

**GCSE**  
**HISTORY**  
**8145/1B/C**

Paper 1 Section B/C:

Conflict and tension between East and West,  
1945–1972

---

Mark scheme

June 2019

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)

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

## 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, ie 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.

### Step 3 Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG)

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in question 04.

	Performance descriptor	Marks awarded
High performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	4 marks
Intermediate performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	2–3 marks
Threshold performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	1 mark
No marks awarded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learner writes nothing</li> <li>• The learner's response does not relate to the question</li> <li>• The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li> </ul>	0 marks

Question 04 is an extended response question. They give students the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	1
---	---

**Source A** supports the friendship between the USSR and China. How do you know?

Explain your answer using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

**[4 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**

**Level 2: Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 3–4**

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the image suggests that Communist Russia and China are closely linked; the doves are a symbol that China will have peace with the USSR as an ally. The poster was published shortly after China had become communist in 1949 and made an alliance with the USSR to get help and protection.

**Level 1: Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 1–2**

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the leaders are shown standing side by side; Stalin is waving in a friendly manner; dancers and buildings from each country are presented alongside each other.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0**

**0 2**

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to an historian studying events in Hungary in 1956?

Explain your answer using **Sources B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

**[12 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target**      **Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)**  
**Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)**

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

**Level 4:**      **Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance**      **10–12**

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, the sources are useful because they give a dual perspective on the events of 1956 by showing how peoples' optimism was replaced with a sense of betrayal. The content of Source B suggests the hope that Khrushchev's call for peaceful coexistence with the West might bring greater freedom for Hungary. The provenance of Source C suggests that people in America felt that the US should have used the Truman Doctrine and the policy of containment as grounds to help Hungary.

**Level 3:**      **Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance**      **7–9**

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful to illustrate Nagy's role as a leader in the democratisation of Hungary. Nagy brought reforms and rejected communism. When he called for Hungary to leave the Warsaw Pact the USSR sent tanks and troops to attack the revolutionaries, resulting in a huge death toll. Source C is useful for showing a critical opinion of the UN's failure to do anything more than condemn Soviet brutality.

**Level 2: Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6**

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, Source B is useful because it shows that Hungary wanted to be free from communism and control by the USSR. Nagy is calling for an end to the revolt of 1956 during which Soviet tanks had been burnt by revolutionaries.

Source C is blaming the rest of the world for doing nothing to stop the USSR from being completely ruthless against Hungary.

**Level 1: Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3**

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point, for example, Source B explains the reforms that took place as part of the Hungarian Uprising. Source C shows the violent response of the USSR.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0**

**0 3** Write an account of how the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences led to international tension. **[8 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)  
Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)**

**Level 4: Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question 7–8**

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, analysis of different consequences over time. In the short-term the conferences led to Western fear of Soviet expansion and laid the foundations for Cold War rivalry and tension. Furthermore, the successful testing of the first atomic bomb made Truman less inclined to compromise with Stalin and in turn Stalin was more suspicious of America's post war ambitions. The distrust that developed in Potsdam became the basis for the nuclear arms race that persisted for decades.

**Level 3: Developed analysis of causation/consequence  
Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question 5–6**

Extends Level 2.

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, the disagreement over what should happen to countries in Eastern Europe created a source of tension that continued long after the conferences. It had been agreed at Yalta that the liberated countries of Eastern Europe would be allowed to hold free elections but Stalin's Red Army remained in occupation; he insisted it was necessary to ensure Soviet security in the long-term.

<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Simple analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>3–4</b>
	<p>Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>For example, disagreement over what to do about Germany caused tension. Stalin wanted Germany to pay reparations and remain weak, but the US wanted to avoid the same mistakes made at the end of the First World War which made Germany bitter.</p>	
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Basic analysis of causation/consequence</b> <b>Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question</b>	<b>1–2</b>
	<p>Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events such as the personnel present at the conferences changed and at the meeting in Potsdam, Truman and Stalin did not get on together.</p>	
	<b>Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question</b>	<b>0</b>

Question 04 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

0	4
---	---

'The main cause of tension between the Superpowers during the 1960s was the Cuban Missile Crisis.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

**[16 marks]**  
**[SPaG 4 marks]**

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full exemplar answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

**Target**      **Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)**  
**Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)**

**Level 4:**      **Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement**      **13–16**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.

Extends Level 3.

Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.

For example, the Cuban Missile Crisis could be seen as the biggest source of tension because it brought both superpowers closer than ever before to a nuclear conflict. However, the other events of the 1960s also raised tension. They were repeated examples of the intense political rivalry and sense of competition that fuelled the Space Race.

**Level 3: Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s)** **9–12**  
**Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the Cuban Missile Crisis caused tension because the USSR's alliance with Cuba created a very threatening situation for America. Kennedy faced an enormous political challenge as Soviet nuclear missiles were installed in Cuba. When the US enforced a naval blockade around Cuba the whole world felt there was a danger of war breaking out.

For example, Soviet actions in Czechoslovakia in response to the Prague Spring of 1968 were another cause of tension; the issuing of the Brezhnev Doctrine declared that all Warsaw Pact countries were to remain under the tight control of the USSR.

**Level 2: Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s)** **5–8**  
**Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the main reason was that in 1961 the USSR built the Berlin Wall which was a symbol of the division between East and West; at one point American and Soviet tanks faced each other on either side of Check Point Charlie.

**Level 1: Basic explanation of one or more factors** **1–4**  
**Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question**

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors.

Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, such as, the Cuban Missile Crisis caused tension because the USSR had nuclear missiles in Cuba that could have destroyed most of America.

Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the U2 spy plane incident caused tension because America was proven to be spying on the USSR.

**Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question** **0**

### Spelling, punctuation and grammar

<b>Performance descriptor</b>	<b>Marks awarded</b>
High performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	4 marks
Intermediate performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	2–3 marks
Threshold performance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy</li> <li>• Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall</li> <li>• Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate</li> </ul>	1 mark
No marks awarded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The learner writes nothing</li> <li>• The learner’s response does not relate to the question</li> <li>• The learner’s achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning</li> </ul>	0 marks