

**AS**  
**HISTORY**  
**7041/2R**

The Cold War, c1945–1991

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

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2022

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](http://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 © 2022 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, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the failure of the Paris Summit?

**[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 having 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

- this is a statement made prior to the Paris Summit of 1960 and is an official response from the Soviet Union to the U2 Incident. It is valuable to demonstrate the severe impact this incident had on the failure of the summit and how perhaps the USA and USSR were not as committed to peaceful coexistence as first thought. It was inevitable that the summit would be doomed to failure
- Khrushchev's purpose here is to warn the USA that this incident will not be taken lightly and has doomed the Paris Summit which there was much hope for in terms of peaceful coexistence. His tone is extremely defensive and accusatory towards the USA. This makes the source valuable in demonstrating the true nature of Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence and the impact this had on the Paris Summit
- the source is a public press statement and Khrushchev is emphasising US aggression by suggesting it is they that have damaged any attempts at a successful summit, therefore indicating to the audience that the US provoked the failure of the summit.

### Content and argument

- Khrushchev is arguing that the USA have taken a provocative act of aggression against the USSR by flying into Soviet airspace on a reconnaissance mission. The USA did indeed intend to gather intelligence on Soviet nuclear capacity and decipher how big the missile gap truly was, demonstrating that peaceful coexistence was unstable by this point
- Khrushchev is suggesting that this is not the first act of aggression against the Soviet Union and therefore future summits will now be at risk. This could be in reference to the developing Berlin Crisis where an ultimatum had been declared to the West and tensions were rising. Furthermore, the space race and the arms race were heating up – demonstrating that peaceful coexistence had been pushed to the side and the Paris Summit was doomed to fail
- Khrushchev states that the Soviet Union will do everything in its power to continue to promote the relaxation of international tension, therefore suggesting that the USA was responsible for the failure of the summit. This could be less valuable as the Soviet Union actually continued to escalate tensions in other areas such as the Berlin Wall and the Cuban Missile Crisis; and therefore, perhaps used the U2 Incident as an excuse to condemn the summit.

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

**Provenance and tone**

- this is a government report prepared by the US Bureau of Intelligence and Research, reflecting on the intentions of the Soviet Union regarding the Paris Summit. This is valuable to show the US viewpoint on the reasons why the Paris Summit failed
- the report is extremely critical and disparaging of Soviet actions in its tone – it is valuable to demonstrate the shifting of blame towards the USSR for the failure of the summit and therefore the damage done to future US-Soviet relations
- this report is an analysis of Soviet intentions and therefore aims to justify the reasons for the breakdown in US-Soviet relations and provide the US government with reassurance that it was the fault of Khrushchev and the USSR – therefore showing value in explaining why the outcome of the Paris Summit was so negative.

**Content and argument**

- the report is arguing that Khrushchev used the U2 Incident as a way to gain an advantage over the USA at the Paris Summit. This is likely because he wanted a beneficial agreement over Berlin and the future of Germany that would not threaten Soviet interests, and therefore has value in showing that perhaps the Paris Summit was doomed to fail as Khrushchev wasn't committed to a fair discussion
- the report suggests that without the U2 Incident, the Paris Summit would have taken place. This is less valuable because it is simply blaming the USSR for ending the possibility of a summit – despite relations already being shaky due to lack of progress at Camp David, and the ultimatum over Berlin that had been issued by the USSR in 1958
- the report suggests that the USSR used the U2 Incident to gain a personal advantage because they felt they weren't going to gain anything from the summit. This could make the source less valuable because it was the USA that was under pressure to respond to the ultimatum over Berlin and after the uneasy aftermath of Camp David, the USA may just be shifting blame.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that Source A is more valuable because it reflects Khrushchev's initial reaction to the U2 Incident and therefore his condemnation of the Paris Summit, demonstrating why the outcome of the summit was so poor. However, students may also conclude that Source B is quite valuable because it shows that the USA and USSR were pointing blame at each other and perhaps this breakdown in relations was the reason why the Paris Summit did not succeed.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'It was Stalin who was responsible for the division of Germany by 1949.'

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 supporting the view that it was Stalin who was responsible for the division of Germany by 1949 might include:**

- Stalin introduced a number of policies in the Soviet zone such as land reform, nationalisation and compulsory tuition in Russian for German school pupils – making it increasingly apparent that he wanted to cultivate a separate pro-Soviet state
- the USSR increasingly wanted to use Germany for its own economic recovery by taking reparations and natural resources, and therefore responded harshly to anything that would threaten this including Bizonia
- Stalin blocked all road and rail links to the Western zone of Germany and Berlin in response to the introduction of a new currency in the Western sector; with the clear intention of isolating West Germany and encouraging a pro-Soviet Eastern sector
- a new constitution for the East German state had been created by March 1949 in the aftermath of the blockade, and despite presenting itself as democratic, Stalin ensured a one-party state system with the SED as the focal party.

**Arguments challenging the view that it was Stalin who was responsible for the division of Germany by 1949 might include:**

- the USA merged their zone of Germany with Britain in 1947, creating Bizonia with its own currency and therefore demonstrating to the USSR that they fully intended to develop a separate Western state of Germany under their sole economic control
- offering Marshall Aid to the Western sectors of Germany further reinforced the fear of the Soviet Union that the USA was undertaking a policy of dollar imperialism. The USA saw Germany's economic recovery as central to European stability and therefore made it their prime focus, leading to its eventual division from East Germany
- when disagreements over reparations led to General Clay announcing there would be no further reparations to the USSR until a united plan for the future of Germany was formed, this was viewed as a further attempt to create a separate German economy based on capitalism and therefore encouraged its division
- the London Conference also meant that a new constitution was created in West Germany, further distancing it from the East.

Students could come to the conclusion that Stalin did ensure the split of Germany by 1949 because he made clear steps immediately after the Yalta and Potsdam conferences to cultivate a separate German state that could assist the USSR with its own economic recovery. However, it could also be argued that the West encouraged this separation by developing their own separate state and forcing Stalin's aggression.



**0 3** 'The escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, in the years 1958 to 1963, was due to the actions of the USA rather than those of North Vietnam.'

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 supporting the view that the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, in the years 1958 to 1963, was due to the actions of the USA rather than those of North Vietnam might include:**

- Eisenhower was fully committed to supporting the ‘miracle man of Asia’ and ensuring the stability of the anti-communist regime in the South during his presidency and therefore escalated US involvement in Vietnam to secure this
- Kennedy was insistent that South Vietnam remained a democracy before he became President. He also committed himself to the containment of communism in the area – therefore he was confident in escalating US involvement to ensure the defeat of North Vietnam
- Kennedy’s government focused on counterinsurgency tactics and therefore financed the increase of the South Vietnamese army in 1961 and sent more military advisors, meaning that the conflict was quickly escalated
- the Strategic Hamlet programme introduced during Kennedy’s presidency simply drove more South Vietnamese peasants into supporting the North Vietnamese and therefore escalated the conflict even further.

**Arguments challenging the view that the escalation of the conflict in Vietnam, in the years 1958 to 1963, was due to the actions of the USA rather than those of North Vietnam might include:**

- the formation of the National Liberation Front in 1960 by the North Vietnamese leadership aimed to free South Vietnam from US imperialism and managed to recruit many South Vietnamese who were unsupportive of Diem. This meant the determination of the North to unite Vietnam and make it independent grew stronger
- Diem’s nepotistic and corrupt regime in South Vietnam only served to consolidate North Vietnam’s determination to overthrow the regime with the involvement of the NLF and escalate the growing conflict between Diem and dissident generals
- North Vietnam established the Ho Chi Minh Trail in 1959 as a support network for the NLF which provided extensive supply routes for military equipment and personnel into South Vietnam, allowing the NLF to achieve its aims of infiltrating Diem’s regime
- the North Vietnamese undertook a revolutionary violence strategy from 1958 which intended to use military force to overthrow Diem’s government, which led them to also support anti-Diem groups in the South, making it more difficult to prevent the war from escalating.

Students may conclude that it was the USA that holds the responsibility for escalating the conflict, as Kennedy’s administration continued with policies that would strengthen the North Vietnamese and push more South Vietnamese into the opposing side. However, it could be argued that the North Vietnamese actually did more to escalate the conflict by developing their own violent strategies and destabilising the South Vietnamese government.