

AS

History

Paper 2R The Cold War, c1945–1963
Additional Specimen Mark Scheme

Version/Stage: 1.0

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

AS History Unit 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2R The Cold War, c1945–1963

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining foreign policy aims of the USA and USSR in 1946? | [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 of 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 source is from a confidential telegram by George Kennan, who was an expert adviser with great experience and inside knowledge of the USSR. His telegram is widely considered to have had a major impact shaping the policy of containment.
- The tone is one of sober warning, seeking to persuade his superiors to take the Soviet threat seriously.

Content and argument

- It lists a number of characteristic Soviet attitudes and approaches that the US should guard against.
- It links these Soviet attitudes to long-standing trends established under the 'Tsarist police power'.
- It implicitly criticise his superiors in Washington for not having enough awareness of these dangers and that they need to wake up to them.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the legacy of the agreements made in Yalta and the debates within US policy makers under President Truman
- the extent of Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe in 1945-46 and the tensions between the occupying powers in Berlin
- the nature of Soviet ambitions; and Soviet fears of the West
- the legacy of the Soviet Union's involvement in the Second World War and its impact on Soviet policy after it.

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

Provenance and tone

- The source is from the Soviet Ambassador in Washington reporting to his superiors in Moscow.
- The source has an objective tone; but there is also ideological hostility to the US.

Content and argument

- Novikov sets out a summative view of American attitudes and policies, arguing that they are militaristic and capitalistic.
- The intention is to warn the Soviet leadership of the strength of American military power and their expansionist determination to 'lead the world'.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the real nature of American ambitions might be differentiated from Novikov's interpretation of them
- the extent to which Soviet policy was defensive, driven by the quest for security or was actually a deliberate plan for expansion of Soviet influence
- the extent to which the USA was genuinely threatened, or felt this.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude, e.g. that they offer matching, complementary views of each side at a time when both the superpowers were uncertain about each other's aims. It might be argued, for example, that both sources are based on misunderstanding and exaggerated fears; or that one set of warnings was justified but the other not. Any well supported judgement as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0 2 'The Western powers had considerable success in limiting the spread of Communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1960.'

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 supporting the view that the Western powers had considerable success in limiting the spread of Communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1960, might include:

- the US acted firmly to block aggression in Korea. Operating under the United Nations, with important military help from British forces and other allies, greatly strengthened the Western position
- the 1954 peace treaty was a sensible solution that has lasted ever since, with South Korea a strong bulwark against Communism
- the British counter-insurgency against Communist rebels in Malaya was effective
- the Geneva talks in 1954 showed American willingness to compromise, but also readiness to defend countries against Communism
- US policy after the French collapse in Indochina in 1954 was sensible and proportionate; the disasters of Vietnam came after 1960, not before.

Arguments challenging the view that the Western powers had considerable success in limiting the spread of Communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1960, might include:

- whilst Korea was a success, the US learned all the wrong lessons from it. The ‘domino theory’ was based on exaggerated fears and was unrealistic anyway
- the age of colonial rule in Asia was finished by 1954; Dien Bien Phu was a total disaster; Britain’s role in Asia was similarly a lost cause
- American policy under John Foster Dulles was mistaken and provocative, with no idea how to deal with China
- the impact of McCarthyism on public and political opinion in the US prevented more sane and reasonable policies from being implemented
- by 1960, before Kennedy was elected, US policy was already being sucked in to the quagmire of defending South Vietnam where there was no hope of success.

Students may conclude that it is clear that there were some significant successes in limiting the spread of communism in the period, but this related specifically and not generally to the whole of Asia. It might also be argued that Western powers wrongly labelled anti-colonial rebellions as inevitably communist.

0 3 'Credit for the peaceful resolution of the Cuban missile crisis should be shared equally between Khrushchev and Kennedy.'

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.

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a flashpoint in the Cold War, bringing the two superpowers to the edge of a major conflict in October 1962. From a Western perspective, especially at the time, this was a clear victory for the West and for the resolute stance adopted by President Kennedy, who could claim to have defused a crisis caused by the provocative actions of Nikita Khrushchev in placing missiles in Cuba. This narrative has been challenged: both from a Soviet perspective and by 'revisionist' Western historians.

Arguments supporting the view that credit for the peaceful resolution of the Cuban missile crisis should be shared equally between Khrushchev and Kennedy, might include:

- American support for the invasion of Cuba by rebels at the Bay of Pigs was to blame for emboldening Castro and Khrushchev
- Khrushchev was very flexible when it came to negotiating a way out of the crisis
- Khrushchev followed through after the crisis with agreements on nuclear tests and the 'hot line'
- Kennedy faced down the 'hawks' in his administration and the armed forces; just as he had negotiated a way out of the Berlin crisis in 1961 and collaborated with Khrushchev thereafter.

Arguments challenging the view that credit for the peaceful resolution of the Cuban missile crisis should be shared equally between Khrushchev and Kennedy, might include:

- the Americans had helped to provoke the crisis over Cuba by mistaken policies over Berlin since 1958 and by Kennedy's perceived 'weakness' after becoming president
- it could be argued that Khrushchev cannot have equal credit for getting out of the crisis because he was the one who had started it off, by misjudging Kennedy
- Khrushchev got himself into a mess and needed Kennedy to 'bail him out' by enabling him to climb down without losing face
- Khrushchev was regarded by his own Politburo as having failed in a needless adventure; it was a key reason they kicked him out of power in 1964
- Kennedy gained massive prestige out of the crisis; this was the opposite of what Khrushchev had hoped to achieve, to humiliate him:

Students may conclude that whilst the actions of both men in some ways precipitated the crisis, equally it was their actions which led to a peaceful resolution. Kennedy certainly threatened force, but was also willing to negotiate once the Soviets had withdrawn, so the proposition may be supported.