
A-LEVEL HISTORY

Paper 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991

Mark scheme

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 an historian studying the Marshall Plan. | [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.

Students are asked to analyse and evaluate these sources and assess their usefulness as evidence about the Marshall Plan and its reception internationally. Answers may choose to deal with each source in turn; or to make a comparative evaluation, linking the sources together. Either approach is valid.

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

Provenance

- this is a speech by the author of the plan to a US audience but with a wider purpose.

Content and argument

- the source argues that unless the USA provides aid to Europe, Europe will starve
- the source also argues that such aid would be beneficial to the USA
- the source insists that the policy is not directed against any country or doctrine.

Tone and emphasis

- the tone is measured and persuasive with some exaggeration.

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

Provenance

- this source is from diary notes taken at the meeting of the three powers
- the date July 1947 is just after the announcement of the Marshall Plan
- it represents a French perspective.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Soviet Union was and is hostile to the Marshall Plan and that it has pressurised Eastern European countries to reject it
- the source also argues that the Soviet Union is fearful of German recovery and that the Soviet Union wishes to barricade itself between a belt of satellite states.

Tone and emphasis

- the tone is anti-Communist and places blame on the Soviet Union.

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

Provenance

- this is from a speech by a high ranking Soviet official, just after the announcement of the Marshall Plan and the failure of the Paris Conference.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Marshall Plan will place European countries under the political control of the USA
- it also argues that the plan is an attempt to split Europe and form a block hostile to the Soviet Union
- the source argues that the USA intends to rebuild Germany despite the suffering caused by German aggression.

Tone and emphasis

- the source is direct, occasionally forceful, using some emotive language and tries to claim the moral high ground.

In summary, these sources do set out views of the motivation behind the Marshall Plan and the divergent reactions to it. Some answers will have an integrated approach, reaching an overall evaluation by making links and connections and differentiated assessments.

Section B

0 2 'US policies in response to the rise of Communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1960 consistently failed.'

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.

Students should address the American responses to the rise of Communism in Asia and assess the extent to which they ‘consistently failed’. In doing so they may comment on:

- the 1949 Communist Revolution in China and its impact on US policymakers. It can be argued that US policy overreacted to the presumed threat from the new China (and that the US became obsessed with finding someone to blame for the ‘loss of China’ – which was a key factor in the rise of McCarthyism)
- the Korean War, which can be seen as an American failure, although the armed intervention in Korea was under the auspices of the UN
- the Geneva Conference of 1954 can be seen as a failure – many commentators have suggested that John Foster Dulles was at fault in responding to the crisis of France in Indochina
- the failure to deal with the challenge of Communism in Vietnam between 1954 and 1960. The US was being drawn into military involvement in Vietnam even before the Kennedy presidency began
- the continuing confrontations with China, such as Quemoy and Matsu in 1958.

Arguments in the opposite direction might include:

- the view that the rise of Mao’s China really was a direct threat to the US and the West and that a firm US response was the only option
- the view that the Korean War was forced on the world by Chinese and North Korean aggression and was successfully countered by the UN forces led by the US. It can be argued that South Korea has been a clear success story ever since 1954
- the view that Dulles was correct about the Domino Theory and that it was inevitable and right for the US to step in to fill the vacuum after the collapse of French power
- the argument that the Eisenhower presidency showed the US as consistently willing to negotiate peace, both in Europe and in Asia, but had no ‘partner for peace’.

Some good answers are likely to/may focus on the key word ‘consistently’, concluding that there were indeed aspects of US policy which were misdirected or failures; but that there were also areas in which US policy was successful and justified.

0 3 'The relations between Khrushchev and Kennedy were marked more by cooperation than by confrontation.'

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.

Students should address how and why there was ‘confrontation’ and ‘cooperation’ in relations between Khrushchev and Kennedy, and make a judgement as to which was more characteristic of their relationship. The time scale is short: from JFK’s inauguration in January 1961 to his assassination in November 1963, but full of incident.

In considering issues of conflict and confrontation, students may consider:

- JFK inherited from the Eisenhower administration the fall-out from the U2 Crisis, an ongoing crisis over Berlin that had been rumbling since 1958, and the plans of the previous regime for a covert invasion of Cuba
- Kennedy met Khrushchev (and was greatly underrated by him) in Vienna in 1961
- the invasion at the Bay of Pigs was a fiasco and inflamed East-West tensions
- Kennedy’s ‘bad start’ in 1961 may have led to Khrushchev taking up hostile policies over Berlin, leading to the Wall and the ensuing tense stand-off at Checkpoint Charlie
- Cuba became a major conflict, from the Bay of Pigs to the edge of nuclear war in the 1962 Missile Crisis.

There were, however, significant examples of cooperation. Evidence and arguments on this theme might include:

- Khrushchev had already shown himself to be interested in ‘peaceful co-existence’ – for example in negotiating the Vienna agreement of 1955. Right up to 1964 he was regularly criticised from within the Soviet regime for being too ‘soft’ towards the West
- Khrushchev may have underrated JFK at first but at the meeting in 1961 he had made it clear there was no possibility of the USSR being ‘mad’ enough to be involved in a nuclear conflict
- having come to the edge of confrontation over Cuba in 1962, Khrushchev showed flexibility and diplomatic skill in negotiating a peaceful resolution
- the ‘real’ Khrushchev showed himself in improved back-channel links through the ‘hot line’; and in negotiating the 1963 Test Ban Treaty with JFK and Britain.

Stronger responses may show the ability to put forward differentiated assessments, for example appreciation of change over time: by differentiating between actual violent confrontation and the very confrontational approaches of both leaders in the tone and emphasis of their public statements and playing to the gallery.

0 4 'The collapse of Soviet control in Eastern Europe was due to the misguided policies of Mikhail Gorbachev.'

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.

Gorbachev came to power in 1985, after the 'Brezhnev Era' ended with Konstantin Chernenko. The 'collapse of Soviet control' was essentially completed in 1989–1990, though Gorbachev did not lose power in the USSR until 1991. Most answers, therefore, are likely to focus on 1985–1989 but in looking at other factors, answers may well include relevant material from before 1985 to explain the problems inherited by Gorbachev from his predecessors.

Students should address how far Gorbachev's policies were 'misguided' and the relative importance of his contribution to the collapse of Soviet control compared with other factors. In doing so they may consider:

Arguments that Gorbachev himself was to blame:

- he was 'the new Khrushchev', repeating the mistakes of 1956–1964. This supports the general view that attempts at radical overhaul of the Communist system inevitably destabilised the USSR and its Cold War satellites
- Gorbachev had a naïve belief in 'perestroika' and 'glasnost' and badly failed to keep control of his own party elites. This led directly to demands for rapid change in the satellite states
- Gorbachev deliberately undermined Communist leaders in the satellite states, such as Grosz in Hungary and Honecker in the GDR but completely failed to replace them effectively. (Honecker argued that Tiananmen Square in Beijing in 1989 showed a model that could have been pursued successfully in the GDR)
- Gorbachev thought he had succeeded in winning over the Western powers to an agreed, shared re-organisation of central and Eastern Europe – all he got was a West German take-over
- 'What happened next' – the argument that the USSR itself fell apart between 1989 and 1991, with Gorbachev overthrown and succeeded by chaos under Yeltsin.

Against this, students may argue persuasively that Gorbachev was not wholly at fault and that other factors were more important, such as:

- the whole Soviet Bloc was already crumbling by 1985. Gorbachev was like a surgeon operating on a patient already close to death
- the failures of Soviet policy included massive over-spending on the military costs of maintaining the Soviet empire. The only realistic solution was to negotiate the end of the Cold War (the Sinatra Doctrine)
- Gorbachev knew leaders like Grosz and Honecker were unpopular and doomed
- the speed with which Soviet control collapsed in 1989–1990 without proper shared agreements was not Gorbachev's fault but Helmut Kohl's
- the whole process happened peacefully, to Gorbachev's credit.

Strong answers may show differentiated assessments of change over time, different aspects of policy, and of the relative contribution of Gorbachev's policies (whether 'misguided' or not) compared with other, structural factors.

