AS
HISTORY
7041/2R

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

196A7041/2R/MS

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

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.

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. **Always** provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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 purpose of the Marshall Plan? **[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 from the period when the Marshall Plan was still being discussed; it is a speech by Andrei Zhdanov, a high ranking Soviet official, who was convinced that the US was responsible for dividing the world into two camps. As Soviet propaganda designed to vilify the West, its value for helping to understand the purpose of the Marshall Plan is limited
- its purpose is to justify the formation of Cominform and has value for showing how the Soviets portrayed the Marshall Plan
- the tone is damning of US actions with the use of words such as 'vague and deliberately misleading'.

Content and argument

- the Marshall Plan was a scheme to create blocs: Zhdanov believed that US actions were going to split Europe into two blocs or camps
- European states would have to give up their economic and then political independence: it was believed by the USSR that the giving of economic aid would ensure that the US had control over European markets and also mean that they could influence European politics. The USSR had prevented East European states, such as Czechoslovakia, from accepting aid via the Marshall Plan for these reasons
- the Marshall Plan would allow the US to control the industrial areas of Western Germany: Germany was still a key issue at this point and this speech highlights the Soviet view (which would be reinforced by the introduction of a new currency in the western zones in 1948) that the US was seeking to get economic, and thus political control, over the west and that any form of unification of Germany was thus, going to be unacceptable to the Soviets
- the Communists are going to lead resistance to American plans and any supporters of American imperialism: the establishment of Cominform in 1947 allowed for the control and coordination of all communist groups across Europe.

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

Provenance and tone

- this source is a briefing by the Secretary of State to the committee which would be considering the Marshall Plan; as he wants the Senate to view the bill favourably, he is being persuasive and highlighting only the benefits for the US – this limits the value of the source
- it has value for providing an insight into how the Marshall Plan was portrayed in America and how the Soviet threat was perceived
- its tone is formal and persuasive – stressing the responsibility of Congress with such phrases as 'future of our country and the world', 'grave world situation', 'immense responsibility'.

Content and argument

- the need for assistance is urgent: Europe was still suffering from the effects of the war. There was much poverty, Britain was on the verge of bankruptcy
- there is a 'grave' world situation: this was a reference to the growing threat of Communism. Much of Eastern Europe was now under the control of the Soviets (as had been highlighted by Churchill's Iron Curtain speech) and there was real concern in America about the growth of Communism in France and Italy
- the Plan seeks no special advantage for the US: while the Soviet view that the Plan would tie states in receipt of aid to the US economically and politically was an exaggeration, nevertheless the US needed a strong Europe to allow for a healthy trading situation.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might argue that Source B is more valuable as it is a formal and private statement to a committee setting out the aims of the US with regard to the Marshall Plan, while Source A is Soviet propaganda to discredit the West and provide a reason for the introduction of Cominform. However, students might also question the altruistic motives provided in Source B. Both sources are clearly partisan and influenced by Cold War politics.

Section B

02 'Eisenhower's foreign policy in the years 1953 to 1959 marked a change in how the US dealt with the Soviet Union.'

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 Eisenhower's foreign policy in the years 1953 to 1959 marked a change in how the US dealt with the Soviet Union might include:

- the use of brinkmanship; using threats of massive retaliation as a tool of containment, e.g. Taiwan
- the use of the CIA for covert anti-communist operations, e.g. to remove governments, such as that in Iran, if they were considered too left-wing
- Eisenhower was prepared to meet the Soviet leader at summits
- Eisenhower also now made it clear that he was going to rely on nuclear weapons rather than conventional weapons.

Arguments challenging the view that Eisenhower's foreign policy in the years 1953 to 1959 marked a change in how the US dealt with the Soviet Union might include:

- Eisenhower continued with the policy of containment in Europe and extended the concept of containment with the Eisenhower Doctrine. Anyone fighting Communism was guaranteed US support, regardless of their geographical location
- the establishment of alliances to contain and surround the Soviet Union continued. Support of NATO continued – SEATO was set up
- the arms race, which had started under Truman, continued.

Good students may argue that although there was much continuity between the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in US policy towards the USSR, there were also significant changes caused partly by increased US fears by the 1950s and also the widening of the conflict beyond Europe.

03 'Developments in Hungary and Berlin made no difference to superpower relations in the years 1956 to 1961.'

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 developments in Hungary and Berlin made no difference to superpower relations in the years 1956 to 1961 might include:

- despite promises of aid and encouragement via Radio Free Europe, the West took no action to help the Hungarian rebels and so there was no direct confrontation as a result of the uprising
- there was no significant change to the direction of US/USSR relations following the Hungarian uprising; although relations cooled for the next few months and discussions on arms control were put on hold, by 1957 plans were already in place for a new summit so peaceful co-existence was not derailed by these events
- the UN debated the Soviet invasion but no action was taken following the invasion of Hungary, the Soviets were able to restore authority and to retain their sphere of influence.
- there was no direct conflict over Berlin. Despite the Wall, tensions that had developed after 1958 continued due to events in Cuba and the arms race.

Arguments challenging the view that developments in Hungary and Berlin made no difference to superpower relations in the years 1956 to 1961 might include:

- the USA's lack of intervention in Hungary made it clear that they would not challenge the Soviet sphere of influence or attempt 'rollback' (despite this having been an election promise of Eisenhower)
- the lack of US intervention in Hungary, and the fact that Khrushchev backed down over Berlin, highlighted the limits of US-USSR confrontation due to nuclear weapons. The risk of nuclear war was too great and the concept of MAD would come to influence superpower relations
- Khrushchev's actions with regard to Berlin, e.g. the 1958 ultimatum and his threats to Kennedy at Vienna, increased tensions dramatically
- the building of the Berlin Wall removed Berlin as a tension point and also gave the West a propaganda advantage against the Soviets. The focus of superpower tensions now shifted to other regions.

Good students are likely to argue that, although the ending of the revolt in Hungary did not lead to any direct challenge from the West, in fact the clarity regarding US actions towards the Soviet sphere of influence – that it now accepted the post-war status quo – was significant. Similarly, the fact that Germany and, more specifically Berlin, were no longer the focus of superpower tensions meant that the superpowers shifted their rivalry away from Europe.