidence that progress in détente between the superpowers in the 1970s was due mainly to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Fear of the consequences of nuclear proliferation led to arms negotiations and agreements to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, e.g. SALT 1 • The cost of the arms race encouraged the superpowers to come to arms limitation agreements • The Sino-Soviet conflict (1969) meant that both China and the Soviet Union were open to improving their relations with the United States • The Soviet Union was more amenable to co-operation in the 1970s in response to the political tensions in Eastern Europe in the late 1960s and growing economic problems, e.g. the need to import food • General economic problems in the early 1970s, such as an energy crisis and production downturns, saw the superpowers look increasingly to co-operation rather than confrontation • Superpower leaders were willing to engage in détente, e.g. US President Nixon visited Russia and China in 1972, while Russian leaders visited Washington in 1973. 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 Reagan was more influential than Gorbachev in the developments in the 1980s leading to the end of the Cold War. Arguments and evidence that Reagan was more influential than Gorbachev in the developments in the 1980s leading to the end of the Cold War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Reagan's move away from détente in the early 1980s, and his development of the SDI initiative, put further pressure on the USSR at a time when it was experiencing political and economic pressures of its own • Reagan directed his foreign policy to undermine the Soviet Union in key areas of the world, e.g. supporting anti-communists in Latin America and Africa, Afghanistan, missiles in the UK • In 1985, Reagan showed willingness to meet the new Soviet leader in Geneva and to commit to attempts to come to agreements over arms reduction • Reagan's rhetorical challenges to Soviet power over Eastern Europe gave promise to those seeking an end to Soviet control, e.g. his 'tear down' the Berlin Wall speech (1987) • Reagan's willingness, along with his political ally, Thatcher, to negotiate with Gorbachev in the years 1985-88 gave Gorbachev confidence to follow his own policies of moving away from Soviet control over Eastern Europe • Reagan had a genuine fear of the consequences of nuclear war and his policies reflected this. Arguments and evidence that Gorbachev was more influential than Reagan in the developments in the 1980s leading to the end of the Cold War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • When Gorbachev came to power in 1985, he believed that in order to overcome Soviet domestic problems, particularly economic stagnation, the Soviet Union would need to concentrate less on its external security • Gorbachev's foreign policy of 'new thinking' looked to the potential of co-operation and negotiation with the West over arms control and military expansion • Gorbachev's personality, and apparent commitment to pragmatism, contributed to a developing relationship with Western leaders, particularly Reagan and Thatcher, which meant that progress could be made • Gorbachev's replacement of the Brezhnev Doctrine with the 'Sinatra' Doctrine meant that the Soviet Union was no longer willing to underwrite the leaders of Eastern Europe, e.g. visit to Berlin, October 1989 • Gorbachev was prominent in the political events in Eastern Europe, e.g. the rapid reunification of Germany in 1990, and the beginning of the collapse of the Soviet Union, which led to the final thaw in the Cold War • Reagan's presidency came to an end in 1989 and so it was President Bush, rather than Reagan himself, who was directly involved in the negotiations and agreements that brought the Cold War to an end. 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