

AS
HISTORY
7041/2R

The Cold War, c1945–1991

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

Mark scheme

June 2020

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.

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 © 2020 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, i.e. 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 the crisis over Cuba in 1962?

[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 source was a television address to the US people at the height of the crisis and so is of value for showing the importance that was given to this crisis and the official US line regarding the missiles and the danger they posed
- the address would also be intended for the Soviets to hear and this could limit its value as the purpose could be to send a stern message to the Soviets. The purpose was also to get the US public onside for any actions that the US would take against Cuba and the Soviets and so it is possible that the situation is exaggerated which would also limit its purpose
- the tone is determined and strong, indicating that the US regards the missile as a deliberate threat on the part of the Soviets which will not be tolerated.

Content and argument

- John F Kennedy speaks of 'unmistakeable evidence'; this had been provided by photos taken by U2 surveillance flights. These flights indicate the concerns that the US already had over Cuba and Soviet military intervention
- he also talks about 'deliberate deception' and it was the case that the Soviets were doing all of this in secret; Khrushchev was hoping to get the warheads in place before the Americans knew what was going on – the secrecy involved heightened the tension as the US could not understand why Khrushchev was doing this
- John F Kennedy stresses the danger that the missiles pose to the US – 'offensive threats' and indeed, the US saw the missiles as an intolerable danger on an island so close to the US; John F Kennedy also knew that the US public would not tolerate the existence of the missiles. The Americans saw the purpose of the missiles to allow the Soviets to gain an upper hand in the Cold War – possibly even as a bargaining point with regard to Berlin.

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

Provenance and tone

- this source is from Khrushchev's memoirs and so is of value for showing Khrushchev's purpose in putting the missiles on Cuba
- as Khrushchev had been removed from office in 1964 – partly due his actions in Cuba – it is also possible that he is aiming to clear his name and justify his actions, which could limit its value
- this is highlighted by Khrushchev's persuasive tone and his emphasis which is on stressing that he put the missiles there for defensive and not offensive purposes and to get parity with the Americans.

Content and argument

- Khrushchev speaks of his concern for the 'fate of Cuba'; this is due to the US' attempted 'Bay of Pigs' invasion of Cuba in 1961; also 'Operation Mongoose' which was an attempt to destabilise the regime and ongoing CIA assassination attempts on Castro
- Khrushchev talks about maintaining 'the prestige' of the Soviets; this had been damaged by the failure to push the West out of Berlin and the building of the Berlin Wall – this would also help to explain why Khrushchev was trying to get a foreign policy success by putting missiles in Cuba
- Khrushchev's argument that the US had missiles in Turkey and in West Germany is accurate; putting missiles into Cuba would thus threaten the US in the same way that the USSR was being threatened.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source B is more valuable as it comes directly from the man who made the decision to put the missiles in Cuba while Source A is based on US perceptions of Soviet actions. However, students might also question Khrushchev's motives, given the context in which he wrote these memoirs. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Stalin's expansionist policies in eastern Europe were the main cause of tension between the USA and USSR in the years 1945 to 1948.'

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 Stalin's expansionist policies in eastern Europe were the main cause of tension between the USA and USSR in the years 1945 to 1948 might include:

- Stalin had broken agreements made at Yalta regarding allowing free elections in Poland and East European states; Stalin had used 'salami tactics' in eastern Europe which resulted in the transference of the machinery of government into the hands of obedient, pro-Soviet Communists backed up by state police
- the situation in eastern Europe created fears in the West that a similar situation could happen in France and Italy; it led to Churchill's Fulton speech of 1946 which dramatically raised tensions. It also resulted in George Kennan writing his famous Telegram in 1946; this laid the ideological basis for the Truman Doctrine
- the Czech coup of 1948 helped force the Marshall Plan through Congress which further led to greater division between the USA and the USSR
- Stalin's attempts to force the West out of Berlin in 1948 led to the first flashpoint of the Cold War and a dramatic increase in tension, resulting in the formation of NATO and permanent division of Germany.

Arguments challenging the view that Stalin's expansionist policies in eastern Europe were the main cause of tension between the USA and USSR in the years 1945 to 1948 might include:

- the use of the A bomb by Truman in 1945 was seen as threatening by the Soviets, raising tensions
- US actions were viewed as aggressive by the Soviet Union; the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan were seen as 'dollar imperialism' and both triggered a hostile response from the Soviet Union which increased tension
- the US was also to blame for the tension in Germany in 1948; the introduction of a new currency was the trigger that caused Stalin to impose the blockade
- the US' establishment of NATO was an aggressive action against the security of the Soviet Union which increased tensions.

Good answers may argue that Stalin's actions in eastern Europe after 1945 were indeed key for raising tensions and forcing a hostile reaction from the US. However, it can be equally argued that US self-interest in maintaining markets in Europe, and in failing to understand Soviet security needs, played a key role.

0 3 'McCarthyism had a significant impact on US foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1954.'

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 McCarthyism had a significant impact on US foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1954 might include:

- McCarthy promoted the idea of a communist global plot led by Moscow that threatened the US. This contributed to the growing hostility of the US towards the Soviet Union, as evidenced by the intensification of the ideological war of words; his accusations of communist spies within the US government also put pressure on Truman and Eisenhower to be ‘tough’ on communism
- McCarthy put a lot of emphasis on the fact that China had been ‘lost’ by the US; this helped to change the US’ original assessment of the Mao Zedong’s victory – that it had been inevitable given the support for Mao and the corruption of the Nationalists. It also meant that the US presidency was put under pressure not to ‘lose’ any other states to communism and so Taiwan, for example, needed to be protected
- McCarthy put pressure on the US government to shift from containing communism in Europe to also containing communism in Asia; this was known as the ‘Asia first’ view and we do, indeed, see Truman and then Eisenhower shifting cold war focus towards Asia with actions in Korea and support of Taiwan in 1953, as well as the establishment of SEATO.

Arguments challenging the view that McCarthyism had a significant impact on US foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1954 might include:

- the US was already in an ideological battle with the USSR as evidenced by the Truman Doctrine and the Berlin Blockade; the escalation in hostility after 1949 was down to other factors, such as the USSR gaining the A bomb and the invasion of South Korea by North Korea
- the US was already responding to the new global situation, as evidenced by drawing up NSC 68 and Acheson’s ‘perimeter speech’; these were both done in 1950 before McCarthy’s ‘witch-hunts’ had gained momentum
- the switch to ‘Asia first’ would have taken place without McCarthy, given the concerns raised by the Treaty of Friendship between the USSR and China and the invasion of South Korea by North Korea in 1950.

Good answers are likely to stress that McCarthyism played a key role in raising fears of communism within the US and putting pressure on US Presidents to take a firm stand against the spread of communism; however, McCarthy was only building on the ‘Red Scare’ which had already taken place since the Second World War, and it is likely that the actions taken by US presidents, 1950 to 1954, would have occurred even without the actions of Senator McCarthy.