



A-level HISTORY 7042/2R

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945-1991

Mark scheme

June 2021

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2021 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 1** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying summit diplomacy in the years 1985 to 1988.

[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 an address delivered by Nitze who was a special advisor to Reagan on arms control, therefore is of value to show the opinion of a government official on the progress made at Geneva concerning nuclear arms limitation
- Nitze's tone is positive and emphasises the initial progress made on arms control at Geneva and aims to ensure that the Council and the general public are aware of the leaps of progress Reagan and Gorbachev have made. The source has value as Nitze provides an honest account of the achievements and does not shy away from mentioning the limits of summit diplomacy
- in his capacity as Special Advisor to the President, Nitze will be at the heart of these arms talks and therefore have an official capacity to comment on progress. Therefore, is valuable for demonstrating the impact of summit diplomacy on actively reducing the threat of nuclear war
- the emphasis of the source on progress is due to its audience being the Atlantic Council. Nitze will be conscious of emphasising the positives as Western powers will be hoping for progress in diminishing the threat of nuclear war. There is a very slight warning that issues, such as SDI, are continuing to cause problems in the Reagan-Gorbachev relationship which could mean the source is less valuable in studying summit diplomacy, as Nitze may not be as candid as he would to a different audience.

Content and argument

- Nitze suggests that the USA and USSR are standing on the precipice of a new beginning in their relationship and this is due to the summit meetings that have so far taken place. This is clear in the feeling of hope expressed after the Geneva Summit and the joint statement issued by Gorbachev and Reagan on reducing arms by 50%, demonstrating the value of the source in relation to the success of summit diplomacy
- Nitze also argues that this will be a long process of give and take between the two superpowers. At Geneva, there were continuing disagreements over SDI and while Reagan tried to present it as positively as possible, it was a source of tension in future summit meetings – suggesting the source has less value as summit diplomacy did not always have a positive impact on relations as Nitze suggests
- the source focuses on what was agreed at Geneva, including arms control at 50% reduction and the potential of an INF Treaty. It is true that they made clear plans to cut offensive weapons by 50%, limit medium-range missiles and end nuclear proliferation – thereby demonstrating the value of this source in confirming the progress that was made
- the source refers to the Geneva Summit changing 'the tone, though not the substance, of the superpower relationship'. Both Reagan and Gorbachev aimed for a propaganda success from this summit and both finally agreed that a nuclear war could never be won. Therefore, the source has value in demonstrating the symbolic impact of Geneva for the future of summit diplomacy.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Gorbachev is speaking as leader of the USSR after two years of his ‘New Thinking’ policies. His outlook towards the USA has greatly changed since the early stages of their relationship and he is speaking with complete optimism at a private luncheon, therefore, the source has value in showing Gorbachev’s positive outlook on summit diplomacy
- this speech was made during the Washington Summit and therefore has value in the way it reflects the optimism from signing the INF Treaty and making further progress on other humanitarian issues. Most people were aware of the outcome of the summit and had a sense of optimism: the Cold War was ending
- this is a private luncheon and it reflects Gorbachev’s personal feelings towards mutual co-operation, however, in such close quarters he may be overly optimistic and stoic. A private luncheon attended by officials would not be the occasion for hashing out remaining issues or creating further tensions, making the source less valuable in showing the true impact of summit diplomacy
- he has a very positive tone and emphasises the need to not let opportunity pass away but to grasp it and utilise it, therefore demonstrating the positive impact of summit diplomacy on bringing the superpowers together on the same page.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the road they have chosen to limit the threat of nuclear war and improve relations is the right one, and despite obstacles they may face along the way, their joint goal will be achieved. This could be referring to the problem of SDI during summit diplomacy and how it continuously caused tensions between the USA and the USSR. Now both Gorbachev and Reagan have realised their common goal and are committed to achieving it, demonstrating value for studying the impact of summit diplomacy
- Gorbachev references the USSR’s transition into ‘New Thinking’ and how they intend to use this to move away from militarism – this is clearly reflected in agreements made at Washington, such as the withdrawal from Afghanistan and the USSR significantly making no demands that the INF treaty was conditional on the USA withdrawing SDI
- the source focuses on the idea that a new and democratic world is being built as a result of this summit diplomacy and people will no longer live in fear of war or nuclear devastation
- Gorbachev reiterates the importance of maintaining and improving Soviet-American relations as it will have a direct impact on the international community; therefore, the source holds value in suggesting that summit diplomacy has been extremely positive.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Ronald Reagan delivers this speech whilst attending the Moscow Summit. By the time of this summit in 1988 he had made significant progress towards easing relations with Gorbachev by declaring that the ‘evil empire’ was a different era and abandoning his plans for SDI which had been a sticking point at every summit. Therefore, the source has value in showing the progress of summit diplomacy by this point
- the speech is delivered during the Moscow Summit where great things were expected due to this being Reagan’s final year in office, possibly limiting value due to the high expectations of progress. This was the final summit held between the USA and USSR and consolidated all agreements made to date such as cultural and human rights agreements; including fishing rights and student exchange programmes, but no START agreements
- the audience is a group of Moscow University students who are viewed as the next generation – these are the people who will appreciate greater friendship and cooperation after living under the fear

of nuclear war and repression and therefore Reagan's speech could be less valuable due to overemphasising progress

- the source has an expectant tone – Reagan is attempting to outline the new era of co-operation and spread this message to the general public. He is also trying to repair relations with the Russian public after declaring the USSR an evil empire; and therefore, the source may be less valuable in outlining the true position of summit diplomacy by this point.

Content and argument

- the source suggests that the people of the Soviet Union are living in a new age of freedom – perhaps referring to Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' and improving US-Soviet relations through arms limitation and summit diplomacy, demonstrating value as it shows the impact of summit diplomacy so far
- the source also refers to the fact that the INF Treaty is a great step forward – even the SALT treaties did not provide for arms limitation on this scale and the elimination of a generation of nuclear weapons. Therefore, a new era is dawning in terms of arms limitation and co-operation. The INF set an important precedent: it was the first time both sides agreed to remove nuclear weapons, and the USSR made no demands that the treaty was conditional on them withdrawing SDI
- Reagan also refers to the hope for further reform beyond arms limitation, perhaps referring to the general easing of tensions within the Cold War, such as the withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and co-operation on humanitarian and environmental issues. Therefore, the source has value in showing how summit diplomacy had set in motion a long-term easing of tensions
- the source finally suggests that a new era of friendship dawns between the USA and the Soviet Union – at this summit, Reagan had commented that his evil empire view was 'another time, another era' – reflecting how much progress had been made via summit diplomacy and therefore demonstrating value.

Section B

- 0 2** How important was the Marshall Plan to the growth of Cold War tensions by 1949? **[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 supporting the view that the Marshall Plan was important to the growth of Cold War tensions by 1949 might include:

- despite the overriding aim of the plan to provide immediate economic help to Europe and assist them in post-war recovery, the USSR immediately rejected it and suggested it was a stark example of dollar imperialism. Stalin ordered those states who were tempted by the aid to reject it, reinforcing his vision of a communist bloc in Eastern Europe and therefore setting the scene for the Cold War
- Stalin's rejection of the Marshall Plan led to the creation of COMINFORM and COMECON in 1947 and 1949 respectively, which aimed to support communist states politically and economically, and further divided Europe into a capitalist and communist bloc
- the Marshall Plan swiftly accelerated the division of Europe as Stalin felt it was an attempt to undermine the Soviet sphere of influence by targeting countries such as Czechoslovakia and Hungary who were not yet fully communist; thereby undermining any possibility in the future of the USA and USSR reaching a consensus or cooperation
- the Marshall Plan could be argued to have led to more aggressive actions to get Eastern Europe under Soviet control on Stalin's part – for example expelling non-communists from the Hungarian government and facilitating the seizure of power by the communists in Czechoslovakia in 1948.

Arguments challenging the view that the Marshall Plan was important to the growth of Cold War tensions by 1949 might include:

- the aggressive occupation and control of satellite states by the USSR from 1945 onwards meant that Cold War tensions were growing anyway, so the Marshall Plan is not as important. The Truman Doctrine and subsequently the Marshall Plan had been declared in response to Stalin's occupation of Eastern Europe and thus the aggressive atmosphere of the Cold War had already been created
- the Truman Doctrine was also important in the growth of Cold War tensions because it defined US policy as aggressive towards potential subjugation of European states by the USSR and was a radical change in approach from isolationism to the active containment of communism. The Soviet Union viewed this doctrine as evidence of the USA interfering with the USSR's sphere of influence and expanding its own
- Kennan's Long Telegram helped to harden America's attitude towards containment and reiterated the idea that the Soviet Union regime was cruel, oppressive and imperialistic. It would form the basis of American policies of containment for the next few years, therefore showing that this was more important than the Marshall Plan in the growth of Cold War tensions
- following Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, Stalin was convinced that the USA and the UK were involved in a plot to ideologically attack the Soviet Union and destroy their reputation. This led to an escalation in Stalin's anti-Western policy such as the formation of COMINFORM, abandoning the Declaration on Liberated Europe, withdrawal from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and a 5-year plan of self-strengthening being introduced.

Students could come to the conclusion that the Marshall Plan was crucially important for the growth of Cold War tensions because it encouraged Stalin to publicly denounce the USA's actions and strengthen his hold on Eastern Europe. However, students may also value the importance of other developments, such as the Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe from 1945 onwards and Churchill's Iron Curtain speech – as these helped to create the volatile conditions in which the Marshall Plan was introduced.

0 3 To what extent did McCarthyism influence American foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1955?

[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 supporting the view that McCarthyism influenced American foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1955 might include:

- following the outbreak of McCarthyism, Truman was forced to call for a far-reaching review of US foreign and defence policy in response to perceived threats from Communist nations, such as the USSR developing the A-bomb and China ‘falling’ to communism, as indicated by McCarthy. This suggests that McCarthyism was instrumental in changing the course of US foreign policy
- NSC-68, was a report published in 1950 in response to the growing fear of communism due to McCarthyism, warned of communist activity being traced back to Moscow and that US foreign policy needed to change to meet this monolithic communist challenge. An increase in military strength and spending to \$50 billion was introduced, to provide aid to any country perceived by the USA to be resisting communism
- in response to the threat indicated by McCarthy, Dean Acheson delivered the ‘Defensive Perimeter’ strategy which aimed for new US protection across key areas in Asia, to protect against communism, giving the USA justification to intervene in future conflicts
- McCarthyism emphasised the urgency of moving America’s Eurocentric Cold War policy to an Asia-first approach due to Truman’s ‘loss’ of China in 1949, hence their involvement in the Korean War and increasing involvement in French Indochina.

Arguments challenging the view that McCarthyism influenced American foreign policy in the years 1950 to 1955 might include:

- Truman himself was a key influence on changing foreign policy as he was heavily criticised for his lack of involvement in China and ‘loss’ to communism in 1949; therefore, felt the need to prove himself by becoming involved in Korea and turning Japan into a model state for modern capitalism. There was a clear fear from Truman that failing to intervene successfully in future conflicts could lead to the domino effect across Southeast Asia
- due to communist China being excluded from the United Nations, they established an alliance with the USSR and became the main economic and military aid supplier to North Korea. This led to the USA wanting to keep a strong military presence in Southeast Asia to ensure that China’s influence did not spread further, meaning that US foreign policy changed as a result of increasing Chinese strength
- US involvement in the Korean War was largely down to fears that Kim il Sung’s invasion was supported by Stalin and therefore aimed to destabilise areas in the USA’s sphere of influence. The fear of Stalin’s influence in Asia led the USA to prop up the unstable regime in South Korea and participate in a proxy war to end communism in this region, which they had not done before
- belief in the domino theory meant that the USA intervened in the conflict over French Indochina. Due to increasing fears over the French grip on its territory in Indochina, and the potential of the rest of Southeast Asia falling to communism, the USA ended up paying 75% of the costs of France defending itself
- finally, McCarthy was widely discredited by 1954 after accusing army officers of being communist sympathisers and therefore had lost his credibility – his influence on American foreign policy diminished during this period and could be argued to be just a minor influence.

Students could come to the conclusion that McCarthyism did indeed reflect a general fear of communism in the USA after the ‘loss’ of China and development of the Cold War; and therefore, forced Truman and subsequent administrations to change its approach from a Eurocentric policy to Asia-first. However, as McCarthy was widely discredited after a few years of influence, there could be more important reasons why US foreign policy changed during this period, including belief in the domino theory and the

increasing strength of communism in Asia with Soviet support – warranting new intervention from the USA to roll-back communism.

0 4 'The threat of nuclear war declined significantly in the years 1963 to 1968.'

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 supporting the view that the threat of nuclear war declined significantly in the years 1963 to 1968 might include:

- the National Security Council's Net Evaluation Subcommittee in 1963 agreed that neither the USA or the USSR could emerge from a nuclear conflict without severe damage and high casualties, estimated at a combined 93 million casualties. Both Khrushchev and Kennedy, therefore, acknowledged that the avoidance of nuclear war was crucial – through reducing the spread of nuclear technology and limiting the number of weapons
- the Washington-Moscow hotline, introduced in June 1963, allowed the USA and USSR to communicate quickly and securely to avoid the risk of a crisis similar to Cuba escalating into nuclear devastation. This was an important symbolic act that was necessary due to the slow communication during the Cuban Missile Crisis
- the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 prohibited above-ground, underwater and outer space nuclear testing which was the first collective agreement to establish nuclear limitations. This agreement safeguarded future development of nuclear weapons and ensured that most superpowers were committed to reducing the impact of nuclear testing
- the Non-Proliferation Treaty of July 1968 aimed to reduce the spread of nuclear technology by essentially prohibiting non-nuclear states from forming alliances with nuclear technologically advanced states and thereby establishing their own nuclear arsenals. It was effective in limiting the development of nuclear technology beyond the main superpowers such as the USA, USSR and China.

Arguments challenging the view that the threat of nuclear war declined significantly in the years 1963 to 1968 might include:

- the Test Ban Treaty was not comprehensive and did not include underground testing or mandatory signing – furthermore, France and China did not sign the agreement and continued to test their nuclear weapons well into the future, suggesting that the practical risk of nuclear war was not lessened by this agreement
- the USSR continued to aim for nuclear parity with the USA through the development of ABM's which made the concept of MAD completely ineffective; similarly, the USA continued to develop defensive nuclear technology such as MIRVs, ICBMs and SLBMs. This does not suggest a common goal of reducing the threat of nuclear war
- the Non-Proliferation Treaty had limitations – states were still permitted to use their nuclear facilities without fear of external interference, but merely for nuclear research only. There was still an assumption of a sense of superiority in nuclear capability and therefore the potential threat of nuclear war did not disappear
- the hot-line was introduced in response to the potential nuclear fallout of the Cuban Missile Crisis, but was more of a symbol rather than an effective nuclear deterrent – it was first used by Johnson in 1968 during the Six-Days War and was more about communication than nuclear limitation, therefore suggesting that the potential of nuclear war still remained.

Students may argue that the threat of nuclear war declined significantly in the post-Cuban Missile Crisis period through mutual understanding and co-operation. The agreements and research undertaken during this period paved the way for a safer world after it had come to the brink of nuclear devastation. However, the lack of focus on arms limitation and dependency on MAD meant the threat still very much existed – it was mainly down to the expectations on each superpower that there would be no nuclear devastation.