



A-level History

7042/2R- Component 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991
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.

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991**Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the motives for US intervention in the Caribbean and Central America in the years 1982 to 1984. **[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 press release by the White House issued immediately after the US invasion of Grenada and so is of value for showing how the White House (and thus Reagan) wanted to justify its actions to the US public as this statement was given to the media and would have appeared as headlines in the news of that day
- the tone is defensive; the language is designed to show that the US had no choice and this action was 'forced' upon the government and indeed that its intervention was 'requested'
- there is an emphasis on the dangers and chaos of events in Grenada by the use of such language as 'brutal', 'violently seized', 'no place in civilized society', 'leftist thugs'; this has value in showing the attitude of the US towards left-wing governments and how it portrayed such governments to the US public.

Content and argument

- the White House argues that it only took part in the invasion because it was asked to do so and that it only 'assisted' in the operation. In fact this was a US-led mission involving 1,900 marines
- the statement claims that the primary aim of the US invasion was to protect US citizens: it is true that there were several hundred US medical students studying in Grenada but the real aim was to overthrow the left wing existing government which had taken power in a coup just before the invasion
- the real concern that the US had in Grenada was that there was Cuban influence. Cuban construction workers were building an international airport and the US believed that this was for Soviet and Cuban military use. In fact there was no evidence that the Cubans or Soviets were about to establish a military style government on the island
- the statement refers to 'left-wing thugs'; the new government had indeed killed the Prime Minister (Maurice Bishop) and was more left-wing than the previous government.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a televised speech by Ronald Reagan and so is valuable for showing Reagan's views on central America
- as it is a televised speech it is clear that this is a topic of importance and that Reagan wants to convey his message about Central America to the American people
- the tone is one of pride re America's role in the world in supporting democracy; it is designed to show that America only acts as a defender of key principles or to help others and is not an

aggressor; the use of vocabulary such as ‘strength’, ‘freedom’, ‘peace’ ‘democracy’, ‘human rights’, ‘friends’, in relation to the US actions, reinforces this image of the US

- the date is significant as the Reagan administration was starting to face criticism about its policy in central America by this time. It is also prior to the 1984 Presidential election. The source is thus valuable for showing the consistency of Reagan’s defence of US actions in Nicaragua but we can assume that he is being defensive and possibly trying to cover up his actions which would limit its value.

Content and argument

- Reagan accuses Cuba, the Soviet Union and Nicaragua as working together to spread communism throughout Central America which is of importance to America. Central America was indeed seen as the US’ ‘own backyard’, subjected to US influence for many decades. Cuba and the Soviet Union were involved, to a limited extent, in Central America but there was no clear co-ordinated plan and much of the unrest was fuelled by anti-Americanism, nationalism and desire for a fairer society
- Reagan accuses the Sandinista rule as being of communist terror. In fact the Sandinistas started out trying to get rid of the abuses of the dictatorship it had overthrown and introducing major economic and social reforms to improve the lives of the people. However, they did declare a state of emergency 1982–84, as a result of the Contra attacks and this resulted in restrictions on civil liberties
- Reagan refers to the Contras as being a legitimate opposition but much of the ‘terror’ was a result of the Contra attacks on the population. Reagan’s government became involved in many illegal activities in the support of the Contras
- Reagan talks about the US aiming to preserve democracy and human rights – but in fact it was supporting dictators in Central America and carrying out activities such as mining Nicaraguan harbours, that went against international law.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is from a newspaper and has value for showing that there was criticism of Reagan’s foreign policy in the press; however, we don’t know how widespread this criticism was which limits its value
- as the author is a respected journalist, as evidenced by gaining the Pulitzer Prize, we can expect this to be a well-researched piece of journalism which would give it value
- the date of 1984 gives it value as the conclusions here have been reached after several years of US intervention in Central America
- the tone is scathing of US reasons for intervention in Central America; the language is condemnatory of US actions and duplicity.

Content and argument

- the US maintains that it is in great danger from communism; this was indeed the message from the government and the justification of all of its actions in the Caribbean and central America
- he argues that the US does not want peace in the area – only to get rid of the Sandinistas and replace them with the Contras. This is supported by the fact that the US supported the Contras which was linked to the old Somoza regime
- the Contadora peace plan was rejected by the US: the Reagan administration opposed the plan because it accepted the Sandinista regime and put limits on US involvement in this area
- he accuses the US government of coming up with lies, in other words that there is no threat of Central or Latin America falling to communism which is accurate; the US saw all left-wing groups

as Communist in nature and believed that there was a Soviet strategy to take over Central America which was unfounded.

Section B

02 'The USA was responsible for the division of Germany into two separate states by 1949.'

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/factors suggesting that the USA was responsible for the division of Germany into two separate states by 1949 might include:

- the actions of the USA, in 1947–48, increasingly showed that they wanted a separate western state rather than a united Germany that might fall under Soviet control; this was reinforced by the creation of Bizonia in January 1947
- by 1948, the USA saw West Germany as integral to the economic development of Europe and also key in the cold war struggle; the western sectors were to receive Marshall Aid. This raised tension as the Soviets saw these moves as ‘dollar imperialism’
- the London Conference decided that the Western sectors should have their own constituent assembly which further increased tensions
- the USA introduced a new currency into the Western zones; this was clearly a political move – the first stage in setting up a new state. Stalin wanted to thwart this plan and so set up the blockade which led to the final division.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the USA was responsible for the division of Germany into two separate states by 1949 might include:

- Stalin was also determined to maintain Soviet influence in Germany; he failed with his policies to gain influence across the whole of Germany but went on to introduce a number of unilateral policies, such as land reform and nationalisation, which indicated that he was already treating Eastern Germany as a separate state
- the Soviets were increasingly secretive about what reparations they were taking from the Eastern zones and there was a breakdown in the agreements made at Potsdam, whereby Stalin was to send food over from the Eastern sector; this had already helped to increase tension
- Stalin introduced the Berlin Blockade; the failure of this made the division of Germany inevitable
- it could be argued that the division was the result of the growing cold war tensions, 1946–48, which made a united Germany unlikely as each side was worried that a united Germany would be under the other’s influence.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that the growing tensions in Germany, that ultimately led to the division of the country, were a result of growing Cold War tensions and both sides had a part to play in this. However, the actions of the US were clearly directed towards creating a separate West German state, 1947–48, and in that sense they precipitated the crisis of the Berlin Blockade which led to the division of Germany.

- 03** How effective was Khrushchev’s policy of peaceful co-existence in reducing Cold War tensions in the years 1955 to 1961? **[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/factors suggesting that Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence was effective in reducing Cold War tensions in the years 1955 to 1961 might include:

- peaceful co-existence was about engaging the US in diplomacy and this helped to bring about the Austrian State Treaty; this removed a potential source of conflict and so reduced tension
- peaceful co-existence was also about trying to slow down the arms race (to allow for economic development and reduce danger of nuclear war) and get some agreement on Germany and Berlin, in particular, and so this led to the Geneva Summit which started a dialogue between the powers
- the Geneva Summit led to better relations in terms of trade exhibitions, scientific and cultural exchanges so that the phrase 'spirit of Geneva' was applied to events surrounding the summit
- peaceful co-existence also led to Khrushchev visiting the USA in 1959 and having talks at Camp David, where Eisenhower and Khrushchev significantly agreed to settle international issues through diplomacy rather than force; they also had important talks about disarmament and the situation in Berlin.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence was effective in reducing Cold War tensions in the years 1955 to 1961 might include:

- peaceful co-existence was not about the USSR stepping back from competition with the USA re nuclear weapons or influence and so the arms and space race continued which substantially increased tension in this period, e.g. the hysteria in the USA over sputnik and the impact of the U2 incident
- Khrushchev did not always match his idea of 'peaceful coexistence' with his rhetoric and actions which were very aggressive at times, such as over the U2 incident or towards Kennedy at Vienna
- Khrushchev's determination to maintain the Soviet sphere of influence in Poland and Hungary and his actions in Hungary led to increased tension with the West
- the unresolved issue of Berlin could not be solved by peaceful co-existence; the stakes were too high and Kennedy refused to compromise on the status of Berlin.

In conclusion, good students are likely to argue that the effectiveness of peaceful co-existence was relatively limited in this period, due to continued rivalry in the nuclear arms race and the space race, and the continuing battle for strategic supremacy alongside the unresolved problem of Berlin. The aim of peaceful co-existence is key here; Khrushchev intended to strengthen the position of the USSR through this process and so, at a time when the USA was also trying to strengthen its position, continued tension was inevitable.

04 ‘Summit diplomacy, in the years 1985 to 1988, succeeded because 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.

Arguments/factors suggesting that summit diplomacy, in the years 1985 to 1988, succeeded because of Mikhail Gorbachev might include:

- Gorbachev understood that he needed good relations with other states if he was to make any progress in improving the Soviet economy; he wanted an end to superpower confrontation and competition and this led to the summits taking place
- Gorbachev came to the summits with a new approach to nuclear weapons – he introduced the concept of ‘reasonable sufficiency’ committing the Soviets to only having enough nuclear weapons for defence; this shift in thinking would lead to the signing of the INF Treaty at Washington in 1987
- his actions, such as withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan in 1988, made the West more conciliatory, helping to lead to the success of the summits
- despite protesting about SDI at Reykjavik, he was prepared to sign the INF Treaty without any condition that the US should get rid of SDI. He also compromised in other areas, e.g. accepting that Britain and France need not be part of the final deal.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that summit diplomacy, in the years 1985 to 1988, succeeded because of Mikhail Gorbachev might include:

- Reagan’s attitude was also key; he had softened his approach to the Soviet Union after 1984 and made it clear that he wanted a new relationship
- Reagan was committed to anti-nuclearism and this gave him common ground with Gorbachev in seeking an agreement to reduce nuclear weapons
- Ronald Reagan proved to be a good negotiator/willing to compromise – even to take back his rhetoric of ‘evil empire’ at the Moscow Summit
- it could be argued that SDI in fact forced Gorbachev to come to the negotiating table as he realised that the Soviets could now never compete with the USA.
- Gorbachev was also under pressure to achieve success as the economic situation at home was deteriorating so it could be argued that he had no choice but to agree to arms limitation

Good students are likely to/may argue that Gorbachev’s ‘new thinking’ and his willingness to compromise was key to the success of the summit diplomacy but that Reagan also played a role; having abandoned his hard line approach of the 1980s his willingness to compromise was also significant. It could also be argued that Gorbachev had no choice in his actions; he had to have success at the summits because of the situation within the USSR.