

AS
HISTORY
7041/2R

The Cold War, c1945–1991

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

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 © 2023 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 US involvement in the Korean War?

[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

- the source is written in the Soviet state magazine, Pravda, as an editorial. This is an opinion piece but published in the heavily censored Soviet press and therefore holds value in discussing US involvement in Korea from the communist perspective
- the purpose of the source is to deflect attention away from the hesitant involvement of the USSR and focus instead on the ‘warmongering’ actions of the USA – with the intent of revealing the ‘real’ motives of the USA instead of the ones presented in public by the President. This demonstrates value in that it provides an alternative perspective on US involvement
- the source also aims to focus the blame on Truman and paints the USA as warmongers, with an aggressive and reactionary tone – this is potentially less valuable as it is intended to provoke a response and gain support against the USA from the public.

Content and argument

- the editorial refers to the USA as ‘imperialist warmongers’ and suggests they will stop at nothing to achieve their expansionist goals, drawing attention to the fact that they are now the aggressive ones instead of the Soviet Union. The USA had committed huge amounts of economic and military aid to prevent the spread of communism in China and Japan. Therefore, intervening in South Korea was motivated by protection and defence rather than pure aggression as the source argues, making it less valuable
- Pravda also suggests that Truman has gone beyond simply preparing for direct aggression, to actually committing these acts of aggression and using force against seemingly innocent governments. This is shown by the involvement of the United Nations – troops from 15 different nations aided the USA in beginning their counter-offensive, making the source valuable to show the underlying motives of the USA
- the source further argues that the USA was acting under the auspices of the United Nations but this is unwarranted and illegal – as the USSR was absent from the Security Council due to their boycott over Mao Zedong’s China not being recognised in the UN. It is likely the USSR were feeling excluded from the decision to involve the UN in a counter-attack, thereby presenting the USA’s motives as unwarranted
- finally, the source argues that the USA have presented the United Nations with an irreversible action – meaning that the invasion has already happened and the UN have no choice but to accept their aggressive involvement. Truman ordered US forces to Korea and Taiwan on 27 June 1950 to prevent

Chinese success; and is valuable in showing that the USA wished to intervene even without UN permission.

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

Provenance and tone

- Source B is a radio address given by President Truman, less than a year after the USA became involved in the Korean War, under the auspices of the United Nations. The source is valuable as Truman is attempting to justify the motives for US involvement at a time when the Chinese have pushed beyond the 38th Parallel and MacArthur has been dismissed due to his heavy-handed approach in Korea
- Truman wishes to reassure the American public that they were correct in their decision to intervene and the source has value in showing 'official' US policy in Korea
- the tone of the source is inflammatory and emphasises the wrong-doings of the USSR. It builds upon anti-communist rhetoric which was prevalent in America since the 'loss' of China and the outbreak of McCarthyism, therefore has value in showing why the USA felt they needed to get involved.

Content and argument

- Truman suggests that the US intervention in Korea was necessary to prevent further conflict and therefore should not be questioned. Truman had been criticised for being too soft on communism and the 'loss' of China – so despite being popular in the beginning, it is likely that the American public may have begun to question this 'far-flung' war. Therefore, the source's value is questionable as Truman is trying to justify his actions to the public
- Truman suggests that American involvement in the Korean War would actively prevent further armed conflict in the region. As Secretary of State, Dean Acheson reflected Truman's justifications as he felt that a successful North Korean invasion would result in the destabilisation of Japan, Southeast Asia and the Philippines. This very real fear is reflected in Truman's statement
- Truman also argues that the Soviet Union are using Korea to 'stamp out freedom all over the world' and thereby expand their influence. In fact, the Soviet Union was actually hesitant to involve itself in the conflict as they did not wish to engage in a face-to-face conflict with the USA; making the source less valuable. They only did so because it would strengthen Soviet borders and provide them with economic opportunities – giving credence to Truman's idea that they wanted to expand their own influences and not support North Korea
- Truman also suggests that the best time to act in these situations is straight away – the USA did not act straight away as they wanted UN approval to ensure they were not acting unilaterally, and therefore waited until North Korea had flouted Security Council resolutions and sent UN troops. Therefore, the source holds value in that the desire to invade was existent; but the USA had to wait for UN approval.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that Source A could be viewed as an inflammatory response to Truman's declaration of US policy in Korea and therefore, is swayed by hatred and disapproval. It could be argued as valuable because it hints at the underlying motives of the USA for becoming involved in Korea. However, Source B could be analysed as equally inflammatory as it suggests that the USSR are involved in a conspiracy to defeat capitalism across the globe. Source B might be seen as valuable as it outlines the official US stance on their intervention in Korea less than a year later.

Section B

0 2 'The USA and USSR had fundamentally different aims at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences.'

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 USA and USSR had fundamentally different aims at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences might include:

- reaching agreement on the future of defeated Germany was difficult due to fundamentally different aims. Stalin felt the USSR was due the reparations, resources and land to be stripped from Germany to ensure future security; though the USA, at both Yalta and Potsdam, were insistent on reconstructing post-war Germany. The USA's opposition to Stalin's need for Soviet security worsened at Potsdam with Truman's harsh stance
- despite previously agreeing to a 'Declaration on Liberated Europe' at Yalta, aims regarding the makeup of post-war Europe were fundamentally different by the end of Potsdam. Stalin was keen to stand by the 'percentages agreement' and create a Soviet sphere of influence, whereas Roosevelt, and then Truman, were more concerned with creating true self-determination in Europe
- Stalin's obsession with Soviet security permeated the discussions over Poland at Yalta and Potsdam, as he was focused on regaining land through the Curzon line and also did not want to lose Poland which was vital to Soviet security. The USA, on the other hand, wanted to provide Poland and similar states with some degree of self-determination, something that was not initially acceptable to Stalin
- fundamentally different ideologies of capitalism and communism meant that the vision for post-war Europe for the USSR and the USA/Britain was very different.

Arguments challenging the view that the USA and USSR had fundamentally different aims at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences might include:

- despite fundamental differences over how Germany should be treated in terms of reparations, resources and land, the USA and USSR agreed on how they should initially defeat and demilitarise Germany to end the war. It was clear amongst both superpowers that the division of Germany into four zones, demilitarisation and a programme of denazification was necessary
- by the end of Yalta, both the USA and USSR agreed on aiming to provide free elections and democratic institutions to those countries freed from Nazi occupation and agreed to the Declaration on Liberated Europe. Despite Stalin meaning something slightly different by 'democratic' governments, they were at least agreed on providing a stable, democratic future for Europe
- both powers aimed to develop a United Nations that would replace the League of Nations and safeguard against the potential of another war. The USA was particularly keen on this but the Soviet Union did give their general approval and hoped that international disputes would be settled through the use of collective security.

Students may conclude that while the USA and the USSR did have fundamentally different aims over key issues such as Germany, Poland and the future of Eastern Europe, they were eventually able to compromise in a way that allowed the post-war world to be shaped. However, due to their ideological differences, they entered the post-war conferences with clearly different visions of the post-war world which would cause issues beyond these conferences.

0 3 'The increase in Cold War tensions, in the years 1954 to 1961, was mainly due to the space race.'

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 increase in Cold War tensions, in the years 1954 to 1961, was mainly due to the space race might include:

- both the USA and USSR theorised that if they were ahead in technology for the space race, this would automatically assume that they were ahead in the arms race. This led to the increased competition between the two states – including the launch of the first satellite Sputnik, swiftly followed by Sputnik II and Laika the dog. The USA was convinced that the Soviet Union was developing the capability to launch nuclear missiles under the guise of space technology
- massive retaliation had been the USA's policy towards arms development under the Eisenhower administration, and the development of space technology undermined this as the USA was pouring money into weapons production but being outperformed by the USSR. Therefore, the Eisenhower administration came under great pressure to increase its weapons production
- while the Soviet Union's space programme just went from strength to strength, with Gagarin becoming the first man to orbit the Earth, the USA was under increasing urgency to develop their own programme – and failed spectacularly with its imitation of Sputnik, nicknamed 'Flopnik'. This made the USA feel behind in its quest for global power
- there was a key belief that the space programme was crucial to US security and they would lose their global control as a superpower if they fell behind; leading the USA to spend increasing amounts of money to 'win the space race', including a pledge of \$1 billion and the setup of NASA.

Arguments challenging the view that the increase in Cold War tensions, in the years 1954 to 1961, was mainly due to the space race might include:

- the arms race gathered momentum in this period with the Gaither Report being published, suggesting Soviet superiority in the arms race. US response was to gather intelligence on the USSR via U2 spy planes; one of which was shot down carrying Gary Powers which led to the collapse of the Paris Conference and a deterioration in relations. Developments such as the 1957 agreement to station IRBMs in Britain and the development of missile delivery systems by the USSR, meant there was increasing competition and secrecy
- there were repeated failures to reach an agreement on Berlin and Germany – the Geneva Conference in 1955 ended with no resolution, the Hallstein Doctrine was introduced in 1955 making it more difficult to reach a solution and by 1958, Khrushchev had issued an ultimatum to the West to remove their troops. The Berlin Wall was erected in 1961; a clear physical representation of the divide between East and West
- there were further developments in Asia during this period, where the USA had funded 75% of the costs of war for the French to retain control of Indochina and the Geneva Agreement in 1954 dividing Vietnam along the 17th parallel; the clear attempt from the USA to contain communism in Vietnam would not have helped peaceful relations
- in addition, the existence of China as a communist superpower caused tensions – Mao tried to dissuade Khrushchev from his policy of peaceful co-existence and refused to agree to any missile limitations in the Pacific because he had not been consulted BUT it must be said that Khrushchev carried on with his negotiations on issues like Austria and ignored protests from the Chinese.

It could be argued that despite the space race only starting to gain momentum from 1955 onwards, it was indeed a key instigator for increasing Cold War tensions in this period, due to the competition and secrecy arising from space development. While there were clearly other influences on increasing Cold War tensions that had already begun developing by 1954, such as the arms race and issues in

Asia, the tensions surrounding the space race meant it was increasingly difficult for the USA and the USSR to reach agreement on other issues such as Berlin.