



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 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

Summer 2025

Question Paper Log Number P76472

Publication Code: WHI04_1C_2506_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.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

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
	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's decision to reject Marshall Aid was the most significant development in the Cold War division of Europe 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 announcement of the Marshall Plan in June 1946 led to the decisive moment in dividing Europe. It was a symbol of US foreign policy intent in Europe politically, economically and psychologically. • Marshall Aid was offered to all countries in Europe but Marshall had already expected, and even possibly planned, for the Soviets and their satellites to reject it • Stalin's refusal of Marshall Aid reflected his fear that the USA would use its offer of economic aid to undermine Soviet political control over eastern Europe • Stalin's decision to refuse Marshall Aid effectively prevented any future Western influence over the eastern European satellite states and so led to the fundamental division of Europe in two. Extract 2 • Stalin's blockade of the western zone of Berlin in June 1948 was a major challenge to the Western powers in Europe • The successful use of a massive airlift to overcome Stalin's Berlin blockade resulted in a great boost for the Western powers in Europe and a major setback for Stalin • The blockade led to actions that indicated that Western mistrust of Russia was growing, e.g. the North Atlantic Treaty, and Soviet reaction, e.g. the creation of an East German state • The impact of the blockade led directly to the fundamental division of Europe at all possible levels of international relations by the autumn of 1949. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Stalin's decision to reject Marshall Aid was the most significant development in the Cold War division of Europe in the years 1947-49. Relevant points may include: • The offer of Marshall Aid put Stalin in a very difficult position, as the USSR had been economically devastated by war and was in no position to offer aid itself; Stalin took economic reparations from Germany • The economic division of Europe was decided by events in Czechoslovakia, where initial acceptance of the offer of aid was withdrawn when Stalin's

Question	Indicative content
	complete refusal was extended to the whole Soviet 'sphere of influence' • Stalin's decision to reject Marshall Aid increased ideological differences, with the perception that Europe was divided into a 'Soviet sphere' of predatory control and a 'Western sphere' of progress and liberty • The reluctant decisions of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Finland not to accept Marshall Aid meant that the Churchill's Iron Curtain speech in March 1946 had been fully realised. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Stalin's decision to reject Marshall Aid was the most significant development in the Cold War division of Europe in the years 1947-49. Relevant points may include: • In 1948, the wartime alliance had not completely broken down and was still co-operating to some degree with regard to the post-war occupation zones • Stalin's decision to blockade Berlin in reaction to the attempts of the Western powers to unify western Germany economically appeared at the time as a watershed moment for post-Second World War Europe • The co-operative use of an airlift as a physical defiance of the blockade enabled the Western powers' future commitment to a military defence of Europe, with the creation of NATO and the clear armed division of Europe • The creation of the FRG on 1 September 1949 and the GDR on 7 October 1949, with Berlin a part of both, established clearly the political and ideological division of Cold War Europe for the foreseeable future.

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 the extent to which Khrushchev was successful in achieving his foreign policy objective of peaceful coexistence with the USA in the years 1953-64. Arguments and evidence that Khrushchev was successful in achieving his foreign policy objective of peaceful coexistence with the USA in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • A peaceful co-existence along the European Iron Curtain was established for much of the period with the agreement over Austria, recognition of West Germany and the limited response of the USA to events in Hungary • The outcome of the establishment of the Warsaw Pact in 1955 essentially created an armed, but defensive, balance of power in Europe that maintained a coexistence without recourse to hostilities • The ceasefire agreement in Korea signed in 1953 was the epitome of an agreement for 'peaceful coexistence', despite not formally bringing the war to an end • The development of the 'Geneva spirit', while Eisenhower was US President, was based on east-west summit diplomacy with Khrushchev visiting the USA and Vice President Nixon visiting Moscow in 1959 • Even when tensions arose, the final outcomes effectively maintained a status quo, e.g. the building of the Berlin Wall (1961), missiles removed from both Cuba and Turkey in 1962 after the Cuban Missile Crisis. Arguments and evidence that Khrushchev was not successful in achieving his foreign policy objective of peaceful coexistence with the USA in the years 1953-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both sides continued to promote technological and military developments that produced tensions and accelerated the nuclear arms race, e.g. the launch of Sputnik (1957), the hydrogen bomb and ICBMs • Ideological differences continued to promote tensions as both the USSR and the USA were determined to extend their spheres of influence, and this expanded Cold War differences into Asia, the Americas and Africa • The US provoked tensions that had the potential to undermine attempts at peaceful coexistence, e.g. the U2 spy plane incident (1960), the more combative approach of the new US President, Kennedy, after 1960 • Khrushchev's own actions undermined the possibilities for peaceful coexistence, e.g. Khrushchev's rhetoric over Berlin 1960-61, placing nuclear missiles on the island of Cuba in 1962 • From 1960, the summit diplomacy of the 'Geneva spirit' rapidly fell apart; the Paris summit with Eisenhower collapsed in 1960 and the Vienna summit with Kennedy in 1961 was a diplomatic disaster. 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 relations between the superpowers significantly improved in the years 1964-79. Arguments and evidence that relations between the superpowers significantly improved in the years 1964-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Fear of nuclear confrontation and the concept of MAD saw the USA and USSR become involved in discussions and agreements to limit nuclear expansion, e.g. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, SALT I and SALT II • Under Nixon, diplomatic relations improved between the USA and the USSR, with leadership visits in 1972, 1973 and 1974, and between the USA and China, with the ground-breaking Nixon visit to Beijing in 1972 • Trade negotiations took place between the USA and USSR that resulted in agreements, such as the export of US wheat to Russia • The USA and the USSR both signed up to the Helsinki Accords that brought agreement over the Cold War borders of Europe and acknowledged the permanent division of Germany • Cultural and technological ties were forged between the USA and China, e.g. table tennis team exchanges, and between the USA and the USSR, e.g. Apollo-Soyuz co-operation over space exploration. Arguments and evidence that relations between the superpowers did not significantly improve in the years 1964-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Military tensions both in the development of nuclear and conventional weaponry continued, e.g. China became a fully-fledged nuclear military power, US testing of a neutron bomb • All three superpowers increasingly intervened in independence and power struggles across the world, deploying military and ideological support that brought them into conflict in virtual 'wars by proxy', e.g. southern Africa • The US remained vocal in criticising both the Soviet Union and China over human rights issues, and the Soviet Union over its direct actions in European Eastern bloc countries, e.g. response to the Prague Spring • Relations between China and the Soviet Union remained tense throughout the period, e.g. the Soviet Union felt threatened by China's nuclear deterrent and its rapprochement with the USA, the border conflict of 1969 • In the 1970s, Soviet politicians who believed that the USSR should take a more hard-line direction to foreign policy with the USA became more influential and attitudes towards détente became less favourable • By end of the period, the era of détente was under severe strain as the situation in areas such as Iran, Afghanistan, Central America and Cambodia made it difficult to maintain good relations, e.g. SALT II. Other relevant material must be credited.

