



AS History

7041/2R-The Cold War, c1945–1991

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

Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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 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

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.

The Cold War, c1945–1991**Component 2R To the brink of Nuclear War: international relations, c1945–1963****Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the reasons for the Berlin blockade of 1948–49? **[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 have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

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

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

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

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a Soviet source written in response to US complaints about the blockade
- it is written at the height of the crisis and has value for showing how the Soviets sought to justify their actions
- the tone is damning of the West with strong vocabulary such as ‘violation’, ‘dismemberment’, ‘no validity’.

Content and argument

- the West had violated agreements made at Potsdam. It could be argued that the Allies had violated the Potsdam agreement by stopping reparations to the USSR in 1946 and then introducing Bizonia which ended four power control. However, the USSR had violated the agreements in terms of reparations (see above)
- the West had a policy to dismember Germany. Certainly from 1947, the West did move towards this policy. The London Conference in 1947, to make decisions on the future of Germany, was a failure and after this the West decided to move towards a West German state aligned to the Western alliance
- the Western currency had no validity and its introduction had forced the Soviets to ‘protect’ the economy of the Soviet zone. Protecting the economy of the Soviet zone meant establishing the blockade.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a British source written after the blockade; as it is a formal, confidential document to the British government it has value as for showing the view of the Air Ministry regarding the causes of the crisis
- the fact that it is written after the crisis is over gives it value as the report has been written with the benefit of some degree of hindsight
- the rather simplistic analysis and clear determination to blame the Soviets for all aspects of the crisis detracts from its value. Its tone is formal but condemnatory of the Soviets with strong vocabulary: 'planned', 'deliberate', 'refusal'.

Content and argument

- the blockade was the climax of a planned attempt to force the West out of Berlin. Certainly Stalin wanted the West out of Berlin and had hoped to establish a united Germany under his control, but it could be argued that it was reaction to Allied actions regarding the establishment of Bizonia and introduction of the new currency
- the implementation of the Potsdam Agreement depended on co-operation and good will which was missing from the Soviets. The reparations agreements had indeed broken down and the USSR had not delivered the food required from the eastern sector which had been agreed on; it was also very secretive about what reparations it was taking from its zone
- the currency reform triggered the blockade but this was due to the Soviets refusing to co-operate over the currency reform. This is not really accurate as the initiative for the currency reform came from the Allies and was clearly a political statement that this was the first move towards creating an independent West German state.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source B is more useful, given that it is a formal document reviewing the causes of the crisis and that as a confidential report has no reason to hide information, while Source A is a clear propaganda document seeking to justify the blockade and to blame the West. However, students might also question the value of Source B given its rather simplistic analysis of the events. Both sources are clearly partisan and influenced by cold war politics.

Section B

- 02** 'Truman shifted the focus of his containment policy from Europe to Asia after 1949 because of the establishment of communism in China.'

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 suggesting that Truman shifted the focus of his containment policy from Europe to Asia after 1949 because of the establishment of communism in China might include:

- China was the first country outside of Europe to go Communist. It led to government reviews of US policy in the Far East: Acheson's Perimeter Speech and NSC 68, which advocated a more global approach to containing communism
- Truman needed to protect the Nationalist government in Taiwan
- the 'loss of China' was seen as a failure by many Americans; Truman was under pressure not to allow any other countries in Asia to fall to communism.

Arguments challenging the view that Truman shifted the focus of his containment policy from Europe to Asia after 1949 because of the establishment of communism in China might include:

- initially the Truman administration blamed the loss of China to the failure of the Nationalists to win popular support. They did not see it as linked to Soviet expansionism. It was the Red Scare, which reached fever-pitch, 1950–1954, in the witch hunts of McCarthy, which used the 'loss of China' to put pressure on the government to have an 'Asia First' policy
- other events, such as the USSR getting the A bomb, and the invasion of South Korea by North Korea in particular, were just as important in explaining the shift of focus from Europe to Asia. It was the Korean War which allowed NSC 68 to be implemented
- the USA was already developing strong relations with Japan which culminated in the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty of September 1951.

Good students are likely to argue that the establishment of communism in China on its own was not the cause of the shift of focus from Europe to Asia, but a combination of factors – in particular the fact that the 'loss of China' was used by McCarthy to put pressure on the Truman administration to take stronger action in Asia.

- 03** 'The failure to contain communism in South Vietnam by 1963 was the result of Kennedy's policies.'

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 suggesting that the failure to contain communism in South Vietnam by 1963 was the result of Kennedy's policies might include:

- Kennedy supported the Diem government up to November 1963. The Diem government was hugely unpopular and its policies continued to alienate the South Vietnamese and encourage support for the communist opposition
- the Strategic Hamlet policy which involved the resettlement of villages was ineffective and further alienated the South Vietnamese peasantry. Other counter-insurgency operations which were started under Kennedy, such as the use of Agent Orange, were equally disastrous. The counter-insurgency force set up by Kennedy, the Green Berets, was ineffective
- the Kennedy administration was implicated in the coup against Diem; this did nothing to stop the tide of communist resistance against the government and in fact it resulted in a series of even weaker South Vietnamese governments.

Arguments challenging the view that the failure to contain communism in South Vietnam by 1963 was the result of Kennedy's policies might include:

- Kennedy was dealing with a situation which he had inherited and over which he had little control; the administration tried to get Diem to introduce more economic and social reforms but with little success
- Diem's policies were key for encouraging the growth of communism. He failed to carry out reforms that might have provided an alternative to communism, and his support for Catholics and the persecution of the Buddhists was disastrous leading to the Hue crisis of 1963
- Vietnamese saw the Americans as imperialists and most were committed to the reunification of their country. This meant that any US policy was going to fail to contain communism; the US misunderstood the nature of the conflict.

Good students are likely to argue that although Kennedy's policies did little to contain communism in South Vietnam and, indeed, made the situation worse, in fact it was Diem who was mainly responsible for the alienation of the South Vietnamese by 1963. Alternatively, students may argue that the situation was much more complex than the US understood and any US policy was unlikely to succeed in Vietnam.