

GCE

History A

Unit **Y252/01**: The Cold War in Asia 1945–1993

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **H105**

Mark Scheme for June 2017

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.















All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2017

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
	Assertion
	Analysis
	Evaluation
	Explanation
	Factor
	Illustrates/Describes
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Judgement
	Knowledge and understanding
	Simple comment
	Unclear
	View

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1*	<p>To what extent was the Korean War, 1950-53, a failure for the United States?</p> <p>In assessing how the war was a failure,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might discuss the truce of 1953 which merely restated the borders and left North Korea under communist control. • Answers might discuss relations with China which had plumbed new depths. • Answers might discuss the damage to the armed forces of the US: they had suffered heavy casualties and their reputation was dented by the capture of Seoul and its retreat from the Yalu River. • Answers might discuss how the war was regarded as a failure at home and weakened the position of the president. • Answers might discuss the damage to US leadership of the UN as they led the UN forces fighting the communists. <p>In assessing how the war was not a failure,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might discuss how 'containment' had been achieved. • Answers might discuss how the US military had performed well, not least in the early part of the war (Inchon landings), especially taking into account the handicap of operating with armies from other countries. • Answers might discuss how defence treaties were formed, eg the ANZUS Pact of 1951 and SEATO in 1954. • Answers might discuss how the USSR kept its distance and did not enter the war. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • At Level 5 there will be judgement on the extent to which the Korean War was a failure for the USA. • Judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation. It should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2*	<p>‘The guerrilla warfare of the Vietcong explains the victory of communist forces in Vietnam after 1968.’ Do you agree?</p> <p>In assessing guerrilla warfare in the victory of communist forces,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might discuss the nature of guerrilla warfare (difficulties in identifying the enemy, surprise, attrition etc) and the problems of confronting it. • Answers might discuss the impact of the Tet Offensive. • Answers might discuss the importance of the Ho Chi Minh Trail. • Answers might discuss the demoralising effect of guerrilla warfare on US troops. • Answers might discuss the offensive of 1972. <p>• In assessing other reasons for the victory of communist forces,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers might discuss the terrain and the problems for the US of communication and deployment of troops. • Answers might discuss the degree of popular support in Vietnam for the Vietcong and the willingness of the people to pay a high price for victory. • Answers might discuss the reluctance of US forces and the strength of public opinion against the war in the US. • Answers might discuss the policy of Vietnamization after 1968. • Answers might assess the importance of support for the Vietcong from China and the USSR. • Answers might discuss the ineffectiveness of various US strategies (air bombardment and the use of chemicals, search and destroy etc). 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • At Level 5 there will be judgement on the reasons for the victory of communist forces. • Judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions. • Knowledge must not be credited in isolation. It should only be credited where it is used as the basis for analysis and evaluation, in line with descriptions in the levels mark scheme.

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>'It was the North who invaded the South. Therefore, whatever else might be said, they had started the [Korean] war.'</p> <p>From: Derrick Murphy and Kathryn Cooper, <i>United States 1917-2008, 2008</i></p> <p>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The historical debate about causes of the Korean War focuses on the responsibility of various interested parties for the conflict. • In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation, answers might consider that the interpretation is too narrow in its judgement as it pins the blame for the war on the North alone. • In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The invasion of June 1950 and the capture of Seoul and the rest of the south except for the Pusan pocket. • Kim Il Sung had ambitions to unite the peninsular. • The initiative and the timing of the invasion came from the North (not USSR or China). • In analysing the limitations of the given interpretation, answers might use knowledge and understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North may have invaded the South but the interpretation does not give any hint as to the motives of the North. • The interpretation does not provide any information about the context in which the invasion took place. • Korea had been a point of tension since 1945 when it was 	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set answer is expected • Candidates must use their knowledge and understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate surrounding the issue to analyse and evaluate the given interpretation. • Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation. • The quality of analysis and evaluation of the interpretations should be considered when assigning answers to a level, not the quantity of other interpretations included in the answer. • Other interpretations considered as part of evaluation and analysis do not need to be attributed to specific named historians, but they must be recognisable historical interpretations, rather than the candidate's own viewpoint. • Answers may include more on strengths or more on limitations and there is no requirement for a 50/50 split in evaluation. However, for level 5 there should be well-supported evaluation of both and for level 4 supported evaluation of both, in line with levels descriptors. • Candidates are not expected to construct their own interpretation.

	<p>divided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretations are:• Syngman Rhee had, for years, incited the North with his rhetoric, border skirmishes and intimidation of the North. He was equally ambitious to unite the peninsula.• The Americans began removing troops from the South in 1948 leaving the South vulnerable. Also, before the invasion American policy makers had made it known that they regarded Korea as outside the US 'defence perimeter'. Further, Truman was intent on persuading the American public of NSC-68 (massive military spending) and encouraging a war in Korea was a way of doing that.• The USSR may be considered to be a cause of the war. Stalin seems to have given Kim Il Sung his backing for an invasion and supplied him with tanks just beforehand. Stalin may have wanted a victory in Korea to offset his reverse in Berlin the year before. However, when the Americans made it clear they would defend the South the USSR backed off.		
--	---	--	--

APPENDIX 1 – this contains a generic mark scheme grid

	<i>AO1: 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.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]
Level 5 25–30 marks	There is a mostly consistent focus on the question. Generally accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer and is evaluated and analysed in order to reach substantiated judgements, but these are not consistently well-developed. There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear and logically structured. The information presented is relevant and in the most part substantiated.
Level 4 19–24 marks	The question is generally addressed. Generally accurate and sometimes detailed knowledge and understanding is demonstrated through most of the answer with evaluation and some analysis, and this is used appropriately to support the judgements that are made. There is a line of reasoning presented with some structure. The information presented is in the most-part relevant and supported by some evidence.
Level 3 13–18 marks	The question is partially addressed. There is demonstration of some relevant knowledge and understanding, which is evaluated and analysed in parts of the answer, but in places knowledge is imparted rather than being used. The analysis is appropriately linked to the judgements made, though the way in which it supports the judgements may not always be made explicit. The information has some relevance and is presented with limited structure. The information is supported by limited evidence.
Level 2 7–12 marks	The focus is more on the topic than the specific demands of the question. Knowledge and understanding is limited and not well used, with only limited evaluation and analysis, which is only sometimes linked appropriately to the judgements made. The information has some relevance, but is communicated in an unstructured way. The information is supported by limited evidence and the relationship to the evidence may not be clear.
Level 1 1–6 marks	The answer relates to the topic but not the specific question. The answer contains only very limited relevant knowledge which is evaluated and analysed in a very limited way. Judgements are unsupported and are not linked to analysis. Relevant knowledge is limited, generalised and poorly used; attempts at argument are no more than assertion. Information presented is basic and may be ambiguous or unstructured. The information is supported by limited evidence.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding and no demonstration of any relevant knowledge.

APPENDIX 2 – this section contains additional subject specific information

	<i>AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]
Level 5 17–20 marks	The answer has a very good analysis of the interpretation. It uses detailed and relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows thorough understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of detailed examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a well-supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 4 13–16 marks	The answer has a good analysis of the interpretation. It uses relevant knowledge of the historical context and good understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of examination of other interpretations, in order to produce a supported evaluation of both the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation.
Level 3 9–12 marks	The answer has a partial analysis of the interpretation. It uses some relevant knowledge of the historical context and shows partial understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of reference to other interpretations, in order to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the given interpretation. The evaluation may be un-even with only limited treatment of either limitations or strengths, but both will be addressed.
Level 2 5–8 marks	The answer has a limited analysis of the interpretation. It uses generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows limited understanding of the wider historical debate, in the form of generalised reference to other interpretations, in order to produce a limited evaluation of the given interpretation. The evaluation may deal with either strengths or limitations in a very superficial way, or may only address limitations or strengths.
Level 1 1–4 marks	The answer has a very limited analysis of the interpretation which may be descriptive and relate more to the topic area than the detail of the interpretation. It uses very limited and generalised knowledge of the historical context and shows very limited or no understanding of the wider historical debate, with reference to other interpretations being implicit or lacking, in order to produce a very simplistic, asserted evaluation of the given interpretation.
0 marks	No evidence of understanding or reference to the interpretation.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2017

