

GCSE HISTORY

(8145)

Marked Papers 1B/C - Conflict and tension
between East and West, 1945-1972

Understand how to apply the mark scheme for our sample
assessment papers.

Version 1.0 April 2018

EXAMPLE RESPONSES



Example responses plus commentaries

The following student responses are intended to illustrate how the mark scheme can be interpreted and how it is likely that students will respond to the questions, allowing the student and teacher to explore and reflect upon the mark scheme and how answers can be improved.

Paper 1B/C

Conflict and tension between East and West, 1945–1972

Question 01

Study **Source A** in the Sources Booklet.

Source A supports the Soviet Union. How do you know?

Explain your answer by using **Source A** and your contextual knowledge.

[4 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

Level 2 Developed analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 3–4

Students may progress from a simple analysis of the source with extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding related to the features of the source.

For example, the caption which projects a progressive and heroic image by seeing the Soviets as ‘pioneers’ of space; the Soviet spaceman is depicted in triumphant pose and holds aloft the hammer and sickle emblems; the four sputnik flights are represented as stars lighting up the sky; the date of the poster can be linked to the Soviet Union’s triumph in the space race.

Level 1 Simple analysis of source based on content and/or provenance 1–2

Students identify relevant features in the source and support them with simple factual knowledge and understanding,

For example, the legend (‘Glory to the Soviet people’) was very pro-Soviet Union; it was painted by a Soviet artist so it would be propaganda.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

The cartoon supports the Soviet Union because it boasts about the glory of the Soviet space programme. It also shows a heroic looking astronaut holding the symbols of communism, which shows that the Soviet Union was the leader or 'pioneer' in space. This is because the USSR launched Sputnik 1 the year before, so the poster shows that USSR is in the lead in the space race.

Commentary – Level 2

The response shows developed thinking, based on extended reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding and evidence from the source. It supports the inference by explaining the features of the source with knowledge of Sputnik.

Student two

The poster has a Russian astronaut and shows what the Soviets did in space. The astronaut is out in space and is dressed in red, which shows how powerful he is because red is the colour of Russia. It says 'Glory to the Soviet People' which is just what it would say because it was published in Russia and is propaganda.

Commentary – Level 1

The response shows simple reasoning, based on the identification of relevant features of the source, supported by simple knowledge. It combines the content (how the figure is shown) with provenance (where it was published). To progress, the response should try to explain the features of the source with factual knowledge and understanding to support the given inference.

Question 02

Study **Sources B** and **C** in the Sources Booklet.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** to a historian studying opinions about the Marshall Plan?

Explain your answer by using **Source B** and **C** and your contextual knowledge.

[12 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Analyse sources contemporary to the period (AO3a)

Evaluate sources and make substantiated judgements (AO3b)

In analysing and evaluating sources, students will draw on their contextual knowledge to question critically the content and provenance of sources (for example, the context of the time in which source was created, place, author's situation, knowledge, beliefs, circumstances, access to information, purpose and audience).

Level 4 Complex evaluation of both sources with sustained judgement based on content and provenance 10–12

Students may progress from a developed evaluation of the sources by complex reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and provenance. They may evaluate the relationship between the sources based on analysis of provenance and contextual knowledge.

For example, taken together the sources are useful because they reflect similar attitudes towards the Marshall Plan emphasising its benefits. Equally students may discern a different emphasis arising from authorship or the passage of time. Students may recognise the limitations of the sources, in that their western provenance may only offer a partial view.

Level 3 Developed evaluation of sources based on the content and/or provenance 7–9

Students may progress from a simple evaluation of the sources with extended reasoning related to utility on the basis of content and/or provenance. They may focus on the specific aspects of the sources individually and explain how they might reflect opinions towards the Marshall Plan, such as how it stressed co-operation in Europe and that there was evidently a desire/need to promote this in 1950 (Source B) and the way the support for freedom was linked to its American originator's initial anti-Communist emphasis (Source C).

Level 2 Simple evaluation of source(s) based on content and/or provenance 4–6

Students may progress from a basic analysis of the source(s) to simple evaluation of the content and/or provenance.

For example, the poster (Source B) is useful because it shows how the Marshall Plan was presented as bringing the countries of Europe together.

Marshall's speech (Source C) may be used by historians to shed light on how the Marshall Plan was viewed by its founder as a means to remove poverty and to preserve freedom.

Level 1 Basic analysis of sources(s) 1–3

Answers may show understanding/support for one or both sources, but the case is made by assertion/basic inference.

Students identify basic features which are valid about the sources and related to the enquiry point. For example, the message of the poster that there was unity because the flags of Europe are together. Source C says that the Marshall plan was meant to stop poverty.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

Source B shows that the Marshall Plan will bring Europe together. America gave countries that were damaged in the war \$17 billion between them so that they could rebuild. This is why the poster shows the flags of all countries on one ship facing the same way, which shows how together they are. The purpose is useful because it wants to show that America could help countries who fought each other in the war could work together, and that being on America's side would lead to a better than life than being on the Soviet side. Therefore, the source is useful for showing that all different types of propaganda was used to gather support for the Marshall Plan in Europe.

Source C also supports the Marshall Plan by explaining the benefits of the plan to people, saying that the plan aimed to help 'freedom to exist' in Europe which means helping democracy. The audience are the countries of Europe who could be offered money, and it aims to warn countries who would 'block the recovery' and 'prolong human misery'. This is mainly aimed at those countries occupied by the Red Army and who were in danger of turning Communist.

Taken together the sources show how the plan was shown to the Western countries as a positive thing and also how it was seen in the East and by Stalin. He called the plan dollar imperialism and hated it because it threatened communist countries that if they didn't act how the US wanted they meet the 'opposition of the United States'.

Commentary – Level 4

The response explains the usefulness of the content and provenance (audience and purpose) for each source relevant to the question. Context is provided alongside the motives behind the sources. For example, the evaluation of B shows a sustained judgement on utility shown by explaining the purpose of the source and evaluating how this was useful for studying propaganda that supported the Marshall Plan. Sustained judgment is also shown through the use of the sources in combination.

Student two

Source C is a speech written by Marshall, so he wants to be clear about his aim to stop Communism. For example, he talks about the seeds of Communism growing, and this is backed up by my knowledge as the Red Army had already taken over many countries like Poland and the USA spent billions of dollars to stop Stalin's Iron curtain pushing in to other countries in Europe. Stalin was a communist dictator so he didn't want democracy to spread in the countries that he controlled.

Even though source B is a poster, it is useful because the people behind European Recovery gave a prize for an image which showed how people in Europe were working together. For example, it shows the British flag and other countries who got Marshall plan money on the same ship because these countries would get \$17 billion dollars from America. Therefore, both sources agree that the Marshall Plan would stop communism and countries would get money.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed evaluation of the content of sources B and C using relevant contextual knowledge. The response identifies relevant features relating to the provenance of each source, and the answer would progress if these were explained. In the final lines the response attempts to use the sources in combination. While this is not fully substantiated, it is to be encouraged. The response would progress to Level 4 if the sources were used in combination to make a relevant judgement about utility.

Question 03

Write an account of how events in Hungary became an international crisis during 1956.

[8 marks]

Mark scheme

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:4)

Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:4)

Level 4 Complex analysis of causation/consequence

7–8

Answer is presented in a coherent narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 3

Students may progress from a developed narrative of causation/consequence with complex sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate and detailed factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at different stages and /or showing understanding about how much each part of the sequence increased tension and led to a crisis.

For example, analysis of different consequences of Soviet actions meant that Cold War attitudes hardened at each stage, with evidence presented in the West of the Soviet's ruthless crushing of the revolt and the murder of its leaders, and the scale of Soviet military intervention against Hungarian citizens. It undermined the idea of 'peaceful co-existence' in a post-Stalinist era and the crisis escalated when Khrushchev carried his provocative veto in the UN in the face of Western protests. It was widely thought that US President Eisenhower supported the Hungarian Rising. East/West tensions arising from Hungary persisted against a background of the arms race and hard line Soviet attitudes.

Level 3 Developed analysis of causation/consequence

5–6

Answer is presented in a structured and well-ordered narrative/account that demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Extends Level 2

Students may progress from a simple narrative of causation/consequence with developed sequencing and reasoning supported by a range of accurate factual knowledge and understanding which might be related, for example, to an analysis of how/why tension increased at one stage in the process.

For example, one consequence of the Soviet's response to Nagy's reforms was that it gave more evidence to the international community of the Communists' ruthless attitude towards anything which threatened the USSR and the Warsaw Pact. Hungarians demanded independence and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Condemnation grew when the Soviets sent in tanks and soldiers and the death toll mounted – probably over 11 000 lost their lives. The scale of the repression against tens of thousands of Hungarian people shocked the West and provoked protests.

Level 2 Simple analysis of causation/consequence 3–4

Answer is presented in a structured account that demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students may progress from a basic narrative of causation/consequence by showing a simple understanding of sequencing, supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, the Soviet Union was behind the crisis because it crushed the Hungarian people's demands for independence and withdrawal of all of Soviet troops. The Soviets' violent military reaction against the revolt upset the West and led to international protests.

Level 1 Basic analysis of causation/consequence 1–2

Answer is presented as general statements which demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Students identify cause(s)/consequence(s) about the events, such as Nagy made reforms, which made Russia send troops into Hungary again.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

One reason how events in Hungary became an international crisis was because the West criticised the violent Soviet reaction. For example, when Nagy threatened to leave the Warsaw Pact, Khrushchev was afraid that this would weaken communist power. Khrushchev decided to send thousands of soldiers and tanks to Budapest, which resulted in over 10000 people being killed. This was an international crisis because it led to a war of words between the USA and USSR after the US objected and President Eisenhower openly criticised the Soviets.

Another reason why it was an international crisis was because it was the end of peaceful co-existence between the USSR and the West. For example, before the Hungarian Uprising, Khrushchev tried to ease relations between the USSR and the West, releasing political prisoners and criticising Stalin. However, after he was criticised in the UN by the USA and its allies, Khrushchev ended this policy. This was an international crisis because the thaw ended and relations in the Cold War were damaged after the West said that the USSR couldn't be trusted, which led to more problems in the 1960s.

Commentary – Level 4

The response analyses two ways in which the Hungarian Uprising became to an international crisis, supported with detailed knowledge and understanding. The response becomes complex when a second point of escalation is analysed.

Student two

The Hungarian Uprising happened after the USSR allowed Imre Nagy to form a government. They thought that he would obey them, so the Soviets began to take soldiers and tanks out of Hungary. Instead, Nagy's government wanted free elections to be held and demanded that Hungary was allowed to leave the Warsaw Pact.

This was a crisis because of Russia's reaction to Nagy's reforms. Soviet tanks took control over Hungary with thousands killed for wanting more rights and freedom to leave the Warsaw Pact. The USSR decided to keep full military control over eastern Europe, but the West said the killings were unacceptable. As a result Cold War relations became even worse, because the US criticised the USSR and made Khrushchev angry.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed analysis of one stage of the crisis. The second paragraph shows how Khrushchev's violent reaction led to an international crisis, supported with accurate knowledge and understanding. The first paragraph shows simple thinking, as it is characterised by a simple narrative sequence without any part of the escalating crisis analysed. It is purely descriptive. To progress to Level 4, a second way in which the events in Hungary became an international crisis should be analysed.

Question 04

'The main reason for the tension between East and West in Europe in the 1960s was the actions of the Soviet Union.'

How far do you agree with this statement?

Explain your answer.

[16 marks]

Mark scheme

Question 4 requires students to produce an extended response. Students should demonstrate their ability to construct and develop a sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant, substantiated and logically structured.

The indicative content is designed to exemplify the qualities expected at each level and is not a full example answer. All historically relevant and valid answers should be credited.

Target	Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order concepts (AO2:8)	
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied (AO1:8)	
Level 4	Complex explanation of stated factor and other factor(s) leading to a sustained judgement	13–16
	Answer demonstrates a range of accurate and detailed knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Answer demonstrates a complex, sustained line of reasoning which has a sharply-focused coherence and logical structure that is fully substantiated, with well-judged relevance.	
	Extends Level 3.	
	Students may progress from a developed explanation of causation by complex explanation of the relationship between causes supported by detailed factual knowledge and understanding to form a sustained judgement.	
	For example, the way reasons interacted, such as the Soviet Union was mainly to blame because of their actions in Berlin and Prague. Although the arms race between the USA and the USSR might be seen as a bigger source of tension, America was only spending money on expensive weapons systems to deter further Soviet aggression.	
Level 3	Developed explanation of the stated factor and other factor(s)	9–12
	Answer demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question	
	Answer demonstrates a developed, sustained line of reasoning which has coherence and logical structure; it is well substantiated, and with sustained, explicit relevance.	

Extends Level 2.

Answer may suggest that one reason has greater merit.

Students may progress from a simple explanation of causation with developed reasoning supported by factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, that Soviet aggression was evident (eg) in the building of the Berlin Wall and in the suppression of the Prague Spring which the West saw as an attack on freedom.

Students may additionally argue that America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s. Their expenditure on weapons increased Soviet anxieties, whilst the spying on Russia during the Geneva talks broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany so soon after the Second World War was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.

Level 2 Simple explanation of stated factor or other factor(s) 5–8

Answer demonstrates specific knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a simple, sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, structured, substantiated and explicitly relevant.

Answers arguing a preference for one judgement but with only basic explanation of another view will be marked at this level.

Students may progress from a basic explanation of causation by simple reasoning and supporting it with factual knowledge and understanding.

For example, arguing that America was responsible for the tension in the 1960s because of such reasons as their expenditure on weapons and spying on Russia during the Geneva talks which broke down trust. America's investment in West Germany so soon after the Second World War was viewed with hostility and suspicion in the USSR.

Level 1 Basic explanation of one or more factors 1–4

Answer demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question

Answer demonstrates a basic line of reasoning, which is coherent, structured with some substantiation; the relevance might be implicit.

Students recognise and provide a basic explanation of one or more factors. Students may offer a basic explanation of the stated factor, for example, the Soviets caused tension because they built the Berlin Wall. Students may offer basic explanations of other factor(s), for example, the West didn't help relations because it was hostile towards communism.

Students either submit no evidence or fail to address the question 0

Responses

Student one

Both sides were guilty of creating more tensions in the Cold War.

The Soviet Union's aggression was a definitely a reason why tension got worse in the 1960s. The Soviets disliked capitalism and the freedoms and rights people enjoyed in the west, and they were willing to use aggression to get their way. For example, when the Soviet Union put up the Berlin Wall in 1961 it made the USA think that they were obsessed with building up their strength secretly behind their Iron Curtain. The crushing of the Prague Spring in 1968 also showed this. After Dubcek decided to keep his reforms, the Soviets sent tanks and removed him from power. This showed the West that the Soviets would use their military against anyone that that threatened their control of Eastern Europe a time of a dangerous arms race with the USA.

On the other hand, the actions of the USA caused tensions, and Russians might say that they were reacting to what the US was doing. For example, a U-2 spy plane that was spying on the USSR was shot down while talks in Geneva aimed at easing tension were happening. This made the USSR believe that the US was not interested in peace, but instead trying to trick them in to lowering their defences. The Russians could also point out how much the US was spending on nuclear arms such as Polaris submarine missiles, which could launch missiles that could wipe out Soviet cities.

Overall, both sides increased Cold War tension. This was shown in the Cuban Missile Crisis, when the Soviets tried to put missiles in Cuba that could hit American cities because American missiles could hit cities in Russia, leading them to accuse each other of aggression. This lead to a dangerous arms race of mutually assured destruction. Therefore, they were both to blame, and reacted to what each other were doing.

Commentary – Level 4

The response shows complex explanation of the given factor and another factor. Both sides of the argument are developed with detailed supporting knowledge and understanding. The response becomes a Level 4 answer by showing how the factors are linked (the US and USSR reacted to each other's actions) in order to sustain a judgement about their responsibility for the tension.

Student two

I agree with the statement because the Soviets were never interested in peace. The Berlin Wall was built in 1961 to reinforce the Iron Curtain and to stop people in East Germany 'escaping' to the West. This showed their aggressive attitude to the West, because Communist tanks and soldiers were sent to checkpoint Charlie, which was a stand-off with US military in Berlin and increased tension.

The USSR were also responsible for increasing tension in 1968 in Czechoslovakia. For example, they sent tanks to crush people in the Prague Spring who wanted more freedom. It increased tension because it made the West suspicious about Soviet attitudes if they were willing to attack fellow communists.

However, the US was also responsible for increasing Cold War tensions. For example, it sent US spy planes to gather intelligence over Russia, which Russia saw as aggressive because the US could be seen to be getting a military advantage and this was dangerous because it could upset the nuclear balance. Also, Kennedy went to Berlin and made speech saying they would not back down in defending West Berlin

against Communism, which also this too increased tension because Berlin was an important city in the Cold War because parts were controlled by the West even though it was in East Germany.

In many ways both were to blame, but the USSR was the main reason for causing the tension to rise because of their aggressive actions.

Commentary – Level 3

The response shows developed explanation. It explains factors on both sides of the argument with support. The response remains at Level 3 because the judgement is in the form of a statement or assertion. To progress, the judgement must be substantiated.

Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at aqa.org.uk/8145

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: history@aqa.org.uk

T: 0161 958 3861