

AS

History

The Cold War, c1945–1991

7041/2R To the brink of Nuclear War; international relations, c1945–1963

Mark scheme

7041

June 2016

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 2016

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 Truman Doctrine? **[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

- Truman, as US President, was at the centre of US foreign policy formulation. This speech is a statement of Truman's Cold War strategy by March 1947 delivered by Truman himself. The fact that it is made before the US Congress underlines its validity as a direct policy statement which will be endorsed by the USA's government as official state policy
- Truman's tone is direct and forceful. It is presented as a reasonable and structured statement of intent but with strong opinions. Truman speaks of the USA's need only to 'support free peoples who are resisting' an outside threat.
- Truman is trying to get Congress on-side to support his policy; hence the forceful tone and the stress on the dangers; this possible exaggeration could limit its value

Content and argument

- Truman argues that Greece is under threat from communist terrorists and that the USA must support Greece, thus taking over from the British who could no longer afford to support the Greek Monarchists in the civil war
- he also points out that other states face a similar threat, and so the USA must support all 'free' peoples who are fighting 'armed minorities'. This is a reference to the fact that the USSR had already expanded its political and ideological influence into Eastern Europe by means of 'salami' tactics
- he argues that there are now only two political choices, one is democracy and the second is enforced subjugation under some form of tyranny thus setting out the Cold War battle lines between the liberal democracy of the West and Communism controlled by the USSR.

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

Provenance and tone

- the Soviet newspaper, 'Izvestia', was a propaganda mouthpiece for government policies and attitudes intended for the Soviet public and so it is valuable for what the Soviet government wanted their public to believe
- the tone of the article is angry and aggressive, accusing the West of being expansionist and even comparing its actions to those of Hitler

Content and argument

- the article argues that the US was attempting to gain control in Greece by pretending to combat totalitarianism. In fact, the US had no plan to take over Greece or to use its military forces to occupy Greece. Much of the US influence in Greece came from the Marshall Plan introduced in 1948
- the article also argues that the US has a plan for wider expansion in the style of Hitler. Certainly the US had strengthened its position in Europe since 1946; there was a clear intent to strengthen Germany and after 1948 the US would use the Marshall Plan to boost European economies.
- the article clearly refutes the idea that 'totalitarianism' was a feature of Soviet controlled areas by using the expression 'so-called totalitarianism'. In fact pro-communist totalitarian states were being created in Eastern Europe by the time this article was written.

Both sources offer a view of the development of the Truman Doctrine by 1947 from contrasting perspectives. Very well-supported conclusion in favour of the value of one or the other source should be rewarded.

Section B

- 02** ‘The main reason why the United States entered the Korean War was in order to defend South Korea.’

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 United States fought in the Korean War in order to defend South Korea might include:

- South Korea had been supported by the United States since 1945; after the refusal of North Korea to allow elections in 1947, it became an independent state under the US approved Syngman Rhee
- the invasion of the South was a clear act of aggression of one state against another; Kim Il Sung was an ardent nationalist who wanted to take over the whole peninsula
- the US believed that the UN needed to be seen to play a role in stopping aggression in the post war world so it did not go the way of the League of Nations; the US thus called for collective security action in order to defend South Korea from the aggression of North Korea.
- the US wanted to protect the South from Communism which they considered to be an unacceptable ideology and against the ideals and freedoms of democracy which they had wanted to establish in South Korea.

Arguments challenging the view that the United States fought in the Korean War in order to defend South Korea might include:

- the US's main concern was to stop the expansion of Communism in Asia; they believed that if South Korea fell to Communism, that the rest of Asia would also fall to Communism (articulated by Eisenhower as the domino theory in 1954)
- the USA believed in monolithic Communism and so thought this had all been planned by Stalin; thus containment had to be used as it had in Europe to stop the spread of Stalin's influence. Even before the invasion, the administration had drawn up NSC 68 which proposed massive spending on defence to resist Communism on a global scale
- the USA was already worried about China having gone Communist; the Democrats were accused by Republicans of having 'lost China' and so Truman had to take action in Korea so that he would not be seen as 'soft on Communism'. The USA was already changing its policy with regard to Japan to ensure that it acted as a bulwark to spread of communism.
- during the war, General MacArthur (with Truman's approval) changed the US's aim from pushing North Korea out of South Korea to 'roll-back' and an attempt to free North Korea from Communism; this clearly went beyond just defending South Korea.

Good students are likely to argue that although the US wanted to defend South Korea and to show that the UN would stand up to aggression of one state against another, its primary aim was to contain Communism in Asia. Thus, there may well be challenge to the view that the main reason was not to defend South Korea.

- 03** ‘Khrushchev’s policies in the years 1955 to 1961 ensured that there was no Cold War confrontation in Europe.’

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 Khrushchev's policies in the years 1955 to 1961 ensured that there was no Cold War confrontation in Europe might include:

- Khrushchev's policy of 'peaceful co-existence' meant that he was not looking for confrontation with the West, but rather to avoid nuclear war and have more dialogue.
- Khrushchev's policies allowed greater communication between the USA and the USSR, e.g. regular summits which allowed for exchange of views and reduction of conflict within Europe. The Geneva Summit in 1955 opened the way for exchange of some scientific information, as well as cultural and trade exchanges.
- Khrushchev showed that the USSR could be conciliatory, e.g. The Austrian State Treaty ended the occupation of Austria thus removing it as a potential area of confrontation
- Khrushchev was not prepared to risk war over Berlin and backed down from implementing his ultimatum that the West should leave. It could be argued the building of the wall ended any possible conflict over Berlin.

Arguments challenging the view that Khrushchev's policies in the years 1955 to 1961 ensured that there was no Cold War confrontation in Europe might include:

- between 1958 and 1960, Khrushchev raised tension over Berlin by issuing an ultimatum to the West to leave; this caused a serious Cold War confrontation and Khrushchev only backed down when Kennedy took a firm stand.
- he continued with the arms race and the space race; his bragging and lies to the West that the Soviet Union had many nuclear warheads increased tension and was a dangerous strategy that threatened stability in Europe where a nuclear confrontation was likely to happen
- he used confrontational rhetoric and actions towards the USA regarding events in Europe, e.g. at the Vienna Summit where he tried to bully Kennedy over Berlin, and at the Paris Summit where he walked out following the U2 incident
- he intervened with force in the Hungarian uprising despite dangers that the West might intervene.
- Some students may also argue that Eisenhower was just as/more important in ensuring that there was no confrontation as his policies of massive retaliation and brinkmanship acted as a deterrent to Soviet aggression

Good students may argue that Khrushchev's policies helped to reduce tension in Cold War relations up to about 1956. However, after this time his actions increased tension in Europe particularly in Berlin where confrontation nearly led to war..