

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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 Assessment Writer.

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

A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2R The Cold War, c1945–1991

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to a historian studying 'détente'. | [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.

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

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

Provenance

- This was a public speech to an American audience; but it was also intended to be heard by (and have a reassuring effect upon) the Soviet leadership.
- Its timing is significant: this was the summer of 1963, after the Cuban missile crisis, at a time when JFK was seeking a Test Ban Treaty and improved bilateral links with Moscow.

Content and argument

- Kennedy's main argument is the mutual interest of the superpowers in avoiding war. Students may seek either to corroborate or to dispute the genuineness of this approach according to their understanding of context.
- He was also setting out to educate his American audience about the achievements of the USSR and the need to respect Soviet viewpoints.
- The conciliatory tone is balanced by a firm re-statement of the American view that Communism is 'profoundly repugnant'.

Tone and Emphasis

- Kennedy's tone is designed to convey and promote sympathetic understanding of the USSR: 'no nation in the history of a war'; 'acts of courage', etc.
- JFK emphasises the dangers to Americans of failing to engage with the USSR: for example 'two nations would become primary targets', showing how military power actually makes you vulnerable.

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

Provenance

- This is the transcript of a private conversation; though it was later edited for publication.
- It reveals the views of an acting president responding to the questions of a former president; it is taken for granted that both men are highly well informed and that they share similarly patriotic views about the Cold War and the USSR.
- The timing is significant: President Johnson has just made a major diplomatic initiative by meeting the Soviet leader at Glassboro.

Content and argument

- The arguments are mostly indirect and implicit.
- There is a shared understanding of the difficulties in ‘reading’ Soviet intentions and in responding to Soviet diplomacy.
- Both men show a strong interest in the issue of China.

Tone and emphasis

- The tone is conversational and constructive; seeking ways to achieve better relations.
- There is an element of self-justification in the emphasis on the difficulties and frustrations that have held back policy initiatives.

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

Provenance

- This is a confidential report by Dobrynin to his bosses in Moscow.
- It contains a view of US foreign policies as seen through a conversation with Henry Kissinger; Dobrynin’s views are implicit.
- This is the first year of Nixon’s presidency when both sides are trying to assess the intentions of the other.

Content and argument

- The main argument is the need to avoid misunderstanding and an accidental conflict.
- Kissinger is quoted as wanting a more constructive relationship; that the ‘Cold War’ is now in the past.
- The source shows (on both sides) great interest in US attitudes to China, at a time when there was serious tension between the USSR and China, when Nixon was looking to revolutionise US policy toward China.

Tone and emphasis

- The tone is mostly objective reportage: ‘Kissinger said’.
- But the language is implicitly trusting and without the usual ideological hostility.

Section B

0 2 'The Cold War developed by 1949 because of Stalin's intention to dominate postwar Europe.'

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 the Cold War developed because of Stalin's intention to dominate post-war Europe, might include:

- Stalin's personality and his consistently expansionist approach, as seen in his control of 'Soviet puppets' trained in Moscow
- the use of political commissars close on the heels of the Red Army as it advanced into Eastern Europe, leading to so-called salami tactics after the war
- Stalin's particular obsession with controlling Poland, as seen at Yalta
- Stalin's attempts to enforce Soviet control over Berlin as a single city from 1945, including the launch of the Soviet blockade, 1948-49
- the obstructive diplomacy of Molotov in Paris in 1947; and Soviet rejection of the Marshall Plan.

Arguments challenging the view that the Cold War developed because of Stalin's intention to dominate post-war Europe, might include:

- American policies were unnecessarily provocative and pushed Stalin against the wall
- US policy failed to recognise the size of Soviet losses and sacrifices; this meant that the US just did not grasp why Stalin was so concerned with Poland
- the Kennan 'Long Telegram' and its influence on American foreign policy; containment
- US policy, especially under Truman, tried to bully the USSR with American monopoly of atomic weapons
- the Marshall Plan was one-sided and was never open to be accepted by the Eastern Bloc
- allied policies over Germany and West Berlin, especially currency reform, forced Stalin into actions like the Blockade
- the allied response to the Blockade.

Students may challenge the proposition in the question. US policy might be seen as aggressive and, in some respects, provocative and willing to meet a perceived Soviet threat head on.

0 3 'The outcomes of the Korean War weakened the position of the United States in Asia in the years 1954 to 1961.'

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 the outcomes of war in Korea weakened the position of the USA, might include:

- Korea cemented a mistaken American hostility to, and refusal to engage with, Communist China
- Korea strengthened US belief in the ‘domino theory’, that supporting anti-Communist regimes in Asia was both important and effective; this theory had disastrous effects on later US policies in Asia
- Korea strengthened the ‘national security state’ and the influence of ‘hawks’ such as John Foster Dulles and militarists in the Army and Air Force. This prevented the promising Geneva talks in 1954 from getting anywhere
- Korea led to serious misunderstanding of the implications of the French defeat in Indo China and to misguided dependence on national leaders like Diem
- President Kennedy inherited massive misconceptions from the Eisenhower administration in 1960–61, this led straight to the disasters of US escalation.

Arguments challenging the view that the outcomes of war in Korea weakened the position of the USA, might include:

- Korea was a success and was a success for broader Western intervention through the UN, not just an American action
- there were other Western successes such as support for Taiwan (eg over Quemoy and Matsu in 1958)
- the ‘domino theory’ was based on a correct appreciation of the Communist threat
- US policy was highly consistent from 1949 onwards, Korea did not change much
- Kennedy’s escalation of American support to South Vietnam in 1961 was sensible and proportionate; the ‘disasters’ in Vietnam were due to later policy errors.

Students may conclude that whilst the Korean War did lead to some embedding of misconceived assumptions which plagued US foreign policy in future years, at least some of the conclusions reached following engagement in the war proved to be valid and strengthening of the US’ influence.

0 4 'The reason why the Cold War ended peacefully was the statesmanship of Mikhail Gorbachev.'

Assess the validity of this view with reference to the years 1985 to 1991.

[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 Gorbachev's statesmanship was the reason the Cold War ended peacefully, might include:

- the Cold War could never have been ended peacefully without a policy revolution inside the USSR. Gorbachev's commitment to 'perestroika' and 'glasnost' was all-important in steering the USSR away from militarism and a confrontational mindset
- Gorbachev ended USSR involvement in Afghanistan, previously a major cause of tension with the West
- Gorbachev's 'Sinatra Doctrine' was essential to educate (and bully) Communist leaders in the satellite states (such as Gosz in Hungary) that the old ways were over
- Gorbachev was brilliantly successful in reaching out to possible partners in the West, including Reagan and Thatcher but also Western public opinion. He showed he was willing to engage in summit meetings and offered to make reductions in Soviet weapons, if these cuts were reciprocated
- even when reunification of Germany went very differently from what he had wanted, Gorbachev remained statesmanlike and did not go back to the old Cold War ways.

Arguments challenging the view that Gorbachev's statesmanship was the reason the Cold War ended peacefully, might include:

- the West won the Cold War, economically, militarily and politically. The real victors were Reagan, Thatcher and Pope John Paul II. All Gorbachev did was recognise the inevitable failure of the Brezhnev way
- Gorbachev was pushed into action by reformers in Eastern Europe, especially in Hungary but also in East Germany and Czechoslovakia
- the reform movement inside East Germany should be given more credit than Gorbachev
- the real driving force ending the Cold War was the economic collapse of the USSR, all Gorbachev did was recognise the inevitable, following Andropov's lead
- the way events turned out from 1989 was completely different to what he had planned.

Students may conclude that a balanced conclusion is most appropriate. Gorbachev's role was highly significant and he did play a major part, but it may be argued that, fundamentally, he was reacting to what was becoming inevitable in relation to the position of the USSR.