

---

A-LEVEL

# History

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991

Mark scheme

---

7042

June 2017

---

Version: 1.0 Final

---

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

June 2017

A-level

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 causes of the Korean War.

**[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 speech made to the people of North Korea. The date indicates that it was made the day after the invasion of the South and so it is of value for showing how Kim Il Sung justified the invasion of South Korea and rallied the support of the North Koreans
- it is made by the leader of North Korea which gives it value as this would mean that it had great impact on the people; as it was on the radio it would have been heard by most North Koreans
- the tone is aggressive and warlike; the language is designed to emphasise the illegality of the Syngman Rhee government by the use of words such as ‘clique’ and ‘puppet regime’
- the emphasis is on destroying the South and reuniting Korea into one country; thus it has value in showing the nature of North Korean propaganda, though is limited for giving the true picture as to the reasons for the attack.

### Content and argument

- he claims that South Korea is a great danger to the North; indeed Syngman Rhee was anti-Communist and also a nationalist who wanted to unify the country, though there was no sign of any imminent attack
- he refers to the fact that Syngman Rhee is supported by only a small group of reactionary people. Certainly, Syngman Rhee’s rule was very repressive and he attempted to eliminate opposition which included arresting and torturing communists
- the North must destroy the Syngman Rhee government which is ‘fascist’ in character; this is a reference to the fact that the South’s government was strongly anti-Communist and had been set up and was supported by the US
- he argues that Korea must be united into a single state; again this emphasises the nationalist element of the conflict – both leaders wanted to unify the peninsula.

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

### Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a speech to Congress by President Truman and is of value as a high profile and public speech which has as its purpose, the goal of setting out the US position regarding Korea and gaining support for its actions. It also has value for showing the extent to which the US perceived North Korea’s attack a threat to world peace which had to be stopped

- Truman is using this speech to set out the US' view on the spread of communism and to make clear the US' determination to contain the spread of communism – he would have been aware that it was being studied by the Soviets as well as Americans and so has value for showing the message that Truman wanted to give to the world
- as a key policy speech this is formal in tone but also defiant and uncompromising
- the emphasis is on the legality of the US' actions and the danger and illegality of North Korea's actions with the use of language such as 'attack', 'subversion', 'conquer', 'aggression', 'defiance'. He also talks about 'Korea' rather than South Korea indicating that he does not consider North Korea to be a legal entity.

### **Content and argument**

- Truman outlines the nature of the attack on South Korea and the fact that the North has not responded to calls from the UN to cease hostilities. The attack had caught the Americans and the UN by surprise; the North had no intention of halting the attack believing that there would be no outside intervention
- he confirms that the US has given military aid to the South. This had happened, but in fact this did not stop the Southern advance of the North Korean troops which successfully took most of the peninsula before the Inchon landings
- he sets out the dangers of communism spreading. The US saw this as a Soviet inspired attack and part of a larger plan of the Soviets to spread communism worldwide
- Truman stresses the need for the UN to respond. Indeed, Truman saw that it was important for the UN to intervene to show that it was not as weak as its predecessor.

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

### **Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this is written by Khrushchev and so would have value as he was part of Stalin's inner circle of advisors at the time of the war, and so would have had a good knowledge of what was going on
- as it is from Khrushchev's memoirs it would have been written some years after the actual Korean invasion which could limit its value
- its purpose appears to be to justify the actions of the Soviets in supporting Kim Il Sung; this could also limit its value
- the tone is matter of fact, explaining the sequence of events. The emphasis is on the fact that Stalin did not initiate the invasion and was cautious in proceeding.

### **Content and argument**

- Khrushchev says that the motivation for the attack was that the North Koreans wanted to 'help their brethren'. In fact, Kim Il Sung was a nationalist who wanted to unite the peninsula under his control
- Khrushchev argues that the initiative for the invasion came from Kim Il Sung with Stalin having doubts. This is true – Stalin initially told Kim Il Sung that he would not support such an attack despite being asked many times for assistance by Kim
- Khrushchev says that Stalin and Kim believed the war could be won swiftly. Acheson had not included South Korea in his 'Perimeter Speech', giving rise to the belief that South Korea was not fundamental to US defence and so the US would not get involved

- he confirms that Stalin checked with Mao who agreed with the invasion and also believed that the US would not intervene. Mao did agree with the attack going ahead but believed that Stalin was more enthusiastic than he actually was.

**Section B**

- 02** How effective was the nuclear arms race in restraining the aggression of the superpowers in the years 1955 to 1963? **[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 will need to assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the policies of the Soviets and the Americans.

**Factors suggesting that the nuclear arms race was effective in restraining the aggression of the superpowers in the years 1955 to 1963 might include:**

- aware of the dangers of nuclear war, both sides kept out of the other's sphere of influence. Thus the US did not interfere in the USSR sphere of influence by helping the Hungarian rebels in 1956
- head to head confrontations were avoided; thus both the Berlin and Cuba crises were ultimately resolved without resort to force as both sides realised that nuclear war was not an option
- Khrushchev's policy of peaceful co-existence was partly based on the need to avoid a nuclear showdown
- following the Cuban Missile Crisis, there was an understanding that MAD (mutual assured destruction) meant that nuclear weapons could not be used and there was increased co-operation in reducing dangers of nuclear war, e.g. establishment of the hotline.

**Factors challenging the view that the nuclear arms race was effective in restraining the aggression of the superpowers in the years 1955 to 1963 might include:**

- both sides continued to stockpile weapons and to develop new weapons during this period which raised tensions
- the space race was also pursued aggressively by both sides as part of this weapons race
- rhetoric and policies remained aggressive; Khrushchev was prepared to threaten war over Berlin and to risk war over Cuba by placing missiles close to the US. The US' policy of Brinkmanship and Massive Retaliation under Eisenhower implied the readiness to use nuclear weapons in any confrontation
- both sides used aggression directly during this period; the USA intervened in Cuba in the Bay of Pigs, for example, and Khrushchev used force to put down the Hungarian uprising.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that for most of this period, the superpowers pursued aggressive policies regardless of the dangers of a nuclear showdown. However, there was a growing awareness of the dangers and by 1963, there was a move to avoid the types of aggressive behaviour that had led to the type of crises seen in the period 1958–1962.



- 03** ‘The Tet Offensive of 1968 was a turning point in America’s conduct of the Vietnam War in the years 1965 to 1970.’

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 will need to identify the impact of the Tet Offensive on US policy in Vietnam; which aspects of policy changed and which aspects of policy stayed the same after this event.

**Factors suggesting that the Tet Offensive of 1968 was a turning point in America's conduct of the Vietnam War in the years 1965 to 1970 might include:**

- Tet showed that America was still vulnerable in Vietnam and led to a rethink of policy; bombing of the North was halted and peace talks were initiated from 1968, indicating that America was no longer pursuing an outright military victory. Johnson now refused to send more troops which can be seen as a turning point
- Tet changed the mood of the media, e.g. position of Walter Cronkite. This led to a decrease in Johnson's approval rating which impacted on Johnson's handling of the war and his decision not to re-run for the Presidency
- Nixon won the next election with the slogan 'Peace with Honour', again reinforcing the impact of Tet on US policy; Nixon now pursued other tactics such as Vietnamisation and covert bombing of Cambodia
- General Westmoreland was devastated by the attack and he was removed from his post, again highlighting change in policy.

**Factors challenging the view that the Tet Offensive of 1968 was a turning point in America's conduct of the Vietnam War in the years 1965 to 1970 might include:**

- in reality the Tet Offensive achieved little military benefit for the Viet Cong and NVA (North Vietnam Army) due to the huge losses incurred and so the US was actually in a stronger position as a result of Tet
- aggressive military action by the US continued after 1968. More US soldiers were killed after 1968 than before, also indicating that tactics on the ground remained the same as before
- in addition, it could be argued that the change in US tactics might have happened regardless of Tet, e.g. the Secretary of Defence, Robert McNamara, had already stood down and been replaced by Clark Clifford who doubted the wisdom of US involvement; sections of the media were already hostile to the war; it was unlikely that congress would continue to support the war given the cost and huge losses involved
- there was no real change in the American perception of the war, i.e. it was still considered necessary to contain communism at all costs. There were also no new initiatives to win 'hearts and minds'.

Good answers may conclude that although the Tet Offensive was a shock to the American public highlighting the weakness of the US' position in Vietnam and acting as a catalyst to starting a peace process, in fact it was not a turning point in that military tactics continued as before. In addition, change in US policy may have happened regardless of the Tet Offensive.

- 04** 'Weak leadership in the USSR was the most significant reason for the increase in Cold War tension in the years 1982 to 1985.'

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 will need to examine the reasons for the increase in Cold War tension in the years 1982 to 1985 and assess the impact of the weak leadership in the USSR.

**Factors suggesting that weak leadership in the USSR was the most significant reason for the increase in Cold War tension in the years 1982 to 1985 might include:**

- the fact that the USSR had 3 leaders between 1982 and 1985, all old and infirm, prevented any kind of initiative to improve relations or strong leadership to deal with the tense atmosphere of those years
- the weakness of the USSR heightened paranoia and led to the dangerous situation during Operation Able Archer in 1983, when the Soviet leadership was convinced that the US was about to launch a nuclear first strike
- the follow-up to the shooting down of the South Korean airliner by the USSR was handled badly and contributed to tensions; again it is believed that this was because of the ailing health of Andropov
- it is notable that tension decreased with the stronger leadership of Gorbachev after 1985, thus indicating that the weak leadership of 1982 to 1985 had been significant for creating tension.

**Factors challenging the view that weak leadership in the USSR was the most significant reason for the increase in Cold War tension in the years 1982 to 1985 might include:**

- the collapse of détente and breakdown of good relations before 1982 following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and President Carter's response to this
- the aggressive rhetoric of President Reagan during these years, e.g. calling the Soviet Union an 'evil Empire'; this contributed to the paranoia of the Soviets
- the increased military spending of the USA along with SDI (Strategic Defence Initiative) which undermined the whole idea of MAD (mutual assured destruction) and thus the concept of deterrence
- increased US intervention to support anti-Communist insurgents as well as anti-Communist governments; the Reagan Doctrine led to US intervention in Central America and Grenada. In addition, aid was stepped up to the Mujahidin in Afghanistan.

Good students are likely to/may conclude that although the actions of the US and Reagan helped to create a dangerous international situation, the weak leadership within the USSR prevented any initiative to deal with this and indeed nearly brought about a nuclear showdown in 1983. The importance of a strong, rational Soviet leadership is shown by the fact that the arrival of Gorbachev in 1985 allowed relations between the USA and USSR to improve.