

A-level
HISTORY
7042/2R

Component 2R The Cold War, c1945-1991

Mark scheme

June 2020

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 © 2020 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, 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.

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 the position of Gorbachev in 1991.

[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 press conference given by the group of hard-liners within the Soviet Union who have imprisoned Gorbachev. It is thus, of value for showing that the hardliners were in opposition to Gorbachev in 1991
- as this is a press conference, the new leadership is trying to make their actions sound essential and inevitable given the condition of the USSR; this limits the value of the source as they are trying to seek national and international approval for their actions
- the date is significant as it is as the start of the crisis before the hardliners realise that their cause is lost
- the emphasis is on the catastrophe that the USSR faces and the tone tries to be reasonable but also urgent in terms of action needing to be taken.

Content and argument

- the source refers to the fact that Gorbachev is unable to carry out his duties due to the state of his health; in fact Gorbachev was not ill, and had been put under house arrest while on holiday in Crimea which indicates that secrecy surrounding this action and the concern that the plotters had of facing resistance to their actions
- the source talks about ‘profound reforms’ and the USSR being in ‘a deep crisis’; this was indeed the case. Gorbachev had initiated a series of economic reforms – ‘perestroika’, and had also encouraged ‘glasnost’. The result of these reforms had meant a catastrophic decline of the USSR’s economy which had drawn criticism from both conservative hardliners who wanted to stop or even reverse the reforms, and others such as Yeltsin who wanted the reforms to go further. This had weakened Gorbachev’s position
- the source refers to ‘blood being spilt’ and this was a reference to the fact that pro-independence Georgians had died at the hands of Soviet troops – as had 12 Lithuanians when the Baltic states had started pushing for independence. It is notable that the source implies that all deaths are the result of ‘inter-ethnic’ conflict and does not refer to the use of troops by the Soviets which had led to deaths
- the source is concerned with the ‘international’ repercussions and this is a reference to the fears that the hardliners had of the Soviet Union collapsing; this was due to the growing nationalist feeling in the USSR (Azerbaijan, Georgia, Baltic States) which was threatening the breakup of the Soviet Union. Such events show the impact of Gorbachev’s actions and the opposition that had developed in response to his actions.

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

- as a private phone call between Bush and Yeltsin, this can be seen as having value for revealing that there was in fact confusion surrounding Gorbachev's removal and position, as indicated by Yeltsin
- this telephone call was taking place the day after the actual 'coup' and so reflects the events which were taking place at that time which gives the source value
- Yeltsin is hoping to get international support, so he is stressing the fact that it is 'anti-constitutional' and it is possible that he is exaggerating the situation/his support, e.g. the number of supporters outside of the White House, to get Bush on side (however, most of Yeltsin's account is accurate)
- the tone is very friendly between the two men, which is valuable for showing the good relationship that existed between them and the changed relationship between the US and Russia as a result of Gorbachev's actions, which could help give the source more value re the arguments given.

Content and argument

- Yeltsin describes the coup as 'unconstitutional' and a 'right-wing coup'; this was indeed the case, as the instigators of the coup were imprisoning Gorbachev and trying to take over the government. They were the right-wing hardliners who were appalled at the direction in which Gorbachev's reforms had taken the country
- Yeltsin describes the actions that he has taken; his account is accurate. On 19 August, Yeltsin declared the coup unconstitutional, urged the military to resist orders to attack the people and addressed the people from the top of a tank urging them to resist. As Yeltsin states, the people believed that an attack on the White House was imminent. These actions also reflect Yeltsin's growing power within Russia as opposed to Gorbachev's weakening power
- in the source, George Bush gives full support to Yeltsin and this is a reflection of the new international situation; at the Malta summit, in December 1989, the Cold War was said to be 'at the bottom of the Mediterranean' and Bush had agreed not to intervene in Germany over the issue of reunification or in the Baltic states. More arms agreements had also been signed
- Bush's support for Gorbachev is also indicative of the high regard with which Gorbachev was regarded in the West following the summits which had helped end the Cold War.

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

- this is Gorbachev's farewell address and so Gorbachev's purpose here is to give the reasons for his resignation; it thus has value for showing his perspective of the situation in 1991 and his perspective of his position
- because Gorbachev is facing criticism, he is using this speech to justify his actions regarding economic and political reform since becoming President, this can limit the value. He is at pains to point out both the positives of the reforms, the challenges posed by the extent of the reforms and the problems that arose because of opposition from different interest groups
- the date is significant as it comes directly after the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the dissolution of the USSR; thus, Gorbachev no longer had a job as head of the USSR and is making this speech having just been forced out by Yeltsin
- the tone of the address is defensive as he seeks to justify his actions.

Content and argument

- Gorbachev argues that he is resigning on a matter of ‘principle’ though in fact he had no choice but to resign; he no longer had support. In fact, he had earlier already resigned as CPSU Secretary General and Yeltsin was already driving forwards with the reforms that he wanted
- the ‘strain’ and the complexity that Gorbachev refers to regarding the economic reforms is accurate; the economy of the USSR basically collapsed due to many of the measures that he had taken
- Gorbachev also blames the failure of reforms on different groups, e.g. reactionary forces, and it is true that (as indicated by the coup) the conservative elements resisted the changes. He also received criticism from those such as Yeltsin who wanted more reform; however, Gorbachev also has to accept some blame for how the reforms were carried out
- Gorbachev stresses the positive changes that have been achieved – that they are now living in a ‘new world’ and it is true that the repression of the old Soviet Union had gone, the Brezhnev Doctrine ended, the Cold War ended and massive economic changes were taking place.

Section B

- 0 2** To what extent were the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences responsible for the growth of Cold War tensions in the years 1945 to 1946?

[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 Yalta and Potsdam Conferences were responsible for the growth of Cold War tensions in the years 1945 to 1946 might include:

- both conferences highlighted the different aims that the powers had for a post-war Europe; this was particularly so with regard for Germany and eastern Europe. The conferences failed to lay the foundations for a peaceful post-war settlement but rather confirmed suspicions on both sides
- specific agreements made at the conferences, such as the Declaration on Liberated Europe and the agreements made at Potsdam regarding reparations in Germany, quickly broke down increasing tension
- Stalin's actions in Poland went directly against what had been agreed at Yalta and this caused tension in the Grand Alliance – particularly between Churchill and Roosevelt
- at Potsdam, Truman's hostility to Stalin would set the tone of their future relations; he also told Stalin about the A bomb, which had just been successfully tested, hoping that this would pressurise Stalin to fulfil agreements made; Stalin saw this as atomic diplomacy.

Arguments challenging the view that the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences were responsible for the growth of Cold War tensions in the years 1945 to 1946 might include:

- Roosevelt actually got on well with Stalin at Yalta and it could be argued that it was Truman's personality and actions which caused tensions
- growing ideological differences were responsible for growing tensions; these had nothing to do with decisions taken at the conferences. The USA was determined to keep markets open and prevent another economic crash; to this end, they set up the Bretton Woods System in 1946. This also proved to the Soviets that the US were spreading their own views
- regardless of the conferences, Stalin was also determined to maintain security for the USSR and would have spread Soviet influence over the eastern European states regardless of the conferences, thus increasing tension
- other events, such as Churchill's Fulton speech, growing support for communism in France and Italy and events in Iran, were just as significant for raising tensions in this period.

Good answers may argue that the conferences at Yalta and Potsdam increased Cold War tensions as they highlighted the divisions that existed in the Grand Alliance and made Stalin's actions in eastern Europe more noticeable in that they broke agreements that had been made; however, the actions taken by both sides would most likely have happened regardless of the conferences; tensions quickly developed due to the very differing post-war aims on each side and fear of each other's ideologies.

- 0 3** How significant was the communist victory in China in influencing US foreign policy in the years 1949 to 1953?

[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 communist victory in China was significant in influencing US foreign policy in the years 1949 to 1953 might include:

- China was the first country outside of Europe to go Communist. It led to a fundamental review of US strategic objectives and priorities in the Far East: evidence of this are Acheson's Perimeter Speech and NSC 68, which advocated a more global approach to containing communism
- the US was supporting Jiang Jieshi's forces in the civil war and had given significant aid and resources; the 'loss of China' was seen as a failure by many Americans; Truman was under pressure not to allow any other countries in Asia to fall to communism which was to affect US response to the invasion of South Korea
- the Nationalists had fled to Taiwan; Truman was under pressure to support the Nationalists here which would mean using US resources in Asia to continue to help the Nationalists
- China's Treaty of Friendship with Russia, which was signed in 1950, seemed further evidence that China and the Soviet Union were part of the same 'monolithic' Communist bloc. Thus, China needed to be contained in the same way as the USSR in Europe.

Arguments challenging the view that the communist victory in China was significant in influencing US foreign policy in the years 1949 to 1953 might include:

- initially, the Truman administration blamed the loss of China on the failure of the Nationalists to win popular support. They did not see it as linked to Soviet expansionism and so the Communist revolution in China did not initially influence US foreign policy. Rather, it was the Red Scare, which reached fever-pitch 1950–1954 in the witch hunts of McCarthy, which used the 'loss of China' to put pressure on the government to have an 'Asia First' policy
- in 1949, the USSR attained the Atomic Bomb; this was just as significant for explaining the new directions of US foreign policy, such as the shift in focus from Europe to Asia, as there was now an arms race which would not be contained to Europe
- the invasion of South Korea by North Korea had a significant impact on US foreign policy as this again reinforced the idea that all communists were working with Stalin; this started the idea of the Domino Theory – that communism anywhere needed to be halted. It was the Korean War which allowed NSC 68 to be implemented – this fundamentally changed the direction of US foreign policy by militarising and globalising the Cold War
- US foreign policy continued to be influenced by events in Europe, Japan and Vietnam as well as China.

Good answers are likely to/may argue that the establishment of communism in China was significant in influencing the USA's Asia first policy in these years but that other factors, such as events in Korea, were also key for pushing the US in this direction. Domestic factors also played a key role in determining US foreign policy and the actions of the Soviets, in gaining the A bomb and in supporting North Korea, remained a key influence on US foreign policy.

0 4 'Nixon's policies towards Vietnam, in the years 1968 to 1972, were a total failure.'

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 Nixon’s policies towards Vietnam, in the years 1968 to 1972, were a total failure might include:

- a key policy was Vietnamisation; this was never successful as the AVRN had low morale, and corruption was endemic. Officers were appointed on the basis of their loyalty to the Thieu regime and the AVRN never became an effective fighting force. In fact, Vietnamisation made them more dependent on the US
- a key policy of Nixon’s was to destroy the Ho Chi Minh trail which thus meant also attacking those parts of Cambodia which were regarded as safe by the NVA and the Vietcong. Ground forces also led raids into Cambodia. This ended up pushing the North Vietnamese further into Cambodia which also strengthened the position of the Khmer Rouge. The US was thus also forced to prop up Lon Nol’s regime in Cambodia, thus increasing US commitment in South East Asia at a time when he was promising to withdraw troops and achieve ‘peace with honour’
- Nixon’s policy of disrupting the Ho Chi Minh trail also involved an attack on Laos; this was a failure and further highlighted the weakness of the AVRN troops while encouraging the North to go on the offensive
- Nixon carried out a détente policy with China, hoping that they would pressurise North Vietnam in the peace process; however, despite his efforts, Kissinger failed to get any significant concessions through this process.

Arguments challenging the view that Nixon’s policies towards Vietnam, in the years 1968 to 1972, were a total failure might include:

- Vietnamisation was the only way of ensuring that US troops could leave but that South Vietnam would still be secure. The policy of Vietnamisation did allow Nixon to bring US troops home and by June 1972 there were only 47 000 US troops left in Vietnam
- the AVRN received massive amounts of resources and it did achieve some military successes, such as resisting the Spring Offensive of 1972
- the attacks on Cambodia seriously undermined the ability of the Vietcong to operate effectively and large amounts of Vietcong equipment and supplies were either captured or destroyed
- in the negotiations for a peace treaty, the US managed to ensure that Thieu would not be removed from power in the South; this was key to attaining a final agreement.

Good answers are likely to/may show that while Nixon was able to reduce US troops in Vietnam, he was far from achieving his overall aim of ‘peace with honour’. Vietnamisation could never be a success given the political situation in South Vietnam and, in attempting to weaken the NVA and the Vietcong, he also helped destabilise governments in Cambodia and Laos.