



Pearson

# Mark scheme

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel 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 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)

January 2020

Publication Code: WHI04\_1D\_2001\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## 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.

## 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: 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
	<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>

<b>5</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<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</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>

<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<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 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 the main reason for Truman's decision to go to the aid of South Korea, in June 1950, was to make a stand against global communist aggression.</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>• It was not a commitment to Korea but the impact on US standing internationally that explains Truman's response</li><li>• The attack on South Korea required a response because it was an act of armed aggression against a partner state</li><li>• US policymakers believed that the North Korean invasion was being used to test the willingness of the US to stand up to communist aggression in more important Cold War arenas, such as Europe and the Middle East</li><li>• Truman would have to defend Korea if the international standing of the US was to be maintained.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truman's decision was rooted in the domestic politics of the US</li><li>• Opponents of Truman's administration had accused Truman of not responding adequately to communist expansion in Asia and this was an opportunity for him to appear more decisive</li><li>• By taking action in Korea, Truman hoped he would not be forced to confront communist China by domestic pressures</li><li>• Truman and his Secretary of State, Acheson, exaggerated the global threat posed by the Korean invasion.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the main reason for Truman's decision to go to the aid of South Korea, in June 1950, was to make a stand against global communist aggression. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Truman administration was fully convinced that the North Korean attack on South Korea had been instigated by Stalin</li><li>• The attack on South Korea and its possible outcome appeared to many to suggest that the domino theory of communist expansion in both Asia and Europe was about to unfold</li><li>• Truman was particularly mindful that he did not want to repeat the same sort of policy decisions that had contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War, e.g. the failure to defend smaller nations against aggression</li><li>• There was genuine concern amongst the Truman administration that Stalin would take the opportunity to create tensions in Germany but more particularly in Iran.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that the main reason for Truman's decision to go to the aid of South Korea, in June 1950, was to make a stand against global</p>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>communist aggression. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 203 1417 297">• McCarthyite anti-communism was a significant feature of American domestic politics and Truman was under intense pressure to show his anti-communist credentials before domestic elections in 1950</li><li data-bbox="347 304 1417 398">• Truman felt stigmatised by the claims that he was the President who had 'lost China' and so South Korea provided an opportunity to prevent a communist takeover of Korea</li><li data-bbox="347 405 1417 499">• Despite fears of Soviet aggression there was no evidence that the Soviets were mobilising elsewhere and it was the absence of Soviet delegates from the United Nations that allowed the US to gain UN support</li><li data-bbox="347 506 1417 555">• Other reasons: the US commitment to Japanese security, to protect the integrity of the UN.</li></ul>

## 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 the statement that the US commitment to the Diem government was the main reason why the US became increasingly involved in South Vietnam in the years 1954-63.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that US commitment to the Diem government was the main reason why the US became increasingly involved in South Vietnam in the years 1954-63 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• From 1954, the US began to extend greater diplomatic support and provide more economic aid to South Vietnam as part of its commitment to Diem, who was viewed as a credible, non-corrupt alternative to Bao Dai</li><li>• As Diem's government became increasingly unpopular, e.g. Agrovilles, the US pumped more and more economic aid into South Vietnam in order to strengthen Diem's position; seven billion US dollars between 1955-61</li><li>• President Kennedy's initial willingness to extend US influence reflected his long-time commitment to the Roman Catholic Diem's government; Kennedy had been a member of the 'American Friends of Vietnam'</li><li>• Under President Kennedy the US poured financial and military aid into South Vietnam to help prop up Diem's government, which was becoming increasingly perceived as ever more corrupt and brutal</li><li>• The failure of Diem's armed forces to resist the Vietcong meant that the US was forced to increase the amount and range of military aid sent to support South Vietnam, e.g. advisers, weapons and technology.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons why the US became increasingly involved in South Vietnam in the years 1954-63 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• From 1954, the US was committed to support South Vietnam against any likelihood of communist government whether Diem was in power or not; his assassination in 1963 did not lead to the withdrawal of US aid</li><li>• The US intervened in South Vietnam because of its general foreign policy of containment in South East Asia; South Vietnam was perceived as a vital element in preventing the 'domino theory' from becoming reality</li><li>• It was the influence of Le Duan and the aggressive policies of Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam, including his threat of invasion, that necessitated increased support for South Vietnam</li><li>• It was the strength of the Vietcong, bolstered by similar support from North Vietnam to that of the US in the South, that led to the need for the increased US military support</li><li>• The escalating involvement under President Kennedy was due to his specific commitment to a hardline defence against communism and his belief that the situation in Vietnam could be solved by military force.</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 whether there was an economic transformation in South-East Asia in the 1980s.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that South-East Asia underwent an economic transformation in the 1980s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the south-east Asian nations experienced rapid economic growth, based on the availability of labour, investment in light industry and construction</li> <li>• Singapore emerged as a major entrepôt and financial hub, being identified as one of the four main Asian 'tiger economies' and other nations were being identified a potential 'future tigers', e.g. Thailand</li> <li>• At the end of the 1980s, Thailand was the world's fastest growing economy with a growth rate of 13.6% (1988), foreign investment increasing by 400% from 1986-89 and the tourist industry taking-off</li> <li>• A consumer boom across the region was fuelled by the growth of the middle-classes</li> <li>• Malaysia rapidly developed an economy based on natural resources and, particularly, export-led industrialisation; low inflation and a GDP of around 7% throughout the 1980s allowed Malaysia to modernise.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that, in the 1980s, South-East Asia did not undergo an economic transformation/economic change was limited should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poverty was still a feature of many of the South-East Asian economies with growing economic disparity between the rich and poor; it was the availability of cheap labour that fuelled industrial labour</li> <li>• Within the emerging economies, the transformation of urban areas was not mirrored in rural areas, e.g. in Thailand growth was concentrated around Bangkok, and the environmental costs were often high</li> <li>• Regional development was variable, with the island economies experiencing more sustained economic growth than the mainland economies; Thailand was the exception rather than the rule</li> <li>• Those countries that had been most affected by the Vietnam conflict experienced economic problems; reconstruction was slow and production stagnant, e.g. in Vietnam income was \$200-300 per annum</li> <li>• Countries that did not incorporate elements of free market policy in their economic plans tended to experience slow economic growth, e.g. Vietnam under a centralised, command economy in the early 1980s</li> <li>• The role of foreign investment continued to play a major role in the economic development of independent South-East Asian nations just as it had done under colonial rule.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>