



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 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

Summer 2025

Question Paper Log Number P76473

Publication Code: WHI04_1D_2506_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.

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
	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
---	-------	--

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	1–6	• 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	7–12	• 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	13–18	• 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	19–25	• 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 President Truman dismissed General MacArthur in April 1951 primarily due to political reasons. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • In March 1951, MacArthur sent a communique to the Chinese without authorisation that undermined President Truman's ability to implement his own foreign policy decisions • MacArthur's actions in Korea appeared to leave the UN allies of the USA questioning whether President Truman was politically in control of his own government • MacArthur was wilfully disobeying orders about his public interference in the running of the Korean War and positioning himself as a political, rather than just a military, figure both internationally and domestically • MacArthur's willingness to cooperate with Truman's opponents came to a head when Representative Martin's reading of MacArthur's letter to the House appeared to Truman to threaten directly his presidential authority. Extract 2 • The Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) had immediate military reasons for replacing MacArthur as commander in Korea in April 1951 • The JCS, fearing an imminent offensive from the Chinese, did not feel that MacArthur was trustworthy enough to respond in a sensible manner to such an attack • The JCS deliberately withheld information about a Presidential order because they feared that MacArthur would manipulate the situation to his own advantage rather than for the 'good' of the war • The Joint Chiefs came to a unanimous decision to recommend MacArthur's dismissal in favour of General Ridgway, in the light of fears that he desperately wanted to bomb China. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that President Truman dismissed General MacArthur in April 1951 primarily due to political reasons. Relevant points may include: • The personal relationship between President Truman and General MacArthur had been difficult from the start. In October 1950, at a meeting on Wake Island, MacArthur may have insulted Truman by not saluting him • General MacArthur was a strong anti-Communist and had links to the Republican Party, and this created tensions with the Democrat President Truman. MacArthur had stated an interest in becoming President himself • In December 1950, Truman ordered MacArthur not to talk to the press after MacArthur had publicly criticised Truman for failing to rule out an

Question	Indicative content
	attack on China. Martin's April 1951 speech referred to this again. • The USA's UN allies were wary of the consequences of MacArthur's actions as US/UN commander; they continually expressed their unease through diplomats, so giving the impression that Truman was not in control. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that President Truman dismissed General MacArthur in April 1951 primarily due to political reasons. Relevant points may include: • By March 1951, the US/UN forces had retaken Seoul and pushed communist forces back to the 38th parallel. Truman and the JCS were concerned about the decisions MacArthur would make next • MacArthur strongly believed that, if necessary, an attack on China should be on the table, possibly even a nuclear strike. General Bradley, in particular, was concerned that MacArthur would act recklessly • Ridgway, as the newly-appointed commander of the 8th Army, had been on the ground for the recent successes, as opposed to MacArthur's 'flying' visits from Japan. The JCS increasingly felt Ridgway was a safer option • The political and military concerns about MacArthur's fitness for command came to a head at the same time in March/April 1951 and the combination of Truman's outrage and the JCS's fears resulted in his dismissal.

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 most significant cause of the outbreak of the First Vietnam War in 1946 was the impact of the Japanese occupation. Arguments and evidence that the most significant cause of the outbreak of the First Vietnam War in 1946 was the impact of the Japanese occupation should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The nature of the Japanese occupation, including its acceptance of continued French control until March 1945, reignited Vietnamese nationalism and the desire for independence that underlay the war in 1946 • The Japanese invasion was a humiliation for the French and an indication that European imperialism in South East Asia could be challenged from within Asia itself. The French were never able to retrieve their status • The Japanese occupation led directly to the development of the Viet Minh as a communist-inspired nationalist resistance that became the most influential nationalist movement in Vietnam, particularly after 1945 • Japan's decision to oust the French completely from Vietnam in March 1945 created the power vacuum in which the Viet Minh under Ho Chi Minh were able to declare independence and proclaim the DRV • The occupation of Vietnam by China and Britain, after the withdrawal of Japan, in preparation for the return of the French, created the conditions for the 1946 war. Arguments and evidence that the outbreak of the First Vietnam War in 1946 was caused by other significant causes should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The long-term growth of Vietnamese nationalism and the desire for independence meant that resistance to French rule was always inevitable • The growth in popular support for communist solutions to the problems of the Vietnamese people and, particularly, the emergence of the Viet Minh left-wing nationalist movement with Ho Chi Minh as its leader • French imperialism: resentment of French colonial rule had been long-established and the actions of France in attempting to re-establish control in the post-Second World War world directly contributed to the 1946 war • Post-Second World War geopolitics: the development of Western anti-communist policies amid the growth of tensions with the communist world turned Cold War politics into a 'hot' war. • US ambivalence meant that a negotiated solution in Vietnam in 1946 was unlikely. The US maintained an observational stance at the same time as courting the Viet Minh and giving assurances of support to the French. 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 the statement that, under President Johnson in the years 1965-68, US direct intervention in the war in Vietnam was a complete failure. Arguments and evidence that, under President Johnson in the years 1965-68, US direct intervention in the war in Vietnam was a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The aerial bombardment of North Vietnam under Operation Rolling Thunder (1965-68) failed either to destroy North Vietnam's industry or its economic capabilities to supply the Vietcong • Attempts to destroy the Ho Chi Minh supply trail from North to South Vietnam, e.g. Operation Steel Tiger (1965) in Laos, failed to prevent supplies reaching the Vietcong • Military limitations; the inexperience of US troops, increasingly conscripts, fighting in unfamiliar terrain, contrasted significantly with the commitment of the Vietcong guerilla fighters and tactics • Search and destroy missions carried out by US troops in South Vietnamese rural areas directly impacted the ability of the US to win over the 'hearts and minds' of the very people they claimed to be protecting • US action in Vietnam contributed both to the reluctance of its traditional allies in Asia, Britain and France, to commit troops in support and to China and Russia being more supportive of the Vietcong and North Vietnam • US action led to increasing domestic opposition. Popular protest and political uncertainty meant that Johnson turned down requests for more troops in 1968 and looked to open peace negotiations. Arguments and evidence that, under President Johnson in the years 1965-68, US direct intervention in the war in Vietnam was not a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • South Vietnam was governed by the US-supported General Thieu throughout the period and, at the end of 1968, there was no indication that it was in imminent danger of becoming communist controlled • The counter-offensive led by the US military was very successful in thwarting the gains made by the Vietcong during the Tet Offensive. The Vietcong was effectively finished as a fighting force and reliant on the NVA • Fighting alongside the US troops, the ARVN became a more resilient fighting force and, in 1968, were in a better position to defend South Vietnam than at any time previously • The impact of the blanket bombing of North Vietnam, which had been relentless across the period, and the impact of the Tet counter-offensive, contributed to North Vietnamese openness to peace discussions. Other relevant material must be credited.

