



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
In History (WHI04) Paper 1D
International Study with Historical Interpretations
The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945-90

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 2018

Publications Code WHI04_1D_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Unit 4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945-90

Introduction

Please note: that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within WHI04 1A-1D and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also highly recommended that centres read the general Introduction and Section A and B introductions in the Principal Examiner Reports for June 2017. These generic introductions outline the assessment requirements for WHI04 and give an indication of the skills required.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

2018 is the second June series of the WHI04 paper. There has been an increase in entries over this time period and it is clear that the majority of centres have taken note of the feedback provided in previous Principal Examiner reports. Candidates were usually well prepared in relation to knowledge of the specification and centres are to be commended for this. Candidates have good knowledge and they often include material which is interesting and thought provoking. Many responses were well-informed and well-written. There was a definite improvement in the understanding and appreciation of the skills required for the Section A Historical Interpretation question which assesses AO3/AO1. Section B responses were also generally stronger with many more responses clearly showing the qualities of Level 4, and indeed Level 5. However, lower Level responses continue to exhibit the weaknesses highlighted last year in regard to a lack of focus on the wording of the question and/or the second-order concept being targeted and a tendency for candidates to write about everything they know rather than to select material relevant to the question.

It is worth noting that the responses are marked using a 'best-fit' process. Each bullet point strand within the generic mark scheme is considered to create an overall sense of Level and a mark applied within the Level. If a response has qualities which exemplify a variety of Levels or a strand is missing then this will be reflected by applying a 'best-fit' Level and mark. For responses which do not address one particular strand, for example a lack of contextual knowledge for Section A Strand 2, it is not possible to reward the strand and so this will be reflected in the mark rewarded.

There is also a tendency for a significant minority of candidates to write responses which seem to thread their knowledge into the language of the mark schemes. The descriptors reflect the qualities examiners would expect to see in

an essay answering the question set rather than a scaffold on which responses should be built. It is the examiner who determines whether criteria are valid or if the analysis is sustained rather than the candidate by asserting 'so it can be seen by the valid criteria I have used...' or ' In conclusion, this sustained analysis...'. This does not necessarily add value to the response and can be detrimental if this assertion is clearly not substantiated. This is also the case in responses that assert 'It is a compelling argument...' when that argument is not well organised or even contradicts itself.

Once again, candidates were, in general, clearly aware of both the structure and the timing of the examination paper; there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A and B.

General candidate performance on each Section and specific performance on individual questions for Paper 1D are considered below.

Section A

It was genuinely pleasing to see the improvement in the application and understanding of the skills required to answer the Interpretation question successfully. There were clearly more responses being rewarded Level 4 and some excellent responses in Level 5. There is sufficient time to read the extracts carefully and plan an answer (see below) but some high Level responses reflected an outstanding ability to address the viewpoint through superb analysis of the interpretations presented while integrating detailed historical knowledge in the time provided. The best responses are invariably those that are built around the views expressed in the extracts throughout the response. These responses were often thoughtful discussions of the viewpoint in the question and resulted in interesting answers that were very enjoyable to read.

The question requires candidates to make a judgement on a stated viewpoint, through the analysis of two extracts from historical works which address the historical issue and their own knowledge of the historical debate. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the three bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- interpretation and analysis of extracts
- deployment of knowledge of issues related to the debate
- evaluation of and judgement about the interpretations

The best responses reflected the qualities of each strand outlined in the Level 4 and Level 5 descriptors. However, it is worth noting that, although some candidates now clearly better understand what is required and write answers that can achieve Level 4, there are many candidates failing to reach high Level 4 or Level 5 because they are writing very long responses that include everything

they know and develop a confused or contradictory argument/overall judgement as a result. There is sufficient time to plan a response of sufficient length which interprets the extracts with 'confidence and discrimination' and in which the knowledge is 'sufficient' and 'precisely selected and deployed' to explore the view under debate.

There are also some candidates who are able to access Level 4/Level 5 for interpretation and analysis of the extracts but who either do not deploy knowledge of the issues related to the debate or do not come to a judgement in relation to the view in the question. Many responses reflected a structure that analysed Extract 1 and Extract 2 with some skill but then wrote a conclusion which just restated an understanding of the view in Extract 1 and the view in Extract 2 without coming to a judgment at all – so making it difficult to reward strand 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates exhibited great knowledge of the debate central to the overall focus of the question but ignored the extracts altogether perhaps referring to them briefly to exemplify a point being made.

There are still a significant number of candidates whose responses reflect the qualities outlined in the lower Levels of the mark scheme. These responses often showed the following characteristics:

- answering the question without reference to the extracts at all or only using the views implicitly
- paraphrasing the extracts or just stringing together quotations from the extracts using connecting words or terms
- do not include any relevant historical knowledge to support the analysis
- use AO2 skills of source analysis to evaluate the extracts with regard to aspects of provenance.

Candidates at all Levels tend towards using the term 'source' rather than 'extract' when referring to the material under discussion. If candidates are to see the material as interpretations, rather than sources of evidence, centres should encourage candidates to refer to Extract 1 or Extract 2 or the names of the authors. Candidates should be encouraged to see the sources evaluated in WHI02 and WHI03 as the building blocks which create the interpretations and views being discussed in WHI04. One extract will mainly reflect the view given in the question statement while the other will mainly reflect a counter argument to be discussed in the course of coming to an overall judgement.

As in the previous Reports please note the guidance given in the *Getting Started* document. *Students are not expected to be familiar with the writing of the selected historians but they should be familiar with the issues that make the question controversial. Reference to the works of name historians, other than the material in the extracts provided is not expected but students may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their arguments.*

Once again, many candidates appeared to create their discussion by reference to only the first few lines of each extract and so lost an opportunity to develop key points made later in the extracts. Candidates have sufficient time to consider the extracts carefully and to draw out a variety of different key points in order to compare and contrast the interpretations presented.

Finally, centres should note that the response is set up for candidates to discuss the view put forward in the question in relation to the views being expressed in the extracts rather than using the extracts to exemplify the debate.

Q1

There were some excellent responses to this question which were both thought provoking and really pleasing to read. As with the previous series candidates for this Option were almost universally well-prepared in relation to both their knowledge and understanding. Candidates were clearly aware of different views and the best responses were able to deploy this in discussing the extracts and using their understanding to reach a judgement on the view stated in the question. Fewer candidates ignored the view stated in the question and went on to develop a discussion of the stated view reflected in the extracts provided. A small number of candidates, however, wrote long responses which could have been more effective with some judicious planning. In general, though centres are providing candidates with excellent knowledge of the debates surrounding the Korean War.

Most responses were able to contrast the view in Extract 1 that it was MacArthur who was responsible/took advantage of the situation to widen the war in Korea with the view in Extract 2 that MacArthur did not have the power to widen the war and that the responsibility lay in Washington. Some responses were able to show that both Extracts suggested to some extent that the reality lay somewhere in between.

Many candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to explain and evaluate the views presented. Candidates used their knowledge of MacArthur's actions prior to September 1950 to exemplify and discuss the suggestion of MacArthur's arrogant attitude in Extract 1 and the events post-September 1950 to explain the actions of the UN and the Truman administration identified in Extract 2.

When the Korean War broke out in 1950 and Kim Il Sung launched his attack on ~~South~~ Seoul. The Americans were taken by ~~soft~~ surprise, however due to the fact that they were ~~ill~~ ~~can~~ ~~structuring~~ ~~to~~ = Japan they could mobilise troops into Korea relatively fast. Along with the troops General MacArthur was sent in to deal with the situation. He was told by Truman and his administration to push the troops out of North Korea but what ~~was~~ MacArthur ended up doing was something completely different.

Extract 1 is from a book called "The Korean War" which was published in 2004 and it talks about a meeting that was between MacArthur and president

Truman. In this meeting what happened was that ~~Dr.~~ Mac Arthur gave a report to Truman, informing the president about what was happening in Korea and how the war was going to be over by Christmas. This made the president confident in MacArthur's leadership and decisions in the Korean war. Mac Arthur took this as a sign that the president allowed him to do as he pleased in Korea. Another part of Mac Arthur's report that ~~made~~ increased Truman's confidence in him was that Mac Arthur assured Truman that Soviet or Chinese intervention was impossible. Due to the trust the president had in Mac Arthur, ~~Mac Ar~~ he decided ~~to~~ Mac Arthur thought he could do as he pleased in Korea. So after the meeting Mac Arthur changed his orders and decided to march on the Yalu river which

would spell doom for America
in the Korean war. MacArthur's decision

3

Turn over ▶

To March all the way up to the
38th parallel and get close to
the Yalu river was not solely
his decision. A little known fact
is that Jiang Kai-shek pushed
MacArthur to launch an attack deep
into North Korea. The disgraced
past leader of China thought that
if the Chinese are busy fighting
America, and while they were busy
we could re take what he considered
rightfully U.S. ~~AND~~ MacArthur
loved this idea, being an Asian
first he loved the idea that
an American ally could re take
~~the~~ Communist China. It can
be clearly seen that ^{extract} source 1

Supports the argument that MacArthur was responsible for widening the Korean War.

Extract 2 is from a book called "MacArthur and the Korean War" it is written by D Clayton James and was published in 2001 as well. This extract states that MacArthur

4

was not involved in the decision making that unleashed all the forces to the 38th parallel. And this is very debatable, because it is a known fact that MacArthur ordered the advance on ~~South~~ the 38th parallel and the Yalu river. Throughout this extract it can be seen that the author is extremely biased towards MacArthur and states that China's entry into the war was not his fault.

The United Nations passed a resolution that called for the reunification of Korea by force, This too can be linked to Mac Arthur, since Mac Arthur pushed for this resolution to be passed. Moreover while all this was happening Mac Arthur left Truman and his administration in the dark, So the next point extract = makes is very strange it states that the decision to seize North Korea came from Washington, which it was very likely that the Republicans made this decision without Truman and

his administration knowing about it, ~~to~~ because when Truman got word of MacArthur crossing the 38th parallel he was furious ~~at~~ with MacArthur. Officially Truman made no such order that would allow MacArthur to invade north Korea and unify Korea by force. Although it wouldn't be all that so surprising if Truman did in reality issue this order due to him being one of the biggest advocates of anti-communism and the inventor of the Domino theory. However Truman really wanted to avoid ~~conflicts~~ with China ~~or~~ the USSR, so it is safe to say that this information is at least partially incorrect. Extract 2 unlike extract 1 takes MacArthur's side in this argument and provides information that contradicts what is stated in ^{extract} source 1. What truly happened ~~is a very~~ behind closed doors is a mystery, ~~but~~ however MacArthur defying Truman's orders to push the Korean Communist back

into North Korea ~~was~~ and then
Stop the charge is a fact and
there are multiple sources
proving that it was so.

The two extracts do not share
the same views, as a matter
of fact they contradict each other's
views and it is very likely that
the information in extract two
is not entirely correct. It can be
seen that extract 1 is more
neutral yet still supporting Truman
while extract 2 was probably
written by a conservative / Republican
and is completely biased towards
MacArthur and is quick to blame
Truman for the ~~the~~ events that
transpired in Korea.

To conclude The ^{theory} fact that Mac Arthur was mainly responsible for the escalation of the Korea war is ~~often~~ mostly correct. He invaded the Yalu river without permission and caused the Chinese to enter

7

Turn over ►

The war However ~~some~~ some blame can be put on other people such as Truman not paying enough attention in Korea and therefore letting this happen and the fact that Chiang Kai-shek pushed Mac Arthur to do it. In the end Mac Arthur is the main reason for the escalation of the Korean war, but he's not the only reason.

This is a low Level 4 response. It mainly has qualities of Level 3 and but there are sufficient Level 4 qualities in the analysis of the extracts and the supporting historical context to bring the response into Level 4. This response follows a structure that exemplifies different elements of the mark scheme rather than combining them. In the introduction the context is provided rather than the view brought under discussion, each extract is then analysed and considered with regard to the view (there are hints of the candidate attempting AO2 analysis as well), the views in the two extracts briefly considered and a judgement reached. High Level 4 and Level 5 responses require these elements to be combined. It is also worth noting that many responses using this structure remained in Level 3 because they stopped at the summary of the two extracts without reaching a judgement.

To a large extent, I agree with the view that General MacArthur was mainly responsible for widening the war in Korea after South Korea had been retaken due to his Inchon landing with 70,000 US soldiers, he was able to push ~~through~~ past the 38th parallel.

^{Historian} Catchpole believed that MacArthur was mainly responsible for widening ~~the~~ the war due to his powerful military status. ~~Alternately~~ ~~James~~ Historian James believed that MacArthur was 'not involved in the decision-making' for the widening of the Korean war. Both historians, however, overlooked the roles of China and USSR in widening the war for their own benefits.

General MacArthur was mainly responsible for the escalation as ^{But it was Truman administration that was responsible.} ~~James~~ ^{Catchpole} stated that he ran the war 'with minimal reference to the UN... or his President'. This ~~is backed up~~ point is valid as MacArthur had an extremely arrogant military leadership style as described as ~~many~~ many due to his past success at ~~defending~~ defending Japan in WW2. ~~He~~ His powerful position made it hard for many officials or military advisors to speak/act against him. Thus, he was able to ~~plan~~ the organise the plans for the invasion of North Korea. For example, he went against

military ~~experts~~ advice and executed the Inchon landing, which was a ~~surprise~~ surprise attack on the North Koreans and US troops were able to push back ~~of~~ from the Pusan Perimeter. However, ~~it was~~ ^{the} ~~fact~~ ^{that} ~~MacArthur~~ ^{MacArthur} overlooked the fact that it was actually Truman who instructed MacArthur to communicate to Washington directly instead of with the UN as Truman did not pay much attention to the UN except from using UN to legitimate elections in Korea. James ~~to~~ ~~in~~ ~~fact~~ ~~disagreed~~ with ~~MacArthur~~ ^{MacArthur} as he claimed that 'MacArthur never created the policy made in Washington to seize North Korea! This is supported by the fact that Truman was indeed under great domestic pressure to employ his policy of containment ~~to~~ to show his anti-communist credentials. He was attacked by the Republicans who accused him for losing China and the ~~Philippines~~ ^{Philippines} and felt bound to follow and act far his deep description of communism as a 'terrifying evil' as stated in the Truman's doctrine. This possibly caused Truman to make a more ~~drastic~~ ^{drastic} measure against the expansion of communism in Korea ~~and~~ and allowed MacArthur to encourage him to change his policy of containment ~~of~~ to 'Rollback'. This ~~means that~~ ~~MacArthur~~ ^{MacArthur} suggests that ~~although Truman did~~ ~~James did~~ ~~make~~ ~~a~~ ~~valid~~ ~~point~~ in suggesting that the ~~policy~~ ^{policy} change should ^{be} ~~have~~ ~~look~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Truman~~ ~~administration~~ ~~in~~ ~~Washington~~, ~~not~~ ~~MacArthur's~~ ~~office~~ ~~in~~ ~~Tokyo~~ ~~as~~ ~~Truman~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~President~~ and his ~~was~~ had the final decision ^{making} ~~was~~ ~~made~~ ~~in~~ ~~Washington~~. However.

It can also be argued that it was MacArthur's great influence ~~that result~~ and his obvious popularity with the public (as can be seen in the ticker-tape parades in NYC after he returned to the US) that ~~made~~ persuaded and pressured Truman into expanding the war.

However, it can also be argued that it wasn't MacArthur's ~~adv~~ that expanded the war as ~~For~~ James argued that Truman ~~was the~~ administration was the 'decision makers behind the startling change in policy'. This was supported by the fact that Truman had the power to fire MacArthur ~~whenever he wanted or~~ before things escalated but didn't do so. This suggests that Truman agreed with MacArthur's aim to 'to repel armed ~~force~~ forces and restore peace' in Korea. ~~As~~ Catchpole agreed that he stated that Truman 'told the American people that there was "complete unity" between him and General MacArthur' and he highly praised 'MacArthur's reading of the military situation'. This shows that Truman actually was behind the decision-making as he had a huge involvement in changing policy. However, Catchpole challenged ~~his~~ his own ~~point~~ point as he also said that 'Although Truman was commander-in-chief he did not get a salute from MacArthur when they met'. This highlighted ~~the~~ the tensions between MacArthur and Truman as ~~they did not~~ disagreements on the policies and the extent of the war can be seen in the several cases of MacArthur's memorandums!

MacArthur made a Republican Congress man ~~to~~ read out his letter publicly, in which, he opposed Truman's idea of a 'limited war' and he supported the use of atomic weaponry. This emphasised an MacArthur's aggression as he wanted to involve Tring's forces from Truman and expand the war into a 'total war' and to 'nukes' China. If it wasn't for Truman's dismissal of MacArthur, the war would have widened even more under MacArthur's leadership, showing that Truman was actually ~~reluctant~~ reluctant to give MacArthur permission to ~~to~~ cross the 38th parallel, thus suggesting that it ~~was~~ mainly MacArthur's responsibility that the war was widened. Furthermore, James ~~stated~~ ^{advised} that ~~that~~ ^{one of} the 'the significant escalations of the Korean war' was 'intensifying the UN forces' invasion of North Korea'. ~~and~~ His point is illustrated as there were ~~14~~ ^{here} 14 members of the UN who ~~then~~ ^{here} ~~were~~ involved in the war, in which, most ~~only~~ ^{supplied} supplied food and transportation rather than military aids. US and South Korean troops took up 90% of the total troops fighting against North Korea. This means that UN forces were extremely insignificant ~~that~~ and that it was mainly the US troops, who were under MacArthur's leadership, that escalated the war.

In conclusion, ~~MacArthur was mainly responsible for~~ ^{catching emphasised on MacArthur's ^{aggressive and ~~dismissive~~} military} leadership during the Korean war, which greatly contributed to the expansion of the war as he felt that

'He had a free hand in Korea' and MacArthur's determination to advance to the Yalu, ~~causing~~ resulting in the involvement of the Chinese. On the other hand, James argued that Truman administration was behind the scheme of the widening of the war as MacArthur communicated to Washington about his plans and executed under Truman's policy. Both historians overlooked the ^{contribution} fact that of China and USSR in widening the war for their own advantages. China saw the Korean war as a golden chance for him to elevate his international standing, ^{and spread of Maoism} by proving CCP's military competency. This suggests that the ~~those~~ Chinese might have gotten involved in the war ~~regardless~~ of MacArthur's crossing of the 38th parallel. The fact that the Chinese was so prepared to enter the Yalu river with 100,000 men ~~that~~ implies that this was prepared beforehand and that MacArthur was merely fighting an expanded war that was doomed to happen anyway. However, ~~it was~~ ^{the aggression} ~~by~~ of MacArthur greatly encouraged the involvement of China so I ~~argue~~ agree that MacArthur was the person who was mainly responsible for the expansion of the war.

This Level 5 response combines all of the elements into a discursive response that comes to an overall judgement on the view in relation to the interpretations presented in the extracts.

Section B

There was a significant improvement in the quality of the answers produced by candidate this series. In particular, well-informed candidates were more able to respond to the focus of the question directly and to use the wording of the questions to create discussion and debate. There were some knowledgeable and well-organised responses. Once again, there was little evidence to suggest that

the range and depth of essays were affected by the time taken to consider the two extracts in Section A.

It is important to note that questions can cover content which stretches across the key topics as well as within the key topics. In order to ensure that candidates are prepared to answer any question set centres should cover all the content outlined in the specification.

The question requires candidates to explore and discuss the given question while coming to an overall judgement. It is worth reminding centres that the generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks:

- analysis and exploration of key features and characteristics of the period in relation to the second-order conceptual demands of the question
- selection and deployment of knowledge
- substantiated evaluation and judgement
- organisation and communication of argument

Most candidates are clearly well-prepared and have good knowledge of the content of the specification with Strand 1 and Strand 2 often the strongest elements of the responses seen. However, knowledgeable candidates are often writing detailed responses which include too much unfocussed supporting material and which often results in confused or contradictory arguments being developed. Level 5 Strand 2 refers to 'sufficient knowledge precisely selected and deployed'. Good responses are also often undermined by a lack of precision in the use of vocabulary when formulating an argument or establishing valid criteria. Some responses begin every paragraph by saying 'x is significant to some extent...' or 'x is the main reason...' or begin a conclusion by stating that 'I agree with the statement...' and then give an overall judgement that contradicts this. Many responses begin with 'It is a compelling argument...' and then argue the opposite. It is important that judgements are substantiated and arguments developed with logic, coherence and precision and so candidates should use discursive language relevant to the argument being proposed with thought.

Weaker responses were often those that did not address the question carefully, described the key features rather than explained or explored, wrote a response set within the wrong time period or included major inaccuracies. Many candidates seemed to be prepared for specific potential set questions and edited these to 'fit' the focus of the question asked resulting in Level 3 responses that showed some relevance but were not really suited to the focus of the question.

Q2

A very small number of candidates chose Q2. It is important to note that similarity and difference are second-order concepts identified within the AO1

definition and that questions can cover more than one aspect of the key topics. Those that did answer this question were in general able to show the similarities and differences between key features and produced interesting responses. Lower Level responses tended to just point out the similarities and differences but there were some Level 4 responses which were able to use knowledge well to exemplify key features of the causes, course and outcome of the conflicts. Areas of similarity included the communist opposition and use of guerrilla warfare while areas of difference included the nature of the opposition and the outcome. There was a tendency to determine the extent of difference when the question asked how similar.

Q3

It was clear that the majority of candidates were well-prepared to answer this question. There were some excellent responses which debated the role of the Gulf of Tonkin incident in terms of the extent to which it was just an excuse to increase involvement or as a minor event in relation to later more decisive intervention. There were some very interesting answers which discussed the extent to which Johnson was pulled into the war by his desire to fulfil the legacy bequeathed to him by Kennedy. Responses at Level 3 tended to explain the role of the incident rather than explore its impact as a causal factor and low Level 4 responses often did not clearly link the incident and/or its impact to the escalation and so were unable to begin to establish relative importance.

In my opinion, the view that the Gulf of Tonkin Incident was the main instigator for the major escalation of American involvement in Vietnam under Lyndon B. Johnson is only true to a small extent, because the incident was a mere excuse for Johnson's interventionist ideas and the increase in ground troops was not directly caused by the incident.

Admittedly, the incident, which culminated in the Tonkin Gulf ~~Resolution~~ Resolution (1964), gave Johnson the power to escalate the conflict and he immediately put it to use — indeed, as ~~the~~ Congress allowed him to take 'all necessary steps' to defend South Vietnam's freedom, Johnson authorized bombing runs on North Vietnamese soil, and this did mark a ~~major~~ relatively significant escalation of American involvement. However, as Johnson himself admitted, the Incident was staged by the Americans in an attempt to create an excuse for further ~~the~~ intervention (the Navy was 'shooting whales') — and this proves that ~~the incident~~ Johnson's ~~own~~ own interventionist ideas were more responsible for his decision to increase American involvement. Indeed,

being a patriotic American, Johnson ~~could not~~ said that defeat on the hands of a 'raggedy-ass fourth-rate' Vietnam was unacceptable. Hence, it is clear that Johnson would have upscaled American intervention regardless of the incident as he had to ensure that the North was defeated.

Meanwhile, although some may suggest that the Incident led to further involvement as the bombing ~~was~~ of that occurred ~~after~~ due to the Incident propelled Johnson's approval rating from 41% to 72% and helped him win the 1964 elections, thus Johnson felt he had the popular mandate to increase American involvement, it must be said that America had no choice but to continue increasing their involvement. Indeed, as Johnson's advisers had suggested to him, US 'credibility' and 'prestige' would be severely hampered if America were to allow the South Vietnamese to be defeated. — and as Johnson had retained ~~of~~ Kennedy's Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara whose only resolution regarding Vietnam was to increase American involvement, it is fair to conclude that Johnson had no other option when dealing with an American commitment trap is concerned than to increase involvement. Thus, regardless of whether the incident ~~was~~ had resulted or furthered political support for Johnson or not, the President would have

increased American involvement anyway as the country, given its complicity in the ~~assassination~~ assassination of Diem among various reasons, was, in Johnson's own words, 'morally locked' in Vietnam. Hence, the incident was an excuse rather than a main ~~cause~~ cause for increased American intervention.

Moreover, the escalation of American ground troops in Vietnam, which was certainly a more significant increase in American involvement than the ~~commencement~~ beginning of American bombing, was not directly caused by the incident. Indeed, ~~more~~ American troops ~~did not~~ arrive in mass ~~numbers~~ due to two reasons: firstly, 2 ARVN elite battalions were decimated in just 2 battles, which proved that the ARVN could not defeat the Vietcong; secondly, as Thien has estimated, the Vietcong controlled around 75% of the countryside by 1965, thus General Westmoreland demanded for the use of ~~an~~ American ground troops in order to ~~be~~ defeat the VC effectively. As these two reasons were far from connected to the incident, this displays that ~~the~~ major American escalation in its intervention in the form of increased ground presence, was not ~~the~~ mainly due to (or) the incident. Thus, given that the number of American ground troops rose from 50,000 ~~to 100,000~~ 50,000 to 100,000 in a few months, it would far from prudent

To suggest that American involvement was escalated mainly due to the Incident. In addition, ~~this increase~~ the increase in the presence of American ground troops ~~is not~~ also saw an increase in American funding in Vietnam, as Congress gave Johnson a \$700M grant after the amount of troops in Vietnam had reached 100,000. Thus, ~~the~~ this reflects that an increase in financial involvement, ~~was also caused~~ which is an escalation ~~in~~ itself, was not directly caused by the Incident. ~~Thus~~

~~To~~ To conclude, ~~the~~ ~~was~~ the major escalation of American involvement under Johnson was inherently caused by the fact that Johnson was determined to win the war in Vietnam, and ~~the~~ the US could not afford to suffer an adverse impact to its national prestige by allowing the South Vietnamese to collapse. Thus, the Incident was merely a facade and excuse orchestrated by the Americans in order to escalate their involvement. Although it is arguable that Johnson could not have escalated American involvement ~~if not~~ without the powers Congress gave ~~to~~ him in the Tonkin Gulf ~~Resolution~~ which directly derives from the Incident, it must be said that Johnson would have found another excuse to garner public and congressional approval if the Incident had not occurred. Thus, this coupled with the fact

That ~~American~~ major escalation in American involvement in the form of the increased ground troops and financial funding which came with the former ~~but~~ was not directly caused by the Incident, displays that the Incident was ~~not~~ the ~~direct~~ main cause behind the major escalation of American intervention in Vietnam to a small extent.

This is a Level 5 response. It addresses the focus of the question directly and explores the causal factors surrounding the escalation of American involvement in Vietnam under President Johnson. Although the details of the incident are only very briefly considered the impact of the incident is securely considered in relation to wider influences on Johnson and the causes of the wider escalation in ground troops.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A

- Candidates should use the time available to read and consider both extracts carefully before planning their answer
- Candidates should read the question carefully and make sure that they address the view specifically stated in the question preferably beginning with the introduction
- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors
- Candidates should come to an overall judgement with regard to the view stated in the question; it is not sufficient just to summarise the views presented in the extracts
- Interpretations should be referred to as Extracts or by the author's name; the material presented are interpretations and not a sources of evidence.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the argument being presented is well organised
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Some Level 4 responses included too much information which led to contradiction and confusion in the overall argument being presented
- Candidates should think carefully about the language they use to evaluate the second-order concepts being assessed; do not use 'to an extent' to mean both 'a little' and 'a to a large degree' rather state the extent explicitly
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.