

A-level
HISTORY
7042/2R

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945-1991

Mark scheme

June 2022

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 © 2022 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, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the relationship between the US and South Vietnam in the years c1960 to 1962.

[30 marks]*Target: AO2*

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a message from Eisenhower, the President of America, to Diem and so has value for showing that there was a strong official relationship between the US and South Vietnam at this time
- as the message was made public, the purpose of the message was probably to convey a positive image of Diem's government and the work that it was doing to fight Communism and develop the economy, thus also vindicating the US' support of Diem; this reduces its value
- the date is significant as the source clearly shows that communist opposition was developing by this time – evidenced by the revolutionary violence strategy implemented by the North and the creation of the National Liberation Front
- the tone is very upbeat with the aim to emphasise the positive work of Diem's government.

Content and argument

- the source identifies the growing threat of Communism. In fact, opposition from various groups was growing due to the corrupt, undemocratic nature of Diem's regime. Communists and other opposition groups came together in the NLF which was established in 1960 with the aim of creating a sovereign, unified and independent Vietnamese state
- Eisenhower credits Diem's regime with helping all sectors of South Vietnam to grow; in fact, Diem largely ignored the needs of the peasantry; his primary interest was to maintain power for himself and his family. Many officials were Catholic and this meant that Buddhists were persecuted along with all political opponents
- Eisenhower also credits Diem's regime with effectively dealing with the communist threat which was untrue; Diem's actions were only increasing opposition to the government – his focus was on repression and any political opponents were silenced
- Eisenhower pledges continued support to Diem; this was indeed the case. Eisenhower had referred to Diem as the 'miracle man of Asia' and wanted to support him against the growing threat of North Vietnam, despite clear evidence of Diem's corrupt and nepotistic government

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a news conference by Kennedy and so has value for showing that Kennedy was as committed as Eisenhower to the relationship with South Vietnam and also keen to portray the South Vietnamese government in a positive light
- the date is significant here; it is two years later and Kennedy refers to the deteriorating situation in Vietnam which gives it value

- as this is a press conference, Kennedy's purpose is to justify the US' involvement by stressing the fact that they are supporting 'freedom' and helping Vietnam's 'independence'; he is vague about the exact nature of the support that the US is giving. This limits its value
- the tone is positive regarding the South Vietnam government and the emphasis is on the fact that the US is protecting 'freedom' in a dangerous situation and is maintaining its commitment to maintain South Vietnam's independence.

Content and argument

- Kennedy refers to the deteriorating situation in Vietnam and this was indeed the case; communist attacks in the south were becoming more frequent and deadlier. The government was losing control of some rural areas
- Kennedy refers also to the use of guerrilla tactics. By 1962, the Vietcong were using a range of guerrilla tactics to fight against Diem's government
- Kennedy says that the US is increasing its aid. Under Kennedy, more advisors were sent out to aid the AVRN; Kennedy even established a counter-surgency force called the Green Berets. More military hardware was also provided for the AVRN. Support was given for the Strategic Hamlets programme
- the question from the reporter indicates growing concern by the American people as to the extent of US involvement and also the fact that this was being kept secret; Kennedy's elusive answer further supports this.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is from an advisor to the President and has value for providing an insight that there were those in the administration who both understood the situation in Vietnam and were prepared to tell the truth about it to Kennedy and that in fact the relationship between the two countries is not as robust as might appear on the surface
- the date is significant as at this point the situation is deteriorating and Kennedy is under pressure to take stronger action. The Taylor and Roscow Report had already recommended increasing support including combat forces and bombing
- the fact that this is a private note for Kennedy with a frank assessment about the situation in Vietnam gives it value
- the tone is urgent; the emphasis is on stressing the negative consequences of continued involvement in Vietnam.

Content and argument

- Galbraith stresses the fact that the US' involvement is growing step by step and that this could end in a long and indecisive military conflict; this is of course exactly what was happening – the amount of aid was steadily increasing, 17,000 military advisors had been sent by Kennedy and chemical destruction programmes such as Operation Ranch Hand had started
- Diem is called a 'weak and ineffectual leader' which is accurate. He was weak in the sense that he increasingly lacked authority outside of Saigon and faced opposition from many quarters. He ruled with the support of his family and a narrow group of supporters and the army
- Galbraith refers to the danger of 'pacification' measures. This included the Strategic Hamlets scheme which was deeply unpopular and actually increased support for the communists rather than reduced it
- Galbraith suggests that America should resist committing American troops to combat action. This is valuable because despite being advised to send additional combat troops to Vietnam, Kennedy remained committed to counterinsurgency

Section B

0 2 'American involvement in Europe, in the years 1945 to 1949, was primarily driven by the desire to advance US economic interests.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 American involvement in Europe, in the years 1945 to 1949, was primarily driven by the desire to advance US economic interests might include:

- after the Second World War, the USA wanted to establish free market capitalism – as indicated by the setting up of the Bretton Woods system which promoted American economic aims. They became increasingly concerned with the spread of communism in Europe which would prevent this; the growth of support for communism in Italy and France meant that the USA needed to get involved in Europe to prevent the loss of markets
- the Marshall Plan was devised to ensure that countries in Europe recovered economically; it could be argued that this was so that they could trade with the USA
- the USA saw the recovery of Germany as key – not only to help general European recovery but also as a market for American goods; thus, it supported the idea of a separate state in the West and the introduction of a new currency which triggered the Berlin Blockade
- these measures were all seen by the USSR as ‘dollar imperialism’ – helping Europe so that countries would have to trade with the US.

Arguments challenging the view that American involvement in Europe, in the years 1945 to 1949, was primarily driven by the desire to advance US economic interests might include:

- the US’ involvement in Europe was driven more by ideological concerns; Stalin’s actions in eastern Europe and growing support for communism in Italy and France fed into fears that Stalin was aiming to take over all of Europe
- these concerns were reinforced by both Churchill’s Fulton speech and the Kennan telegram which stated that the USSR was expansionist but also would respond to force; thus, the Truman Doctrine was an ideological statement about preventing the further spread of communism
- the US’ concern with the ideology of communism was reinforced by the Red Scare which started to develop in the US after the Second World War; this led the US to get involved in Europe to stop the spread of communism and its threat to liberal democracy
- the fact that Congress only agreed to the Marshall Plan after the Czech coup of 1948, indicates that the Marshall Plan was as much about the threat of Communist political ideology spreading, as about keeping open markets.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that while the US was concerned with free markets and the concerns of maintaining these in Europe, it was equally driven by an ideological fear of communism which became more intense after 1947, hence the Truman Doctrine and the policy of ‘containment’ which developed.

- 0 3** How far do ideological differences between the USSR and China explain the worsening relations that developed between these two countries in the years 1963 to 1972?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 ideological differences between the USSR and China explain the worsening relations that developed between these two countries in the years 1963 to 1972 might include:

- Mao saw the USSR as a 'revisionist' state and had contempt for their style of government which he saw as lacking revolutionary zeal and purity in comparison to China. This has started under Khrushchev and intensified under Brezhnev despite initial attempts by Brezhnev to establish better relations
- the Cultural Revolution which started in 1966 intensified this ideological conflict; the revolution was designed to attack ideological deviants and this included the Soviets; Red Guards thus attacked the Soviet Union's embassy in Beijing; meanwhile the Soviets denounced the Cultural Revolution as total fanaticism
- the foreign policy of the USSR was also regarded as ideologically suspect. When the USSR made arms agreements with the USA following the Cuban Missile Crisis and then later followed a policy of détente, this was seen as ideologically unacceptable; for the Chinese it seemed that the USSR was betraying the revolution and tolerating the existence of capitalist, imperialist states
- Mao believed that the Soviets were an imperialist state and thus out to get more territory which made them a threat to China and its territory. The attack on Czechoslovakia was condemned; Mao said that the Soviet Union was no longer behaving in a 'truly socialist' manner.

Arguments challenging the view that ideological differences between the USSR and China explain the worsening relations that developed between these two countries in the years 1963 to 1972 might include:

- the growing conflict that developed was about who should lead the communist world; Khrushchev believed that as leader of the Soviet Union, the first communist state, he should be the leader of the communist world. China resented being the junior partner
- linked to the above point was the refusal of the Soviets to help China get nuclear weapons. The Soviets would only help China have nuclear weapons if they could control its defence policy. This was unacceptable to the Chinese who went on to develop their own nuclear bomb in 1964, further intensifying the conflict between the two nations
- much of the tension developed over territorial disputes and Chinese fears of Soviet military might. In 1964 China called for the return of territory, such as parts of Siberia that it claimed the USSR had occupied historically; this claim was rejected by Khrushchev. Border disputes were triggered when in 1967 Brezhnev decided to station military forces in Mongolia and eastern Kazakhstan which were on the Sino-Soviet frontier. A second dispute took place along the western frontier region of Xinjiang in 1969
- Mao's fears of Soviet territorial aims can also be seen in their concern over Soviet actions in Czechoslovakia and their refusal to allow a Soviet air base in southern China to protect the Sino-Vietnamese border against US aggression
- Vietnam further intensified tension; although both sides were helping the communists in Vietnam, both sides competed to win influence over the North Vietnamese.

Good answers are likely to argue that although the deteriorating relationship between the Soviets and the Chinese was portrayed as an ideological struggle, in fact the conflict was more about power politics and which was to be the leading Communist nation.

- 0 4** To what extent, in the years 1972 to 1979, was there a significant reduction in tensions between the superpowers?

[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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 1972 to 1979, there was a significant reduction in tensions between the superpowers might include:

- the Salt I Treaty signed in 1972 significantly reduced tension between the powers in the area of the arms race. Negotiations for Salt II started in 1974 and was signed in 1979
- Ostpolitik meant that tensions reduced in Europe: the Moscow Treaty signed in 1970 recognised the border between East and West Germany and also accepted the post-Second World War border in the East with Poland; the Final Quadripartite Protocol of 1972 agreed to the maintenance of the 'status quo' in Berlin giving West Berlin much more security and The Basic Treaty accepted the existence of both Germanies
- the Helsinki Agreement of 1975 confirmed Willi Brandt's achievements in Ostpolitik by recognising that Europe's borders could not be altered by force; thus, both East Germany and West Germany were now recognised by both sides of the Cold War divide which significantly reduced tension between East and West. There was also agreement to co-operate more in economic, scientific, and cultural fields
- summits took place between the superpowers, easing tension; also, between the USA and China
- tensions also reduced between the USA and China; trade and travel restrictions between the two countries eased and the USA dropped its opposition to China taking its place on the Security Council instead of Taiwan; formal relations between the USA and China started in 1979.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1972 to 1979, there was a significant reduction in tensions between the superpowers might include:

- the USSR continued to support rebel groups in the developing world – in Angola and Ethiopia. To the Americans it seemed that the Soviets were involved in a grand scheme of expansion in several areas of the world; this would cause tension, contributing to the collapse of détente
- there was disillusionment in the West over the fact that the Soviets were not keeping to agreements made at Helsinki regarding Basket 3 on human rights; the US, under Carter, increasingly tried to link economic deals to the Soviet Union improving human rights; this 'linkage' was resented by the USSR
- tension remained over nuclear weapons; the Soviets continued to stockpile weapons and refused to end the deployment of SS-20 missiles in Europe. Thus, Carter also activated the deployment of new weapons programmes
- despite effective use of summit diplomacy during this period, the relationship between Carter and Brezhnev was fractured due to Carter's harsher treatment of the USSR. This meant that some agreements could not be reached and demonstrated remaining tensions; for example Carter made harsher changes to agreements proposed at the Vladivostok Summit, which led to Brezhnev rejecting them

Good answers are likely to argue that although this period known as détente certainly made the Cold War less dangerous and created a more predictable, manageable system, fundamental tensions remained between the superpowers. Neither side changed their perceptions of the other and differing expectations of détente on both sides meant that it quickly collapsed by 1979.