



Pearson  
Edexcel

Mark Scheme

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel  
International Advanced Level  
In History (WHI04)  
Paper 4: International Study with Historical  
Interpretations

Option 1D: The Cold 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2019

Publications Code: WHI04\_1D\_1906\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
---	-------	---

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• 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><li>• 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><li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>
---	-------	---

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asai, 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 dismissed in April 1951 because of his interference in President Truman's proposed Korean peace initiative.</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"><li>• MacArthur's actions were designed deliberately to wreck any formal proposal of peace talks from the Truman administration and Truman was forced to abandon them</li><li>• MacArthur's actions worsened a situation that was already difficult between himself and Truman</li><li>• MacArthur's actions challenged the power of the President to act as Commander-in-Chief of the US military</li><li>• Truman made the decision to dismiss MacArthur after the communiqué but still felt the need to wait for another moment to carry it out.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was MacArthur's letter to Martin questioning Truman's foreign policy in Asia that was responsible for his dismissal</li><li>• MacArthur's communication with the political opposition in the US (domestic politics) was more challenging than his communication with an opposing general (world politics)</li><li>• MacArthur's action was a direct political challenge to the office of the President</li><li>• Truman was responding to a specific political attack in support of Republican opposition to his Presidency.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that General MacArthur was dismissed in April 1951 because of his interference in President Truman's proposed Korean peace initiative. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• By March 1951, General Ridgway's military tactics had been making significant progress and Truman believed that this might present an opportunity to explore ways to bring the conflict to an end</li><li>• MacArthur actively disagreed with Truman's Asia policy believing him to be more interested in Europe; MacArthur wanted to attack China with nuclear weapons if necessary while Truman did not want a wider war to develop</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The communiqué undermined the initiative by ridiculing China's military and industrial prowess so preventing the Chinese from being able to negotiate from a position of strength if talks were organised</li> <li>• MacArthur's offer in the communiqué to negotiate directly with the Chinese commanders over the military situation in Korea explicitly challenged Truman's ability and role as Commander-in-Chief.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that General MacArthur was dismissed in April 1951 because of his interference in President Truman's proposed Korean peace initiative. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1952 was a presidential election year; MacArthur had made no secret of his Republican sympathies and there were suggestions that he might even stand as the Republican nominee</li> <li>• Truman's political position in the US was under increasing attack – he was seen to be soft on communism abroad and at home. MacArthur's letter was an act of open insubordination that could not be ignored</li> <li>• The 24 March communiqué may have actually been a relief to the Truman administration as it gave them a chance to abandon a peace initiative, which they had only reluctantly embarked upon to start with</li> <li>• Other reasons: MacArthur's interference was the culmination of a series of acts that had challenged Truman and was in direct contravention of a gagging order; pressure from other nations, e.g. Britain, Canada.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1D: The Cold 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 how accurate it is to say that the contribution of General Giap was the most important reason for the success of the Viet Minh in the First Vietnam War (1946–54).</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the contribution of General Giap was the most important reason for the success of the Viet Minh in the First Vietnam War (1946–54) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• General Giap was a ruthless but respected military and political leader; he was a close associate of Ho Chi Minh and as such was at the forefront of the decisions made</li><li>• He was a popular commander who gained the support and commitment to the cause of those he led in the Vietnamese Liberation Army</li><li>• General Giap was the strategist behind the effective guerrilla campaign fought against the French</li><li>• General Giap established his forces in the countryside amongst the people of Vietnam appealing to both nationalist and Marxist supporters</li><li>• General Giap was ultimately responsible, as the military commander in charge of the attack on Dien Bien Phu, for dealing the decisive blow to the French in Vietnam; defeat at Dien Bien Phu led to French withdrawal.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the contribution of General Giap was not the most important reason for the success of the Viet Minh in the First Vietnam War (1946–54)/another factor was more responsible should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The political leadership and influence of Ho Chi Minh</li><li>• The lack of effective French military strategy, e.g. the French attempt to draw the Viet Minh into open battle at Dien Bien Phu, and the lack of French commitment from both troops and the public</li><li>• The strength of the nationalist cause in Vietnam</li><li>• The failure of Western attempts to establish Bao Dai as leader of a partially independent government from 1949</li><li>• The support for the Viet Minh from China after the Communist victory in 1949.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

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 President Nixon's policies with regard to the Vietnam conflict, in the years 1969–73, were very successful.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that President Nixon's policies with regard to the Vietnam conflict, in the years 1969–73, were very successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nixon's endorsement of a new 'clear-and-hold' policy meant that 50 per cent of South Vietnam was under government control by the end of 1969 and the Vietcong were in retreat</li> <li>• The controversial Operation Phoenix resulted in 20,000 Vietcong having been captured and executed by 1973</li> <li>• Nixon was able to announce the withdrawal of 60,000 US troops in 1969 and, by the end of 1970, the number of US troops in Vietnam had fallen to 335,000</li> <li>• A policy of superpower diplomacy with China and Russia combined with a policy of heavy bombing against North Vietnam (Operation Linebacker I) brought North Vietnam to the negotiating table in 1972</li> <li>• A combination of the 'madman' theory (the threat of nuclear war) combined with conventional heavy bombing brought a ceasefire in 1973; Nixon claimed 'peace with honour' as US troops were withdrawn.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that President Nixon's policies with regard to the Vietnam conflict, in the years 1969–73, were not very successful should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kissinger was unable to come to an agreement with North Vietnam either in public at the Paris Peace talks or in secret negotiations during 1969</li> <li>• The policy that most symbolised the 'Nixon Doctrine', Vietnamisation, was a failure; the US army failed to make the ARVN into an effective fighting force capable of defending their own nation</li> <li>• Secret US bombing operations and an ARVN-led attack on Laos and the Ho Chi Minh trail extended the war in south-east Asia into Cambodia and Laos in 1970–71</li> <li>• US public consternation with policies such as Operation Phoenix and the bombing of Cambodia led to widespread public demonstrations and to the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution</li> <li>• Despite the ceasefire, in 1975 North Vietnam eventually took control of the South and Cambodia and Laos came under communist control.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

