

AS
HISTORY
7041/2R

The Cold War, c1945–1991

Component 2R To the brink of Nuclear War: international relations, c1945–1963

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why there were tensions between the Soviet Union and the USA over Berlin in the years 1958 to 1961?

[25 marks]*Target: AO2**Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.***Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- this is a note sent by the Soviet government and therefore demonstrates the official Soviet attitude towards West Germany and Berlin. It is valuable as it shows the depth of hostility the Soviet Union felt towards the USA at this time and that they were taking action to regain control in Germany
- the date is valuable as this source followed Khrushchev's speech earlier that month in which he gave an ultimatum to the USA to reach a settlement over Germany within 6 months. Therefore, it is valuable to understand why there were tensions over Berlin as Khrushchev felt the need to give an ultimatum
- the tone of the source is very aggressive and condescending when discussing the USA and other allies, suggesting a degree of 'posturing' and that a diplomatic solution is not intended, therefore making the source less valuable. On the other hand, the reference to German aggression is indicative of genuine Soviet security concerns.

Content and argument

- the note is arguing that the USA and its allies had broken the Potsdam Agreements – for example the agreement that Germany was to become a single economic unit and demilitarised. This is valuable because the USA had introduced a new constitution for West Germany, created the Deutschmark and admitted West Germany to NATO. However, similar Soviet policies towards the GDR such as interfering with political parties to engineer Communism are overlooked; Potsdam had not provided a complete blueprint for post-war reconstruction
- the source also argues that West Germany was aggressive towards the USSR, whereas the GDR was only peaceful. This could be valuable to understand the reasons for tension because the Soviet Union would have considered actions, such as the FRG joining NATO, as aggressive. However, the internal policies of the GDR, such as manipulating elections, could be viewed as aggressive towards the West, making it less valuable
- the source also argues that the USA are abusing their position in West Berlin. This is valuable because it clearly indicates that the Soviet Union felt threatened by the USA and therefore wanted to remove their influence – West Berlin had become a flagship of American Capitalism, a drain on the GDR and easily competed against a Communist economy.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- this is a public broadcast by the President to an American audience, and as such is likely to reflect both Kennedy's public and private position. It is valuable in understanding Kennedy's view of Khrushchev's policies towards Berlin and why this created tension over the region
- the purpose of this source is to demonise the Soviet Union in the eyes of the American people and secure their support for US policy over the future of Berlin; perhaps making it less valuable to understand tensions because it is an aggressive source
- the tone of the source is extremely forthright and critical of the USSR's policies in Berlin. This broadcast conveys a sense of resolution – Kennedy lays down some 'red lines' – points of principle such as 'legal rights', integrity and 'freedom' over which the US will not compromise. This could be more valuable to understand why tensions developed into a full-blown crisis.

Content and argument

- Kennedy's account of his meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna in 1961 emphasises Khrushchev's aggressive intent and the USA's warnings to him. The source is valuable to understand tensions from the USA's perspective but does not address the nature of Soviet concerns raised at that meeting
- Kennedy emphasises Soviet military spending. This is less valuable to understand tensions because in fact following the meeting in Vienna, Kennedy asked Congress to increase defence spending, call up army reservists and reactivate ships that were to be scrapped. Therefore, Kennedy is providing an extreme one-sided view of issues over Berlin
- Kennedy stresses the USA's peaceful intentions and how peace is being threatened by Soviet policies towards Berlin. The stress placed on freedom offers an insight as to US policy, however, it makes the source less valuable as the USA had turned West Berlin into a flagship of Capitalism and the USSR were threatened by this.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source A is valuable in understanding the reasons for tensions from the Soviet perspective. The claim that the underlying reason for tension was the violation of the Potsdam Agreements from 1945 by the USA, mainly – and the fact that it is produced before the Berlin Crisis depicts the build-up of tensions. Source B may be seen to have value in that it provides the US perspective. It is a public address at the height of tensions over Berlin and so may be dismissed as rhetoric. On the other hand, it highlights the US commitment to key principles in the face of perceived Soviet aggression.

Section B

- 0 2** 'The breakdown of relations between the Soviet Union and the West by 1947 was mainly the result of ideological differences.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the breakdown of relations between the Soviet Union and the West by 1947 was mainly the result of ideological differences might include:

- the USA and UK were different politically, but both were theoretically liberal democratic in outlook; whereas the USSR was a Marxist-based state. Both sides felt that the spread of their own ideologies would assist future security – hence fundamental disagreements on post-war systems of government in Europe and taking sides in internal conflicts
- the USA and UK wanted national self-determination in the wake of the Second World War and therefore wanted free elections in Europe; the Soviet Union wanted to establish pro-communist satellite states in Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe. This therefore led to a breakdown in relations over significant issues
- the US and UK's approach to the reconstruction of post-war Germany was based on promoting Western democratic principles; whereas the Soviet Union was motivated by security needs and a socialist world view, therefore leading to a breakdown in relations
- the USA wanted free market Capitalism to stabilise the post-war world and to benefit the American economy – in agreement with the UK as they were financially dependent on the USA. However, the USSR rejected Capitalism and felt increasingly threatened by US policy, naming it dollar imperialism, meaning they could not co-operate on economic reconstructions.

Arguments challenging the view that the breakdown of relations between the Soviet Union and the West by 1947 was mainly the result of ideological differences might include:

- conflicting personalities could be viewed as a reason for the breakdown in relations. The wartime respect and cooperation fostered by Roosevelt gave way to a more suspicious approach under Truman and this was not tempered by Attlee and Bevin; Stalin's repeated acts of bad faith were damaging
- Stalin's genuine need for security guarantees and assistance in recovering from the war were not appreciated in the West and were not a concern to the USA or Britain. Therefore, when Stalin went ahead with creating satellite states in Eastern Europe in the name of national security, relations broke down
- there was a lack of trust between the powers which led to a breakdown in relations. For example, Stalin believed that the USA and its allies were potential enemies, accelerated by Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb. This was therefore the basis of many of his policies – including expanding into Eastern Europe and setting up pro-communist governments there; the UK viewed Soviet influence as a threat to its empire
- wartime unity had been shallow to begin with and once Germany had been defeated, there was no common enemy or need for alliance. For example, the failure to reach agreement at Yalta and Potsdam on key issues like the future of Germany allowed tensions to fester and develop post-war.

Students may conclude that it was indeed mainly ideological differences that were the underlying reason for the breakdown of the Grand Alliance – the key divisions between the West and USSR arose from different ideological values, eg around freedom and democracy. Different economic systems in the form of Capitalism and Communism had political implications. However, students could also conclude that there were other reasons for the breakdown that were more evident such as personality, Stalin's aggression and Truman's lack of empathy towards the USSR.

0 3 'In the years 1949 to 1955, US policies in Asia were very successful.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: 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.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1949 to 1955, US policies in Asia were very successful might include:

- the USA's support for Jiang Jieshi's nationalist government in Taiwan after the Chinese Civil War could be considered a partial success, as Communism was not allowed to continue to spread into Taiwan
- the USA led the complete transformation of Japan by providing support with economic restructure, sovereignty and assisting with Japanese rearmament. Once the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed in 1951, it was a clear success story for the USA
- Communism was contained to North Korea in the aftermath of the Korean War and therefore US intervention via the United Nations could be deemed a partial success
- the USA took further successful steps in Asia to prevent the spread of Communism, such as increasing military defence spending under NSC-68, establishing SEATO and creating the Defensive Perimeter Strategy which protected some countries in South East Asia
- by 1954, the USA was confidently providing support for a non-communist pro-American government in South Vietnam, demonstrating some success in their policies to protect South-east Asian countries from Communism.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1949 to 1955, US policies in Asia were very successful might include:

- the USA's provision of economic and military support to Jiang Jieshi was ultimately a failure, resulting in a communist government being established by Mao and the Sino-Soviet alliance being created, leading to further problems
- South Korea was omitted from the Defensive Perimeter Strategy in 1950 which directly led to North Korea invading the South. This shows that the DPS was a partial failure in containment policy as it did not fully protect Korea
- Communism remained in North Korea after the Korean War and therefore posed a risk to other countries in South-east Asia, meaning US containment policy could potentially fail if Communism spread any further
- there was no long-term solution to the situation in Vietnam and the USA's refusal to sign the Geneva Agreement demanding 'free' elections dictated by the North meant that further problems were to develop in the area.

Students may argue that ultimately the USA's policy of containment in Asia had somewhat failed in the years 1949 to 1955. Despite some successes, China had been lost to Communism and strengthened their alliance with the USSR, there were no long-term solutions for issues in Vietnam and other attempts to contain Communism in the region such as NSC-68, the DPS and SEATO were not fully effective. However, some students may argue that the setting up of Japan as a model state was a success, supporting Diem's government in Vietnam was a successful temporary solution and Communism was contained to North Korea and didn't spread to the South. Therefore, in some ways the USA's policies could be considered successful.