

---

**AS**  
**HISTORY**

Paper 2R The Cold War, c1945–1963

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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)

## AS History Unit 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 2R The Cold War, c1945–1963

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining why there were differences between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union in 1946? | <b>[25 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

*Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.*

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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. | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.  | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | The answer will be partial. There may be <b>either</b> some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question <b>or</b> 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.  | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | The answer will <b>either</b> describe source content <b>or</b> 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.                                       | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## 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 famous set-piece speech by Winston Churchill (no longer Prime Minister but still influential) aimed at warning his American audience
- the tone is partisan, subjective and seeking to persuade and warn of Soviet threat.

### Content and argument

- it lists a significant number of reasons for the West to worry about Soviet expansion
- it implicitly blames Stalin and the USSR for threatening post-war stability
- there is a warning about the need to take action to avert future conflict

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

- the extent of Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe
- the nature of Soviet ambitions
- the extent to which this threatened stability

---

**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 Russian leader in a Soviet newspaper interview
- it is published on 16 March 1946, ten days after Churchill's speech
- the source has an outwardly moderate tone with some emotive language wishing to appear reasonable.

**Content and argument**

- Stalin is using the sacrifices made by Soviet citizens in the war to justify his attempt to establish dominance in Eastern Europe
- The implication that Western powers did not appreciate the scale of Soviet sacrifices
- Stalin's desire for future security

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

- The scale of Soviet losses
- Western attitudes towards the Soviet Union
- The extent to which Stalin's policy was driven by the quest for security

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) that they offer opposing but complementary views about the importance of Soviet expansion. Both may be seen as partisan. Stalin's view may be seen as more valuable as he was directing Soviet policy. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

**Section B**

- |          |          |  |
|----------|----------|--|
| <b>0</b> | <b>2</b> | 'Throughout the years 1949 to 1961, the question of Berlin caused East-West tensions.' |
|----------|----------|--|

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**

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |

## 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 may refer to some of the following in support of the proposition:

- the Berlin Blockade resulted in a kind of ‘frozen conflict’, with West Berlin isolated in the Russian Zone. This was followed by the de facto division of Germany, in the absence of any negotiations or written agreements
- West Berlin was deliberately used as a capitalist showpiece, backed by lavish funding; East Berlin was the scene of a serious uprising against the Communist regime in 1953
- from the mid-1950s, West Berlin was an entry point for hundreds of thousands of people, mostly young and/or skilled, fleeing to the West. This was de-stabilising for the GDR. By 1958, Berlin was a major flashpoint in the Cold War
- the building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 caused major problems for the West in how to respond to it. Soviet and American tanks faced each other at Checkpoint Charlie in one of the most dangerous moments of the whole Cold War.

Students may also refer to some of the following to balance the argument:

- whilst Berlin did cause instability, it was not necessarily ‘dangerous’ – both sides understood the ‘unwritten rules’ of the ‘hot peace’ of the Cold War
- the Berlin Blockade was ended peaceably in 1949. Stalin had launched the blockade because it did not risk war; the Berlin airlift operated on the same basis, knowing that the other side did not intend to use force
- the Berlin situation was essentially stable after 1949. When Khrushchev came to power, he focused on peaceful co-existence. He would probably have agreed on a deal over Berlin like the one over Vienna in 1955, except that the 1956 rising in Hungary got in the way
- the rush of emigration from the GDR did cause instability over Berlin but the Berlin Wall actually provided a stable solution (the West was secretly pleased)
- even the confrontation at Checkpoint Charlie was successfully defused without any real danger of a shooting war.

**0 3** 'The outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis was a triumph for the diplomacy of Nikita Khrushchev.'

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

- |            |  |              |
|------------|--|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.  | <b>0</b>     |



## 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 may refer to some of the following in support of the proposition:

- Khrushchev placed the youthful President Kennedy under pressure after the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. The outcome of the Missile Crisis left Castro firmly in power in Cuba
- Khrushchev may have miscalculated about the American response to his placing missiles in Cuba, but he used clever diplomacy to defuse the crisis
- Khrushchev extracted major concessions from the US in relation to American bases in Turkey – and he was clever enough not to make this a public issue
- the aftermath of the crisis showed Khrushchev's ability to negotiate on equal terms behind the scenes. The 'hot line' and the 1963 Test Ban Treaty were significant achievements and ensured the USSR was seen in the West as a super power.

Students may also refer to some of the following to refute or balance the argument:

- Khrushchev badly underrated Kennedy. Soviet policies provoked a crisis that nearly caused the Third World War
- Khrushchev's diplomacy at the height of the crisis was confused. He sent very contradictory signals to Washington and was lucky that the Americans responded as carefully as they did
- having caused a crisis by placing missiles in Cuba he then had to pull them out again; this was humiliating for the USSR and for him personally
- the perceived failure of his 'adventurism' over Cuba in 1962 was one of the key charges thrown at Khrushchev by his Politburo colleagues when they forced him out of power in 1964.

