

OCR – AS GCE
European and World
History Enquiries
1774–1975
F964: Option B

The USA and the Cold War in
Asia 1945–75

SOURCES
ACCOMPANYING
EXEMPLAR
QUESTION 1

SOURCE A

US President Harry Truman recalls his decision to send troops to Korea.

Communism was acting in Korea just as Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese had acted fifteen, twenty years earlier. I felt certain that if South Korea was allowed to fall Communist leaders would be emboldened to override nations close to our own shores. If the Communists were permitted to force their way in to the Republic of Korea without opposition from the free world, no small nation would have the courage to resist threats and aggression by stronger Communist neighbours. If this was allowed to go unchallenged it would mean a third world war.

Harry Truman from his memoirs: Years of Trial and Hope, 1965

SOURCE B

US Secretary of State Dean Acheson gives an explanation for the North Korean Offensive of 25 June 1950.

It seemed close to certain that the North Korean attack had been mounted, supplied and instigated by the Soviet Union and that it would not be stopped by anything short of force. If Korean force proved unequal to the job, as seemed probable, only American intervention could do it. Troops from other sources would be helpful politically and psychologically but unimportant militarily. Plainly, this attack did not amount to a reason to go to war against the Soviet Union. Equally plainly, it was an open undisguised challenge to our internationally accepted position as the protector of South Korea, an area of great importance to the security of American occupied Japan. To back away from this challenge, in view of our capacity for meeting it, would be highly destructive of the power and prestige of the United States.

Dean Acheson from his memoirs: Present at the Creation, 1969

SOURCE C

A statement of protest by the North Korean Foreign Minister, Pak Hon Yong, about US involvement in the Korean conflict.

The United States government supplied the traitorous bandits of Syngman Rhee with political, economic and military aid, and directed in the building and training of Syngman Rhee's army and in working out the aggressive plan for the invasion of North Korea. Such encouragement and aid spurred the Syngman Rhee clique to start a civil war in Korea. The government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had long since known of the aggressive anti-people's plan of Syngman Rhee and strove to avoid a civil war, taking all the measures it could to achieve a peaceful unification of our fatherland.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1950

SOURCE D

A message from Stalin, the Soviet leader, to Kim Il Sung offering support for a North Korean offensive.

Comrade Kim Il Sung must understand that such a large matter in regard to South Korea such as he wants to undertake needs large preparation. The matter must be organized so that there would not be too great a risk. If he wants to discuss this matter with me then I will always be ready to receive him.

Message received by the Soviet ambassador in Pyonyang, Korea, 30 January 1950

SOURCE E

A modern historian reflects on the origins of the Korean War.

The source of the conflict would have been clearer had the Westerners looked at events before June 1950. The policy makers were familiar with the facts but they had little to gain by drawing attention to the recent past, as this might have led to criticisms of their policies. Hence the media and the public in the United States remained uncertain about the long-term origins of the war. They tended to date the beginning of the crisis from the invasion, with the result that it clearly appeared to be a simple act of aggression by one country against another. While this was helpful in generating support for the American war effort, the facts were much more complicated.

T.E. Vadney, The World Since 1945, 1998

OCR – AS GCE
European and World
History Enquiries
1774–1975
F 964: Option B

The USA and the Cold War in Asia, 1945–75

QUESTION (a)

Examiner's Specific Advice

This answer specifically requires a direct and linked comparison of the two sources set out in the question. Similarities and differences need to be drawn out to achieve a top level answer. Sources will have been chosen to enable a good contrast to be made. The comparison should demonstrate evaluation of such matters as authorship, date, usefulness and reliability. However, whilst these points provide a 'toolkit', students should not use them just as a checklist to run through without careful thought. Introductions and attributions of the sources should be used to develop an effective answer.

[Click Here For
Sources Relating
to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (a) Study Sources A and B.
Compare these Sources as evidence about why the USA decided to intervene in the Korean War (1950–54).
[30 marks]

[Click Here for a
Chronology
Relating to this
Topic](#)

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

- Short introduction
- Analysis of Source A
- Analysis of Source B
- General conclusions

The sources refer to the writings of two important American politicians involved in making decisions about going to war in 1950. They both mention concerns about Communism although Source A does this in a more obvious way (1).

In Source A President Truman argues that if Korea had been allowed to fall to the Communists then a third world war would have broken out. The idea of 'containing' Communism was first put forward in 1947 by George Kennan (2). Truman linked containment to recent history by suggesting that Communism was like Nazism and Fascism. If it was allowed to get out of control, it would be catastrophic for the world. Therefore, Truman believed the USA had no option but to intervene to stop this happening (3).

In Source B Acheson also talks about the importance of defeating Communism by making reference to the Soviet Union's involvement in Korea. However, he also discusses why it was important for the USA to intervene to protect 'American occupied Japan' and to maintain the world status of the USA (4). This seems to contradict a speech he made in January 1950 that suggested South Korea was outside the US zone of defence for the Far East (5).

Both sources suggest the USA intervened due to the fear that Communism would spread. Truman was scared that this would lead to a major world conflict but Acheson emphasised the loss of prestige if the USA didn't act (6).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level II (5 marks): uses historical terms accurately and is structured in a clear and coherent fashion. Lacks some explanation in places.

AO1b – Level III (5 marks): a mixture of internal analysis and some discussion of similarities and differences; links between sources need to be made more explicit.

AO2a – Level IV (8 marks): something of a comparison is made but is largely sequential (one paragraph on Source A followed by one on Source B). There is very limited reference to provenance.

Total mark of 18 (Grade C).

(1) A solid start with a clear focus on the question, although 'a more obvious way' is vague.

(2) Good use of own knowledge to help explain the view of Truman.

(3) Generally, a cogent and accurate interpretation of the source.

(4) A comparison to identify similarity with Source A is attempted here but it needs to be far more explicit. The precise links between the two sources are not made clear.

(5) This is an interesting piece of information but more could be made of it to evaluate the usefulness and reliability of Source B.

(6) A decent conclusion based on a comparative approach, even though it is a bit repetitive.

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

- Introduction
- Linked comparison to show similarities
- Linked comparison to show differences
- Conclusion

Both of the sources focus on concerns about the spread of Communism in general and why it could not be allowed to happen in Korea. However, they differ in terms of the reasons given for why Communism was seen as a threat to the USA. The differences are mainly due to the different political experiences of the authors and the roles that they played in policy making (1).

In Source A Truman states that if South Korea fell to Communism then it would spread to other territory close by. This is echoed in Source B by Acheson, who argues that the Soviet backed Northern Korean invasion of the South was an indirect challenge to 'American occupied Japan'. Thus, they were clearly both fearful about the consequences of the spread of Communist rule. They also argue that the South might not have the resources to resist a Communist takeover and US (or 'world') intervention was therefore necessary. There was bound to be some agreement between the two politicians due to the economic and political systems that they were both defending and intending to promote (Capitalism and Western Liberal Democracy) and the fact that they both served in the same government (2).

However, they differ on the precise threat of Communism. Both consider the results of a possible North Korean victory but Truman, unlike Acheson, likens Communism to pre-Second World War Nazism and Fascism, claiming that if it were not contained another world war would occur. Acheson, on the other hand, emphasises the importance of protecting Japan, as a failure to do so would lead to the USA losing prestige and status throughout the world. In turn this would mean that the USA would no longer act as a deterrent to other regimes in other parts of the world who might intend to carry out similar action. This was probably said with the knowledge that Mao had won a Communist victory in China in 1949 and that the Soviet Union had also influenced the setting up of Communist regimes in parts of Eastern Europe (3). Thus, the likelihood of further Communist backed takeovers at that time was quite strong. The main reason for the difference in perspective is probably due to Truman having been in charge of the USA at the end of the Second World War (from April 1945); he had been partly responsible for dealing with the aftermath and was very keen to ensure that the USA did not get involved in another global conflict. Acheson only became

(1) A comparative approach is adopted from the start with the flagging up of difference and similarity between the sources.

(2) The main similarities are fully discussed and clearly set out in this section.

(3) Discussion of difference is nicely blended with reference to events that Acheson would have been familiar with and that would have influenced his thinking.

(4) The comparison is sustained and linked with pertinent contextual knowledge and understanding.

(5) A useful comment relating to provenance, although it is 'bolted on' and it could perhaps be further developed.

(6) A pointed and well-balanced conclusion.

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

Secretary of State in 1949 and he was more interested in looking to the future, not only to protect the USA from the threat of Communism but to enhance its position as **the** world power that had the military capabilities to deter aggressive countries and minimise the chance of further wars. This also tied in with his other interests, such as the promotion of the US role within NATO (4).

It is worth noting that both sources come from memoirs that were published in the 1960s. Changing foreign and domestic affairs, especially as affected by the emerging Cold War, may well have influenced and altered the views of the authors. Their fear of Communism may have been much stronger in the 1960s than it was in 1950 (5).

In conclusion, it is interesting that although the two politicians were involved directly in policy making at the time of the Korean conflict, their rationale for US involvement was notably different. Nevertheless, both agreed that only US intervention could prevent the South from being overrun and their objective was eventually achieved (6).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IA (6 marks): clearly written with a good range of appropriate historical terms used.

AO1b – Level IA (8 marks): consistently relevant with a good level of knowledge and understanding of key concepts displayed. Focused on analysis of historical evidence throughout.

AO2a – Level IB (14 marks): an effective comparison is provided with respect to content and provenance. Strengths and limitations of sources are considered.

Total mark of 28 (Grade A).

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

Mark Scheme, Question 1 (a). US involvement in the Korean War

Examiners use Mark Schemes to determine how best to categorise a candidate's response and to ensure that the performances of thousands of candidates are marked to a high degree of consistency. Few answers fall neatly into the mark levels indicated below: some answers will provide good comparisons but offer little internal provenance; others may rely heavily on own knowledge. Examiners therefore try to find the 'best fit' when applying the scheme. Each answer has a final mark based on three Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b and AO2a) worth $6 + 8 + 16 = 30$ marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level 1 and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels are tabulated below.

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

Answers need to directly compare the two sources and may evaluate matters such as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for ...'. The introductions and attributions for each source should be used to aid comparison. These two sources provide different views on why the USA entered the Korean War. Source A is from the writings of Harry Truman, who was President at the time of the war and who made the final decision to send troops to South Korea. Source B is from the memoirs of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State at the time, who, despite being an important figure in Truman's government, gave a different slant on why intervention was important. There is much material to help candidates make an effective comparison between the two sources.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (a)

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

Assessment Objectives	AO1a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively	AO1b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis	AO2a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination
LEVEL IA	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks	Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 16 marks
LEVEL IB	Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 6 marks	Judgements are supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 7 marks	Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 13–15 marks
LEVEL II	Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 5 marks	Good attempt at explanation/ analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6 marks	Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 11–12 marks
LEVEL III	Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 4 marks	Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and/or differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 5 marks	Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 9–10 marks
LEVEL IV	Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under-developed or disorganised sections but satisfactorily written. 3 marks	Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts and significance of issues; some unlinked though relevant assertions, description/narrative but without a judgement. 4 marks	Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points of comparative provenance or similarity/difference of content. 7–8 marks

OCR – AS GCE
European and World
History Enquiries
1774–1975
F 964: Option B

The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75

QUESTION (b)

Examiner's Specific Advice

This question requires you to pull together an answer which includes some of the analysis you have had to do for part (a) and then go further by considering all the sources. Make sure you allow two-thirds of the time allocated for the whole paper (that makes 60 minutes for this question). Do a brief plan to remind yourself of agreement/disagreement with the proposition in the question. Identify themes which the sources pick up on; these should emerge in questions set by the examiners.

Make sure you have covered all the sources by the end of your answer, but avoid the temptation to cover each in turn. This 'sequential' approach would seriously limit your chances of achieving a top level mark. Your own knowledge is essential to a good answer. Use it to interrogate the sources and to question critically any assertion they make.

Develop analysis of a source by examining a range of examples from your more comprehensive knowledge. Do not just describe what's in a source. However, avoid a common mistake of deploying so much of your own knowledge that the sources aren't properly considered. This is after all a source-based paper. Avoid the temptation to quote chunks from each source; the examiner should know what is there! Rather, confine yourself to significant words or short phrases. A conclusion is necessary to tie your discussion up. It doesn't need to be long, but it should be clear for greatest impact.

[Click Here For
Sources Relating
to this Question](#)

Exemplar Question

1 (b) Study all the Sources.

Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the **main** reason for the escalation of the Korean War was the fear of the USA that Communism would spread throughout Asia.

[70 marks]

[Click Here for a
Chronology
Relating to this
Topic](#)

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 1

Plan

- Introduction
- Sources explained and discussed
- Own knowledge
- Conclusions

All of the sources need to be looked at along with my own knowledge before making a judgment about whether the escalation of the Korean War was due to the fear of the USA that Communism would spread (1).

In Source A Truman believes that if the USA hadn't intervened then Communism would have spread to the South. This was similar to what had happened with Nazism and Fascism in the inter-war years and the result then had been a world war. Truman predicts that if Communism had been allowed to go unchallenged it would have meant a third world war. Only firm action from the 'free world' (as represented by the USA) could prevent this. Therefore, the US fear of Communism was a reason for the escalation of the Korean War (2).

Dean Acheson in Source B agrees that the USA was worried about Communist and Soviet expansion but differs with Truman over what the possible consequences might have been. It would have meant that if the USA did not protect Japan (which might have fallen to Communism after Korea) it would have lost face and Communist leaders throughout the world might have been encouraged to take over other countries (3).

Source C is the view of the North Korean official Pak Hon Yong and is therefore biased. He blames the USA for the escalation of the war, but not simply because they were scared of Communism. It was more to do with support they gave to Syngman Rhee, who was sympathetic towards western ideas and the USA in particular. Also, Pak Hon Yong says that North Korea was definitely not to blame as it tried to avoid civil war (4).

Source D is also biased as it is part of a message given by the Soviet leader Stalin to Kim Il Sung. It shows that Stalin was willing to help North Korea win the war as long as Kim Il Sung discussed his plans and showed he was willing to minimise the risks. This suggests that the Soviet Union was just as much to blame for escalating the conflict as the USA (5).

Finally, in Source E the historian Vadney seems to blame politicians for escalating the war as they twisted or ignored the facts to give the impression that North Korea was to blame as they started the war by invading the South. Policy makers drew attention away from the long-term origins of the war so that the US public would think that US

(1) The introduction 'signposts', i.e. states the obvious; it should outline the argument that is to be presented and defended.

(2) This paragraph is mainly a summary of Source A that is loosely linked to the question. It contains limited analysis and/or evaluation.

(3) There is some attempt here to show how Source B concurs with Source A but generally it is a thin section.

(4) An attempt is made to evaluate the source through use of the term 'biased'. However, it needs to be explored further. After all, all sources are biased but that does not mean that they lack utility.

(5) A similar approach is used here and again the comments are rather thin.

(6) Source E is quite challenging and the comment

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

intervention was justified to beat off the threat of Communism. This is quite a reliable source as Vadney must have had access to a wide range of evidence before making his conclusions (6).

From my own knowledge, I know that US officials were afraid that Communism would spread in Korea and elsewhere as they had already negotiated with the Soviet Union that Communist control should be limited to an area above the 38th parallel until elections could be held throughout Korea to install a democratic government. It was US policy from 1947 to contain Communism, although some started to say that it should actually be 'rolled back'. After Kim Il Sung attacked, Truman quickly gained a resolution from the United Nations which stated that members should protect the South. The first US troops were sent to Korea on 30 June but under a UN commander (General MacArthur). But, other countries were to blame for the escalation of the war, including the Soviet Union and China. Both Stalin and Mao provided resources to Kim Il Sung, hoping he would unify Korea under Communist rule (7).

In conclusion, the escalation of the war was due to US fear that Communism would spread but other countries were also responsible (8).

here shows that a good attempt has been made to interpret it accurately.

(7) A good amount of own knowledge is utilised here but it is 'bolted on' to the end of the response. There is an attempt to discuss and evaluate a range of factors but the material should really be integrated with source analysis.

(8) A fairly basic conclusion, although there is a focus on making a judgment.

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level III (6 marks): uses relevant and historical terms but not always accurately or relevantly.

AO1b – Level III (6 marks): shows a decent understanding of key concepts, although a bit uneven in places.

AO2a – Level IV (15 marks): comments are mainly sequential but provenance is discussed to some extent.

AO2b – Level III (12 marks): sound analysis and evaluation but unevenness between use of own knowledge and sources.

Total mark of 39 (low Grade C).

Examiner's Exemplar Plan and Answer 2

Plan

- Introduction
- Role of the USA
- Role played by other nations
- Conclusions

The sources focus on why a Korean Civil War escalated in to a bigger conflict involving world powers. US commitment was quite obviously governed by a fear of Communism spreading and, as Vadney suggests, in Source E, American politicians were keen to justify sending US troops to South

(1) A solid start that makes good use of Source E to indicate that a range of influences on the war need to be considered.

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

Korea by pointing out that conflict was started by the aggressive actions of the Communist North. However, Vadney also indicates that the troubles had long-term origins which, in particular, related to the changing relationships between the USA, Japan, China and Russia (1).

The fear of Communism spreading, as expressed in Sources A and B, built up over a number of decades from the time of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. Truman compares Communism with Nazism and Fascism to emphasise how potentially evil it was. His view was obviously coloured by the fact that he was American and that Communism went against the ideology of Liberal Democracy, which most US citizens adhered to. His stance was also shaped by his experience as President at the end of the Second World War when he was involved in negotiations with the Soviet Union under the leadership of Joseph Stalin. Also, Source A was written in 1965 when the Cold War tensions were mounting and the prospect of another global conflict appeared to be a distinct possibility. Acheson's views support those of Truman to an extent; they both believed that Communism should be 'contained' and that the USA was the nation in the strongest position to do so due to its superior military power. However, Acheson is slightly more guarded in his comments and was keen to avoid a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union over Korea. In fact, in January 1950 he made a speech which seemed to imply that South Korea was outside the US defence perimeter in Asia and that the most important thing was to protect Japan from a Communist takeover. However, Source B confirms that Acheson did support the use of military intervention, especially if 'troops from other sources' were also to be provided (2).

Source C also discusses the role of the USA but focuses more on the support given to Syngman Rhee in the South than on the fear of Communism in general. However, this support was still linked to concern that, after the Japanese withdrawal from Korea in 1945, the Korean Communists who had opposed imperialist rule would, with the backing of the USSR, gain enough support to govern the whole of Korea (3). Thus, in August 1945, with the USSR already encamped in parts of the North, the USA insisted on a compromise that involved the nation being divided in two by the 38th parallel. The North would be supervised by the USSR and the South by the USA until elections could be held allowing the Korean people to democratically elect their own government. Until 1948, the USA stamped its authority on the South by demobilising the People's Committees (Communist influenced groups) and promoting the right-wing, pro-American Syngman Rhee. They then prompted the United Nations to supervise elections knowing that Rhee would almost definitely win in the South. The USSR also realised this and refused to support elections. This all caused unrest in the South resulting in a mini guerilla war (1947–48) between Communists and

(2) A thorough, detailed section that shows how argument and use of sources can be effectively blended together.

(3) Source C is used nicely here as a link to discussion of long-term causal factors.

(4) There is very good use of own knowledge here; it is well focused and, again, integrated with discussion of appropriate sources.

(5) More could be said about the role of Stalin, his attitude towards Kim Il Sung and his views on the possible escalation of the conflict.

(6) Similarly, this section is a bit thin, although it raises an important point about what is missing from the source collection (i.e. reference to China).

(7) A well-balanced conclusion that is consistent with the main body of the answer.

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

supporters of Rhee. In turn this prompted Kim Il Sung to suggest he would back his southern comrades. Thus, by supporting Rhee and causing unrest in the South, the USA, as stated in Source C, was partly responsible for the escalation of the Korean War. This is also why Vadney, in Source E, argues for the need to consider events before June 1950 (4).

Sources C and D, though, suggest that the USSR also played an important role in the development of the war as Stalin promised to support Kim Il Sung's plan to invade the South. One must take care when interpreting Source D as the content is vague and Stalin is not communicating directly with Sung. We also know that Stalin treated Sung as a 'junior partner' in Soviet–Korean relations and the source, therefore, probably doesn't truly represent Stalin's views (5). In fact, Stalin didn't formally agree to provide support until April 1950 and it eventually proved to be of a far more limited nature than the support provided by the USA to the South.

Also worth mentioning is the fact that China had a significant part to play in the escalation of the conflict as it gave military support to the North from May 1950 onwards. This is not mentioned in any of the sources (6).

To conclude, the USA was undoubtedly worried about the spread of Communism and this fear prompted the support given to Rhee in the South. It also resulted in subsequent opposition from the North. In this sense the USA had a major responsibility for the escalation of the conflict. But Chinese and Soviet backing of the Northern regime gave Sung the confidence to invade the South in June 1950. Therefore, it would be unfair to lay blame solely at the feet of US politicians. In this sense the causes of escalation were multi- not mono-dimensional (7).

Examiner's Assessment

AO1a – Level IB (8 marks): uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence; clearly structured and coherently written.

AO1b – Level IB (10 marks): clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and issues; judgements are supported by appropriate references to content and provenance.

AO2a – Level IB (25 marks): the value and limitations of the sources are evaluated and, generally, are effectively linked and compared.

AO2b – Level IA (20 marks): focused analysis and evaluation of the interpretation using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion; fully understood that the sources both support and refute the interpretation.

Total mark of 63 (Grade A).

[Click here for a Mark Scheme that accompanies the exemplar answers provided above](#)

Mark Scheme, Question 1 (b). Reasons for the escalation of the Korean War

Examiners are told *not* to look for a set answer. The interpretation in the question may be agreed with or rejected – but it must be considered seriously, even if the claim is then rejected. Answers need to use *all five sources*, evaluating them as to their strengths and limitations as evidence and testing them against contextual knowledge. The set of sources shows three that support the proposition, although interestingly two originate from US politicians and one from a North Korean minister (i.e. the ‘enemy’). Source D gives a lead for candidates to bring in other influences, in this case Stalin and Kim Il Sung. All of the sources, however, can only be made sense of, and used effectively, by being placed in their historical context. Source E should prompt candidates to consider the wider historical context of the Korean War as it mentions the need to consider events before June 1950. Overall, the best answers to this type of question are likely to be in the form of a balanced argument that is supported by ‘own knowledge’ and the sources in an integrated fashion. Evaluation of the evidence should also be blended in and not simply bolted on at the end.

Each answer has a final mark based on four Assessment Objectives (AO1a, AO1b, AO2a and AO2b) worth 10 + 12 + 28 + 20 marks = 70 marks. As the standard of the two answers lies between Level I and Level IV, only the descriptors and marks for these levels are tabulated below.

Marking Grid for Enquiries Question (b)

<p>Assessment Objectives</p> <p>Access to History Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question</p>	<p>AO1a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge and communicate clearly and effectively</p>	<p>AO1b Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation and analysis</p>	<p>AO2a Analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination</p>	<p>AO2b Analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented</p>
<p>Level IA</p>	<p>Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 9–10 marks</p>	<p>Consistently relevant and analytical answer; clear and accurate understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 11–12 marks</p>	<p>Provides a focused comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 26–28 marks</p>	<p>Excellent analysis and evaluation of the interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a conclusion. 20 marks</p>
<p>Level IB</p>	<p>Uses a range of appropriate historical terms; clearly and coherently structured and communicated answer. 8 marks</p>	<p>Judgements supported by appropriate references to content and provenance; very good understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 9–10 marks</p>	<p>Provides an effective comparison of both content and provenance; evaluates qualities and limitations of sources. 23–25 marks</p>	<p>Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion. 17–19 marks</p>
<p>Level II</p>	<p>Uses historical terms accurately; clearly and mostly coherently structured and clearly communicated answer. 7 marks</p>	<p>Good attempt at explanation/analysis but uneven overall judgements; mostly clear understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 8 marks</p>	<p>Provides a relevant comparison of both content and provenance; evaluation lacks completeness and may be confined to the conclusion or second half of the answer. 20–22 marks</p>	<p>Focused analysis and evaluation of interpretation, using all sources and own knowledge to reach a clear conclusion; some imbalance between use of own knowledge and sources. 14–16 marks</p>
<p>Level III</p>	<p>Uses relevant historical terms but not always accurately or extensively; mostly structured and clearly communicated answer. 6 marks</p>	<p>Mixture of internal analysis and discussion of similarities and differences; uneven understanding of key concepts and significance of issues. 6–7 marks</p>	<p>Provides a comparison; makes limited links with the sources by focusing too much on content or provenance. 17–19 marks</p>	<p>Sound analysis and evaluation; there may be some description and unevenness between use of own knowledge and sources. 11–13 marks</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<p>Some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant; some unclear, under-developed or disorganised sections but satisfactorily written. 4–5 marks</p>	<p>Mostly satisfactory understanding of key concepts; some unlinked though relevant assertions, description/narrative but without a judgement. 4–5 marks</p>	<p>Attempts a comparison but comments are largely sequential; makes few points of comparative provenance or similarity/difference of content. 14–16 marks</p>	<p>Some analysis and evaluation with increasing amounts of description; imbalanced use of own knowledge and sources. 8–10 marks</p>

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

Chronology: Key Events in *the Origins of the Korean War*

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

1919		Beginning of Japanese colonial rule and Korean protests against this.
1945	February	<u>USA and Soviet Union agree on a trusteeship for Korea (1).</u>
	August	Division of Korea into North and South by way of the 38th parallel. <u>Local People's Committees set up (2).</u>
	September	Korean People's Party established.
1946	February	Representative Democratic Council established and chaired by Syngman Rhee. Interim People's Committee established and led by Kim Il Sung.
	June	<u>Chinese Civil War restarted (3).</u>
	October	Elections for the South Korean Interim Assembly.
1947	March	<u>Announcement of the Truman Doctrine (4).</u>
	September	Proclamation made by George Marshall to UN General Assembly on Korean independence.
1948	February	North Korean People's Army established.
	March	Elections for South Korea announced, to take place in May.
	May	South Korean elections.
	August	Republic of Korea established and led by Syngman Rhee as President.
	September	Democratic People's Republic of Korea established.
1949	March	Kim Il Sung travels to Moscow to meet Stalin for the first time.
	October	<u>People's Republic of China established (5).</u>
1950	January	<u>Press Club speech made by Dean Acheson (6).</u> Stalin suggests he is willing to help Kim Il Sung organise an offensive against South Korea.
	April	Stalin formally confirms offer of support to Kim Il Sung. <u>President Truman approves draft of NSC68 (7).</u>
	May	Chairman Mao formally confirms offer of support to Kim Il Sung.
	June	Korean offensive begins.

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

- (1) Trusteeship was a strategy that supported eventual independence for colonial territories but only after a period of fairly lengthy guidance by the great powers. The US version originated during the presidential rule of Roosevelt, who based his model on Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations mandate system.
- (2) People's Committees were first established in August 1945. They consisted mainly of people who were sympathetic towards communist or socialist ideas, although some were simply nationalists. They came from a variety of backgrounds and included landlords, former soldiers, students and Koreans who had worked for the Japanese.
- (3) This was between the Nationalists led by Chiang Kai-shek and Communists under the command of Mao Zedong. In June 1946, Syngman Rhee predicted that a similar civil conflict would develop in Korea if Communism gained momentum.
- (4) President Truman stated that the USA would 'support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures'.
- (5) Mao Zedong won the Chinese Civil War and established a communist government in China.
- (6) In this speech, US secretary of State Dean Acheson claimed that any attack by Communists on the South of Korea should be opposed by local military forces in the first instance. If this failed, then there would be 'a call upon the commitments of the civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations, which so far has not proved to be a weak reed by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression'.
- (7) 'National Security Council 68' was a policy document published by the US government that demanded 'greatly increased general air, ground and sea strength' and 'increased air defence and civilian defence programmes'. The Korean conflict was viewed as an opportunity to put the suggestions in to operation.

Teaching activities

1. The aim of this activity is to expand your knowledge and understanding of the topic. Using the Chronology, divide the information into long-term, short-term and trigger causes of the Korean War. What do you think were the most important and least important causes? Explain your answer.
2. The aim of this activity is to improve your skill at analysing and evaluating historical sources. Make a list of the types of historical sources that could be used to research key individuals involved in the escalation of the Korean War, for example, memoirs. Comment on the value and limitations of using each type of source.
3. The aim of this activity is to expand your knowledge and understanding of the topic. Research the key individuals involved in the lead-up to the Korean War, i.e.

- Syngman Rhee
- Kim Il Sung
- Mao Zedong
- Joseph Stalin
- Harry Truman
- Dean Acheson
- General MacArthur

Summarise your material on index cards using the following subheadings:

NAME (including birth and death dates)

EARLY LIFE

IDEOLOGY

ATTITUDE TOWARDS KOREA

Once completed, place the cards in order of who you think was most responsible for the war. Compare your rank order with that of a classmate and discuss similarities and differences. Think of other ways of grouping the cards to help you understand the roles of individuals in the war, for example, Communists, military leaders.

4. The aim of this activity is to improve your skill at analysing and evaluating historical sources. Using all of the sources, complete a table that provides examples of fact, opinion and judgement for each (see below for an exemplar).

SOURCE	FACTS	OPINIONS	JUDGEMENTS
A	Mentions historical figures, e.g. Hitler.	'I felt certain that ...'	'... it would mean a third world war' (or is this an opinion?)
B			
C			
D			
E			

Answer the following questions:

- Which of the sources contains
 - a) the most facts?

Access to History – Online OCR European and World History Enquiries – The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75 – Standard AS Question

- b) the most opinions?
 - c) the most judgements?
- Which of the sources, if any, contains an even spread of fact, opinion and judgement?
 - Historians often argue that sources containing mainly opinion (or assertion) are usually less useful and reliable than those containing judgements (opinion based on fact). Using your table, which of the sources appear to be the most useful and reliable as evidence about the escalation of the Korean War?
 - How far do you agree with the view that sources that contain more opinion than judgement are always less reliable as historical evidence?

Resources

Christian Appy, *Vietnam: The Definitive Oral History Told From all Sides* (Ebury Press, 2006)

Oliver Edwards, *The USA and The Cold War, 1945–63* (Hodder and Stoughton, 2002)

Mitchell Hall, *The Vietnam War* (Longman, 2007)

Max Hastings, *The Korean War* (Pan, 2000)

Steven Hugh Lee, *The Korean War 1950–54* (Longman, 2001)

Walter Le Feber, *America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945–2006* (McGraw Hill, 2006)

Martin McCauley, *Russia, America and the Cold War, 1949–1991* (Longman, 2004)

Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Weblinks

www.archives.gov/education/lessons/Korean-conflict/

www.coldwar.org

www.historylearningsite.co.uk

www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/vietnam

www.kwva.org

www.onwar.com

www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/vietweb.html

www.vietnamwar.com