Mark scheme (Results)

January 2025

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 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

January 2025
Question Paper P76218A
Publication Code: WHI04_1D_2501_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. 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 the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding 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.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

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.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

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**	• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	**5–8**	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	**9–14**	• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.
4	**15–20**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.

5	**21–25**	• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section B

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–4**	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	**5–8**	• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question. • An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	**9–14**	• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included. • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	**15–20**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported. • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.

5	**21–25**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section A: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
1	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that it was Japan that benefited the most from the Korean War. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Japan gained the most out of the Korean War, as it did not commit any troops but experienced an economic recovery as a result of it • The economic growth experienced as a result of the Korean War improved living standards in Japan • The presence of the US military in Japan during the War and US supply orders put money into the economy and rebooted a moribund industrial sector • The Korean War not only allowed the Japanese economy to recover to levels prior to the Second World War but also provided the seeds of potential future growth. Extract 2 • China emerged from the Korean War in a better international position than it was in before the War and having regained its status as a world power • China's willingness to, and relative success in, challenging the US had brought China into the world of international diplomacy, with the peace negotiations and the enhanced reputation of Zhou Enlai • The nature of China's contribution to North Korea meant that its influence was not only increased locally but in other parts of the world as well • China's relationship with the USSR benefited, as Stalin now treated China in a more positive manner. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it was Japan that benefited the most from the Korean War. Relevant points may include: • Japan was able to take advantage of the fact that the US war effort was conducted from General MacArthur's post-1945 HQ in Japan, and its strategic positioning as a place from which to conduct and supply the War • In 1950, Japan was suffering from an economic downturn with business bankruptcies and unemployment and industrial unrest growing • US military supply orders combined with increased domestic demand, generated by the spending power of the US armed forces, saw Japanese business profits rise, and increased economic efficiency and productivity • China suffered huge casualties without achieving clear offensive victories in the War itself, remained an international pariah in the UN and, despite improved relations, the USSR treated China as its junior partner.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it was Japan that benefited the most from the Korean War. Relevant points may include: • By 1952-53, the Chinese were full participants in the armistice negotiations in Korea, and the 1953 agreement was signed between representatives of the US, North Korean and Chinese military • China's intervention on behalf of the North Koreans brought it to the attention of nationalist liberation groups across the world, many of whom began to look to China for support, e.g. south-east Asia, Africa • China's relationship with the two main post-war superpowers changed. The US factored China more into its foreign policy, despite not formally recognising it, and the USSR made significant economic commitments • As a result of the War, Japan continued to suffer inflationary tendencies that impacted its export market and became even more dependent on the US, e.g. US-Japanese security treaty of 1951 • Other beneficiaries: NSC-68 confirmed the pre-eminent anti-communist status of the US; the USSR maintained its status within the communist sphere without the use of ground troops; the UN showed its ability to act.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the growing crisis in South Vietnam, in the years 1956-60, was mainly caused by interference from communist North Vietnam. Arguments and evidence that the growing crisis in South Vietnam, in the years 1954-60, was mainly caused by interference from communist North Vietnam should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • After the Geneva Accords (1954), North Vietnamese leaders encouraged communist Viet Minh in the south to stay in their local areas and agitate for change • In 1959, North Vietnam formally declared a 'People's War' against South Vietnam, with the aim of unifying Vietnam under communist rule • In 1959, having previously provided ad hoc support and arms to the communists in the South, North Vietnam began the construction of a more organised supply route via the Ho Chi Minh trail • In 1959, North Vietnam for the first time sent trained insurgents into the South from the North. The fighters were specifically recruited from those southern Vietnamese who had fled to the North since 1954 • It became clear in 1960 that North Vietnam had begun to fund and resource an organisation designed to act as an 'armed force' to counter the ARVN. The NLF (Vietcong) was officially revealed in December 1960. Arguments and evidence that the growing crisis in South Vietnam, in the years 1954-60, was not mainly caused by interference from communist North Vietnam/was caused by other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • It was really only in 1959 that North Vietnam began to directly intervene in South Vietnam; from 1954-59, the North Vietnam leaders were focused more on dealing with nascent domestic resistance to their rule • Discontent was driven by the refusal of Diem, with the full support of the US, to hold the unifying elections in 1956 that had been agreed at Geneva in 1954; the predicted outcome had been a victory for Ho Chi Minh • The final withdrawal of French ground troops from Vietnam in 1956 signified the end of the colonial era and empowered nationalists in South Vietnam to resist a government perceived by many as illegitimate • Diem's government created the beginnings of resistance independent of the communist North. The government did little for ordinary people after years of war and was seen by many as authoritarian, elitist and corrupt • US political and military support for South Vietnam's leadership angered many. The growing influence of MAAG made many nationalists believe that one imperial power had merely been swapped for another • The situation in Laos spilled over into South Vietnam; the Laotian government, covertly supported by US advisers in South Vietnam, was under threat from the Pathet Lao insurgency openly supported by Hanoi. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the most effective feature of US policy in Vietnam under President Nixon, in the years 1969-72, was the Phoenix Programme. Arguments and evidence that the most effective feature of US policy in Vietnam under President Nixon, in the years 1969-72, was the Phoenix Programme should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Programme used anti-communist infiltrators to collect information on, and target, over 80,000 Vietcong members and organisers who were captured, 'turned' or killed • The impact of the Programme contributed to Saigon's success in regaining control of large areas of South Vietnam. By 1969, Saigon was in control of 50 per cent of the country compared to 20 per cent before 1969 • The Programme disrupted the ability of the Vietcong to embed its local organisers within local, particularly rural, communities and so undermined the heart of the communist propaganda campaigns • The Programme appears to have had some positive impact on US and ARVN troop morale. Ordinary soldiers were often used to carry out these on-the-ground operations, giving them a sense of progress in the war • The effectiveness of the Programme was reflected in North Vietnamese concern over its impact and its attempts to counter its effects. After the war, the communist authorities continued to search for anyone involved. Arguments and evidence that the Phoenix Programme was not the most effective feature of US policy in Vietnam under President Nixon in the years 1969-72 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The covert nature of the Phoenix Programme meant that it was not widely publicised. When the nature, and potential illegality, of its operations became publicly known, it was rapidly closed down by Congress • Nixon's key public policy of 'Vietnamisation', by increasingly handing over the war effort to the ARVN, enabled the significant withdrawal of US troops and bolstered Nixon's claims of 'peace with honour' • The bombing of Cambodia and Laos, initially secret, significantly disrupted the flow of North Vietnamese resources into South Vietnam via the Ho Chi Minh trail • Nixon's commitment to US airpower in 1972 was crucial to pushing back the North Vietnamese Easter offensive (Operation Linebacker) and bringing all sides back to the negotiating table ('Christmas' bombing) • Nixon's commitment to a wider détente with China and the USSR had a mediating impact on the main communist powers' commitment to intervention and attitude to the peace negotiations • It was Nixon and Kissinger's deployment of diplomacy in the years 1969-72, both with regard to the public Paris meetings, and using back-door negotiations, that ultimately led to the peace agreement of January 1973. Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom