

AS

History

The Cold War, c1945–1991

Component 2R To the brink of Nuclear War; international relations, c1945–1963

Mark scheme

7041

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

June 2017

The Cold War, c1945–1991

AS History 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 significance of Berlin to East–West relations in 1961? **[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

- Source A is a television broadcast from Kennedy addressed to the whole US nation and so has value for showing the official US line on Berlin which the US wanted the USSR to understand and the US public to support
- the date is significant as it is after the Vienna Summit and so the source is of value for showing the degree of tension that existed at this time
- the tone is one of defiance; that the US will not be pushed out of Berlin which again is of value for showing the stance that Kennedy now has towards the Soviets.

Content and argument

- Kennedy stresses the importance of West Berlin as a symbol of freedom. The emphasis on freedom is to contrast the situation in West Berlin with the totalitarian system which had been established in East Germany and East Berlin under Walter Ulbricht
- Kennedy mentions that Berlin is an escape hatch for refugees. This is a reference to the huge number of refugees that were leaving East Germany via Berlin; by June 1961 2000 refugees a day were fleeing from East to West making the situation untenable for East Germany
- Kennedy blames the Soviet Union for the tension existing in Berlin; Khrushchev had repeatedly threatened the West over Berlin and had bullied Kennedy at the Vienna Summit over this issue, threatening war.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is an official response by the Soviet Union to America's complaints about the building of the Berlin Wall; it is thus of value for showing the official Soviet line with regard to the wall
- the purpose of this communication was to justify the building of the wall to both the West and its own people; it is using this as an opportunity to defend its actions by attacking the

USA. Thus it is clearly a propaganda statement and so its value is limited for showing the actual state of affairs with regard to US actions in Berlin

- the tone is belligerent and accusatory which again limits its value for showing the actual situation within Berlin.

Content and argument

- the Soviet Union says that it fully supports East Germany in its actions of building the wall. In fact Ulbricht had been desperate to stem the tide of refugees and building the wall was seen as the only option; Khrushchev ultimately was not prepared to risk war over Berlin
- the Soviet Union claims that the West has made West Berlin a centre of espionage. Indeed, West Berlin was a useful base for intelligence for the West with its location inside the heart of Eastern Europe
- the West is blamed for forcing people to migrate to West Germany. In fact it was the harsh economic conditions in the East and the lack of freedoms that were forcing people to migrate.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students may conclude that both sources are valuable for highlighting the significance of Berlin to East-West tensions; the strength of rhetoric and the number of accusations made in each source highlight the importance of Berlin for raising tensions to a dangerous level. However, it could be argued that Source A is more valuable than Source B for explaining why the crisis developed as it did in 1961; the stance of the USA with regard to Berlin, as revealed in this speech, explains why Khrushchev was left with limited options for solving the economic crisis and responding to pressure from Ulbricht. Conversely, Source B is a propaganda rant to justify the building of the wall, which came to be seen as a failure for communism, and much of it is exaggerated or untrue.

Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

- 02** ‘The tensions that existed within the Grand Alliance by the end of 1946 were the result of conflicting ideologies.’

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 the tensions that existed within the Grand Alliance by the end of 1946 were the result of conflicting ideologies might include:

- both sides felt threatened by the other's ideology and indeed the seeds of ideological mistrust had been sown back in the 1920s following the Bolshevik Revolution
- the US increasingly saw Soviet actions after 1945 as being ideologically driven, e.g. Soviet actions in Poland and throughout Eastern Europe during 1945–1946 seemed to indicate that Stalin was attempting to spread communism
- the rise of Communist parties in Italy and France after the Second World War and the civil war in Greece were further seen as being encouraged and funded by the Soviets. These fears were articulated by Churchill in the Fulton Speech and in Kennan's Long Telegram of 1946
- the USSR also saw US capitalist ideology as attempting to 'encircle' the USSR and threaten its actions; Stalin reacted angrily to Churchill's accusations.

Arguments challenging the view that the tensions that existed within the Grand Alliance by the end of 1946 were the result of conflicting ideologies might include:

- the tensions were created by economic conflict; the USA's emphasis on free market capitalism and the setting up of the Bretton Woods system appeared to the USSR to indicate that the USA was setting up economic spheres of influence that promoted American interests only. Hence the USSR withdrew from the Bretton Wood talks in 1946
- tensions were inevitable given the fact that the USA and the USSR were now the only two superpowers; the power vacuums created by the decline of the smaller states meant that both powers naturally attempted to expand their influence and so were bound to come into conflict; thus this was more about traditional Great Power rivalry
- the ending of the war, with the departure of a common enemy and the advent of new problems such as what to do with Germany, was bound to cause tensions regardless of differing ideologies
- aggressive actions by individuals on both sides contributed to the growth of tensions, e.g. the dropping of the A bomb by the USA by Truman and the breaking of the agreements on Poland by Stalin. The personalities and actions of both men contributed to the tensions that existed by 1946.

Good students are likely to argue that ideological differences were key and indeed were starting to play an increasingly important role in the growth of tension by the end of 1946, as indicated by the nature of the rhetoric and propaganda emerging on both sides. However, the personality and actions of Stalin in particular made the growth of tension inevitable.

03 “The US failed to contain communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1955.’

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 the US failed to contain communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1955 might include:

- the Communist Party in China won the civil war despite the US providing aid to the GMD; this was seen by many as a failure on the part of the US government that it allowed this to happen
- the US failed to see the threat of North Korea and Acheson's perimeter speech of 1950 helped give the impression to Kim Il Sung and Korea that there would be no US intervention if the North took over the South
- US policies in Vietnam sowed the seeds of further conflict: after 1954, US policy in South East Asia was based on the concept of the 'domino theory' and so support was given first to the French fighting the Vietminh and then to the Diem as the non-communist ruler of South Vietnam. The failure of the US to understand the situation in Vietnam, or to support a settlement at Geneva that might have led to a long-term solution, created the conditions for the growth of communist opposition in Vietnam.

Arguments challenging the view that the US failed to contain communism in Asia in the years 1949 to 1955 might include:

- ultimately the US did manage to contain communism in Korea; the end of the war saw the situation returned to the split of the peninsula along the 38th parallel
- the reconstruction of Japan was very successful in creating a bulwark against the spread of communism
- the US resisted attempts by Communist China to take back Taiwan, threatening the use of nuclear weapons and forcing the CCP to back down in 1954
- it could be argued that the USA was not responsible for the failure of the GMD in China; there was very little that the US could have done to prevent the victory of the CCP which was due mainly to the incompetence of the GMD.

Good answers may conclude that the US had many successes in these years in containing communism. However this came at a huge cost in Korea, and the commitment to the 'domino theory' after 1954, and the failure to understand the nature of support for Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam, was already embroiling the US in an unwinnable battle to contain communism by 1955.