



Pearson
Edexcel

Mark Scheme

International Advanced
Level in History (WHI04/1D)

Paper 4: International Study
With Historical Interpretations

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

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

June 2018

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed-out work should be marked **unless** the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks

Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 4

Section A

Targets: AO1 (5 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

AO3 (20 marks): Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.• Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section B

Target: AO1 (25 marks): Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly-descriptive passages may be included.• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="400 203 1362 297">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.<li data-bbox="400 315 1406 409">• 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.<li data-bbox="400 427 1390 521">• 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.<li data-bbox="400 539 1353 600">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: Indicative Content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that General MacArthur was mainly responsible for widening the war in Korea after South Korea had been retaken in September 1950.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MacArthur appeared to be running the war in North Korea with little regard for either UN or US policy makers.• At the Wake Island meeting, it was MacArthur who informed Truman of his plans for the prosecution of the war in North Korea and Korean reunification.• MacArthur believed that, in his speech of 17 October, Truman had given him the right to do as he pleased in Korea.• MacArthur made the decision to take the US advance into North Korea right up to the Yalu River border. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MacArthur did not make the decisions that led to the widening of the war into North Korean and the subsequent entry of the Chinese into the conflict.• MacArthur was ordered by the US Joint Chiefs of Staff to take the war across the 38th parallel.• It was a United Nations General Assembly resolution that agreed to sanction the reunification of Korea by force.• It was the Truman administration in Washington that changed the policy in Korea. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that General MacArthur was mainly responsible for widening the war in Korea after South Korea had been retaken in September 1950. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In 1950, MacArthur, as the effective military ruler of Japan and as US commander in the Pacific, believed that he had the right to make decisions on behalf of the US in East Asia• After his success against the odds at Inchon, MacArthur may have come

Question	Indicative content
	<p>to believe that only he was capable of making policy decisions in Korea; he made unilateral decisions in the taking of Seoul that annoyed Truman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MacArthur's actions continually stretched the boundaries of his command of the UN/US forces, e.g. the UN agreed the crossing of the 38th parallel because MacArthur pushed for it, the extent of US activity in the North • Truman later claimed that he has been misled at Wake Island by MacArthur into supporting MacArthur's actions in North Korea by his assurance that the Chinese would not intervene. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that General MacArthur was mainly responsible for widening the war in Korea after South Korea had been retaken in September 1950. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MacArthur was the commander of the UN forces in Korea and so he could not act unilaterally without violating international law • Once the success in South Korea was clear, Truman and the State Department changed their aims in Korea from containment to reunification • At Wake Island Truman did nothing to dissuade MacArthur from his military plans; it was only after the situation turned against the US-UN forces that Truman publically distanced himself from MacArthur's decisions • The Chinese were responsible for the further widening of the war after the crossing of the 38th parallel by sending troops to aid North Korea.

Section B: Indicative Content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the key features of the First Vietnam War (1946-54) and the key features of the Malayan 'Emergency' (1948-60) were similar.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the key features of the First Vietnam War (1946-54) and the key features of the Malayan 'Emergency' (1948-60) were similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In 1945, in both Vietnam and Malaya, the communist inspired guerrilla organisations who had opposed Japanese occupation during the Second World War continued to be active• In both Vietnam and Malaya the pre-war colonial powers – France and Britain – looked to re-establish influence• Both conflicts were part of the wider post-1945 Cold War environment in South East Asia; they were symbolic of the US 'domino theory' and the communist opposition groups both had connections to China• The declared aim of both communist opposition groups and their leaders – Viet Minh/Ho Chi Minh & MNLA/Chin Peng – was to fight for independence• In both conflicts the communist opposition groups fought an intensive guerrilla war against troops from the pre-war colonial powers. <p>Arguments and evidence that the key features of the First Vietnam War (1946-54) and the key features of the Malayan 'Emergency' (1948-60) were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The conflict in Vietnam, which was physically nearer to China, attracted more immediate interest from the USA; Truman and Eisenhower were haunted by the 'loss' of China in 1949• The conflict in Vietnam was as much nationalist as communist; in Malaya the conflict centred on the demands of the ethnic Chinese population rather than the indigenous majority Malay population• The British in Malaya were more committed to a democratic hand-over of power than the French in Vietnam; independent democratic government was achieved in Malaya in 1957 before the end of the 'Emergency'• The British fought a successful guerrilla-style counteroffensive; the French came under siege in fortified positions such as Dien Bien Phu• The British were relatively successful in winning the 'hearts and minds' war amongst the Malay majority; the political intransigence of the French lost the support of the Vietnamese population• The British successfully brought the 'Emergency' to an end in 1960; Vietnam became split at the 17th parallel and France withdrew its troops in 1956 leaving the US to support the South Vietnamese government.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the main cause of the major escalation in US involvement in Vietnam under President Johnson was the Gulf of Tonkin incident</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the main cause of the major escalation in US involvement in Vietnam under President Johnson was the Gulf of Tonkin incident should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gulf of Tonkin incident (August 1964) appeared to be a direct attack by North Vietnamese forces on US navy boats, which needed to be challenged • President Johnson was persuaded that a response was necessary; some members of his administration hoped the 'incident' would provide a reason to bomb North Vietnam • Shocked by reports of the situation in the Gulf of Tonkin, the US Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution giving Johnson the powers to take almost any action he wanted in Vietnam • Reporting of the 'incident' by the news media was instrumental in persuading public opinion that an escalation in US involvement was justified • US military policy changed as result of the 'incident'; before US activity in North Vietnam was minimal but in February 1965 Operation Rolling Thunder - a systematic long-term bombing campaign - was implemented. <p>Arguments and evidence that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was not the main cause/that there were other causes of the major escalation in US involvement in Vietnam under President Johnson should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gulf of Tonkin incident merely provided an excuse to escalate US involvement; there is some debate as to whether the attack actually happened or was really a provocation • In 1964, US strategy seemed to be failing; 40% of the rural areas of South Vietnam was controlled by Communists, who also appeared to be winning the war of 'hearts and minds' • In 1964, there was already a growing need to counter action by the North, e.g. intervention in the South from December 1963 with China providing material support, the Ho Chi Minh trail supply route became increasingly effective • The major escalation of troop numbers began in 1965 in response to the growing demands of Operation Rolling Thunder and the relative failure of Operation Steel Tiger • It was President Johnson's landslide re-election in November 1964 that provided him with the conviction that he would have public support for escalating the war effort.

	Other relevant material must be credited.
--	---