



---

A-level  
**HISTORY**  
**7042/2R**

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

\*196A7042/2R/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](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

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. <b>Always</b> 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.

**Component 2R The Cold War, c1945–1991**

**Section A**

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reasons for Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968. **[30 marks]**

*Target: AO2*

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

**Generic Mark Scheme**

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.**

**Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**

### Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this is a memorandum from the Soviet government to the Americans; as such it is of value for showing the official Soviet line on the reasons for the invasion as given to the West
- the fact that it was personally given to Johnson by the Ambassador is of value for showing that the Soviets were very keen to stress the legality of their actions and to avoid any American condemnation or interference that might undermine moves to *détente*. The fact that it was given the day before the invasion is also interesting as clearly this meant that the Americans were being presented with a *fait accompli*; given the motives of the Soviets here in handing over the ultimatum, its value is limited for showing the actual reasons for the intervention
- the tone is reasonable and the language is non-ideological; the emphasis is on ‘threats’ to security by ‘forces of aggression’ and that the Soviet government is only responding to requests – not taking the initiative with regard to force; again this limits the value for showing the actual reasons for the intervention.

### Content and argument

- the source talks of a conspiracy against the Czechoslovak government. This refers to the fact that the leader of the government, Alexander Dubček, had sought to introduce reforms which included political reform, more freedoms and trade with the West
- the source says that the conspiracy is ‘against the existing social order’; however, Dubček maintained that Czechoslovakia remained a loyal member of the socialist order and only wanted liberalisation within the existing Communist Party framework
- the Soviets claim that their military aid was ‘requested’ by the Czech government; in fact the Warsaw forces moved in when Dubček refused to back down over the reforms
- the memo mentions the ‘development’ of US-Soviet relations which it does not want to damage. This refers to the growing desire on the part of the Soviet Union for improved relations which was to result in ‘*détente*’.

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

**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this is a speech by Marshal Lin Biao; as a high ranking official, this source is of value for showing the CCP's propaganda about the Soviets and their actions and the message they wanted to send to the Soviets
- as this is a speech to the CCP Congress, and one which would be widely reported, it is likely to be exaggerated in content which would limit its value
- the date is significant as this is after the invasion; it is also at the height of Sino-Soviet tension re border disputes which again limits its value re the accuracy of content as Lin Biao's motive was to discredit the Soviets
- the tone is aggressive towards the Soviets and the emphasis is on the fact that the Soviets have deviated from revolutionary communism; the language is very ideological and inflammatory, accusing the Soviets of imperialism and being reactionary, of 'foul performances'.

**Content and argument**

- the speech talks of difficulties being faced by the Soviets at home and abroad; certainly the Soviets faced economic stagnation and decline and growing discontent in Eastern Europe
- the clear condemnation of Soviet actions is an example of the hostility that existed at this point between the two countries over the 'correct' form of communism. This dispute was also about the competition for who should be leader of the communist world
- the source condemns the invasion of Czechoslovakia as a 'foul action' and links it with Soviet actions against its own territories; indeed the Chinese government condemned the Soviet invasion and the subsequent Brezhnev Doctrine. This was not just in support of 'revolutionary struggles' in Czechoslovakia but because they feared that Soviet military might, and the Brezhnev Doctrine could, be turned against themselves
- the source mentions the 'collaboration with US imperialism'; this was a reference to improved relations with the West.

**Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:**

**Provenance, tone and emphasis**

- this is a speech by Brezhnev on an important occasion and so is of value for showing how the Soviets portrayed the reasons for the invasion of Czechoslovakia to its Party members
- the date is significant; by this point Dubček had been replaced and some time had elapsed since the invasion; the Soviets had received much condemnation for their actions and thus, Brezhnev is here attempting to justify the invasion and the Brezhnev Doctrine. It is thus likely to be a very one-sided account which limits its value
- the tone is aggressive and the emphasis is on defending Soviet actions; the speech seeks to justify Soviet actions by focusing on the idea of a conspiracy and of forces threatening the Soviet Union – 'anti-socialist conspiracy', 'right-wing opportunists', 'dangerous enemy plans'.

**Content and argument**

- Brezhnev blames events in Czechoslovakia on anti-socialist forces, also implying the involvement of other countries. In fact political change was carried out by the actual Czech government under Dubček who said that he remained a loyal Communist
- he says that the actions of the conspirators would 'strike a heavy blow against the position of socialism in Europe'. It is true that the other East European governments were worried by events in Czechoslovakia – though again, Dubček said that Czechoslovakia would remain within the Warsaw Pact

- Brezhnev says that the crisis was solved by those who were 'loyal to the principles of socialist internationalism'; in fact the Prague Spring was ended by the invasion of Warsaw Pact forces
- Brezhnev stresses the fact that the Soviets take a 'firm stand in favour of socialist internationalism'; this view was underpinned by the Brezhnev Doctrine which Brezhnev issued in November 1968 which justified Soviet actions in Czechoslovakia and also justified any future interventions.

**Section B**

**02** 'US policies in Asia, in the years 1953 to 1959, were successful.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting US policies in Asia, in the years 1953 to 1959, were successful might include:**

- the armistice that ended the Korean War in 1953 kept South Korea as an independent country
- the use of brinkmanship with regard to Taiwan (1953 and 1958) successfully stopped Chinese aggression in this area
- Eisenhower kept US troops out of Vietnam; he resisted calls for direct military intervention and thus avoided getting the US too involved at this stage. The support of Diem in the South of Vietnam following the Geneva Agreement, allowed the US to keep influence in Vietnam
- the establishment of SEATO strengthened the means for collective defence in Asia
- ultimately the Domino Theory was upheld – no Asian state fell to communism and US' continued support for Japan and South Korea ensured that they remained anti-communist bulwarks and key trading partners for the US.

**Arguments/factors challenging the view that US policies in Asia, in the years 1953 to 1959, were successful might include:**

- while peace was achieved in Korea and South Korea was kept free of communism, this came at a terrible cost in terms of lives and economic cost. It also set the US on the road to further involvement in containing communism globally with the implementation of NSC 68
- despite funding almost 80% of the French war in Indochina, the US were unable to prevent the French losing in Vietnam which can be seen as a failure; the division of Vietnam at the Geneva Conference meant that the US' aim of keeping communism completely out of Vietnam was not achieved
- the support of Diem was to prove a disaster due to the nature of Diem's policies which alienated the population of South Vietnam and allowed support for communism to grow; indeed it could be argued that it was Eisenhower in these years who tied the US into what was to become the quagmire of Vietnam
- the whole policy of containment in Asia – underpinned by Eisenhower's Domino Theory – was flawed in that the US confused Soviet imperialism with local nationalist movements seeking independence.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that while the US successfully thwarted China over Taiwan and got peace in Korea, in fact the premise of NSC 68 and the Domino Theory tied the US into involvement in Vietnam; Eisenhower's support for Diem was to prove disastrous for the people of South Vietnam and overall the actions of the US in these years were to lay the foundations for future Americans involvement.

- 03** 'The USA was more responsible than the USSR for the crisis over Cuba in the years 1961 to 1962'.

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that the USA was more responsible than the USSR for the crisis over Cuba in the years 1961 to 1962 might include:**

- the US had acted aggressively towards Cuba and its socialist revolution through invasion and sabotage; it was clear that following the Bay of Pigs the US would try again to overthrow Castro – Khrushchev indeed later claimed that he was trying to protect Cuba's socialist revolution
- the US had missiles in Turkey and it can be argued that the USSR was only trying to achieve some balance with the US by putting missiles on Cuba
- Kennedy heightened the crisis by going public about the presence of the missiles with a TV broadcast; it can be argued that this was unnecessary and the situation could have been sorted out diplomatically behind the scenes
- the US over-reacted to the missiles and also failed to fully understand Soviet aims; they did not understand that the Soviets were putting the missiles there for defensive purposes.

**Arguments/factors challenging the view that the USA was more responsible than the USSR for the crisis over Cuba in the years 1961 to 1962 might include:**

- Khrushchev was looking for a personal victory over the US following his humiliation over the Berlin Wall and was prepared to take this dangerous gamble
- Khrushchev was responsible for the crisis as he was directly challenging the US and establishing a presence in what the US considered to be 'its backyard'
- Khrushchev misunderstood the US mentality which would not tolerate missiles so close to American shores; he also misunderstood the US political system – no US President could survive an election if they allowed this to happen
- the secrecy surrounding the placing of the missiles also added to a 'crisis' situation.

Good students are likely to argue that both leaders played a role in creating this crisis; much depended on what Khrushchev's aims actually were in taking this gamble. If he was in fact trying to preserve the Cuban revolution as a priority then the actions of the US were extremely provocative and played a key role in causing this crisis. However, there is also no doubt that Khrushchev's actions were very dangerous and it was ultimately his decision to put missiles on Cuba that brought the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe.

- 04** How significant were economic problems in the USSR and its satellite states in explaining the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that economic problems in the USSR and its satellite states were significant in explaining the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 might include:**

- the whole of the Soviet empire was struggling economically. Under Brezhnev there had been economic stagnation and decline – a situation that was exacerbated by the USSR's overseas ventures and the fact that 25% of GDP was being spent on the military
- the satellite states were tied to the Soviet economy and thus suffered from the same problems as the Soviet Union – shortages in food stuffs and lack of housing and consumer goods; all economic initiatives had been stifled since the failure of the Prague Spring
- within many of the satellite states, economic factors played a role in determining the actions of the government or the people in the events of 1989, e.g. in Poland worsening economic conditions meant that Jaruzelski had to negotiate with Solidarity; in Hungary it was a downturn in the economy that triggered reforms, in East Germany economic crisis played a part in forcing the hand of the government to lift travel restrictions
- Gorbachev's economic reforms exacerbated the crisis within the USSR. He also refused to give economic aid to the satellite states. In 1989 he refused to give Krenz economic support to stop the collapse of the economy.

**Arguments/factors challenging the view that economic problems in the USSR and its satellite states were significant in explaining the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989 might include:**

- the growing disillusionment with the Communist Party, which had shown itself as corrupt, repressive and out of touch was also a key factor in all of the satellite states in explaining the protests of 1989
- the role of the people in the satellite countries was also key; it was popular protest in East Germany, Romania and Czechoslovakia that forced the communist governments to resign
- the actions of Gorbachev; his reforms of perestroika and glasnost led to increased chaos within the USSR and inspired the protests in the satellite states
- the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine meaning that Gorbachev would not use the military to support the unpopular leaders of the satellite states was key in explaining the ultimate collapse of these countries.

Good students are likely to argue that the economic crisis faced by the USSR and by all of the satellite states by 1989 meant that collapse was inevitable at some point. However, it was Gorbachev's actions that ensured that collapse came in 1989; it was also his decision to end the Brezhnev Doctrine that allowed popular protest to succeed in the satellite states.