



**GCE**

**History A**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2019**

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 2019

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page
	Highlight
Off-page comment	
<b>A</b>	Assertion
<b>AN</b>	Analysis
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation
<b>EXP</b>	Explanation
<b>F</b>	Factor
<b>ILL</b>	Illustrates/Describes
<b>IRRL</b>	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
<b>J</b>	Judgement
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge and understanding
<b>P</b>	Provenance
<b>SC</b>	Simple comment
	Unclear
<b>V</b>	View

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

**MARK SCHEME Section A**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1*	<p><b>‘The only reason for US involvement in the Korean War was the defence of the South.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In assessing how the priority of the US was the defence of South Korea,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might explain how the US had liberated the South in 1945.</li> <li>• Answers might explain how the US had supported the regime of Syngman Rhee from 1948.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how the US secured UN support for the defence of South Korea.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how the US was prepared to fight back following their initial retreat to the Pusan perimeter.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss the peace of 1953 which confirmed the original borders on the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel.</li> </ul> <p><b>In assessing other reasons,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might argue that the US was more concerned to check the spread of communism and contain the USSR and China.</li> <li>• Answers might explain how the US was concerned to defend Japan.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how the US advanced beyond the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel with the intention of re-uniting the two Koreas.</li> <li>• Answers might argue the US saw the war as an opportunity to exert US influence on the mainland of Asia.</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the war provided an excuse to increase defence spending.</li> <li>• Answers might argue that the US was concerned to ensure its reputation and prestige.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement on the reasons for US involvement.</li> <li>• Judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2*	<p><b>‘The brutality of the Pol Pot regime, 1975-78, was motivated by racism.’ How far do you agree?</b></p> <p><b>In dealing with racism,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might explain that Khmer racism had a long tradition to which Pol Pot had been exposed.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss the persecution of the Muslim Cham.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss the persecution of Chinese Cambodians.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss the persecution of Vietnamese Cambodians.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss the persecution of the Khmer Krom and tribal minorities.</li> </ul> <p><b>In assessing other reasons for the brutality of the regime,</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers might argue that minorities were persecuted to achieve uniformity rather than ethnic cleansing.</li> <li>• Answers might point out that some ethnic groups were tolerated e.g. Thai and Lao minorities.</li> <li>• Answers might explain that most of the victims of brutality were ethnic Khmers.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how violence was used to achieve economic objectives i.e. the movement of urbanites to the countryside to increase food production.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how the brutality of the regime was a means to remove real or potential opponents.</li> <li>• Answers might discuss how violence was the means by which capitalism could be eradicated and communism established.</li> <li>• Answers might argue that brutality was an end in itself and the means to destroy the past and rebuild.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected</li> <li>• At Level 5 there will be judgement on ‘How far’.</li> <li>• Judgements must be supported by relevant and accurate material. If not, they are assertions.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>Read the interpretation and then answer the question that follows:</b></p> <p><b>‘He [Richard Nixon] had numerous options. Vietnamization ... proved to be a disastrous choice, one of the worst decisions ever made by a Cold War president.’</b></p> <p><b>From: Stephen Ambrose and Douglas Brinkley, <i>Rise to Globalism, 1971</i></b></p> <p><b>Evaluate the strengths and limitations of this interpretation, making reference to other interpretations that you have studied.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The historical debate about Vietnamization focuses on the context and outcome of the war in Vietnam.</b></li> <li>• <b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths and limitations of the interpretation,</b> answers might consider that the interpretation is one-sided about the policy of Vietnamization.</li> <li>• <b>In analysing and evaluating the strengths of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The continuation of the war for four years after 1969.</li> <li>• The policy was hugely costly in men and money.</li> <li>• US troops, already demoralised, were increasingly reluctant to fight.</li> <li>• The policy led to the extension of the war into Laos and Cambodia.</li> <li>• The demands of the North Vietnamese at the peace talks were increased, aware that the US was going to withdraw.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>In analysing the limitations of the given interpretation,</b> answers might use knowledge and understanding of:</li> </ul>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No set answer is expected</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Candidates must refer to at least one other interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Candidates are not expected to construct their own interpretation.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The opportunity the policy offered the US to 'withdraw with honour'.</li><li>• The terms of the settlement of January 1973, which appeared to secure US objectives.</li><li>• The chance, Vietnamization allowed Nixon to diffuse an issue that had been highly controversial and divisive at home.</li><li>• <b>Other interpretations that might be used in evaluation of the given interpretations are:</b></li><li>• Comparison with the decisions of other US presidents – Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson – might be considered.</li><li>• The consequences of simply ending the war by withdrawing quickly as Eisenhower did in Korea.</li><li>• The US might have focused their attention on the South and ignored the North.</li><li>• Nixon might have resorted to nuclear weapons and in doing so obliterate the North.</li></ul>		
--	---	--	--

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>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section A, Questions 1 and 2: Essay [30]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 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.
<b>Level 4</b> 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.
<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 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.
<b>Level 1</b> 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.



	<i>A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.</i>
	<b>Generic mark scheme for Section B, Question 3: Interpretation [20]</b>
<b>Level 5</b> 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.
<b>Level 4</b> 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.
<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 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.
<b>Level 1</b> 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)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

