



AS HISTORY 7041/2R

The Cold War, c1945–1991

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

Mark scheme

June 2025

Version: 1.0 Final



2 5 6 A 7 0 4 1 / 2 R / M S

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](https://www.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 © 2025 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 relations between the USA and China in the years 1949 to 1950?

[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 by the Secretary of State on past and future policy towards China. It is valuable to demonstrate relations between the USA and China during the final stages of the Chinese Civil War – however, late 1949 was still relatively early to determine the true future of their relationship and US policy in the region
- the purpose of this source is to reaffirm US policy towards China in the wake of its ‘fall’ to communism in 1949; and to ensure that the public understands that US policy would remain that of promoting China’s independence and integrity; therefore, valuable to demonstrate relations between the two powers
- Acheson’s tone is firm and threatens that if they continue to act aggressively in the name of the Soviet Union, then the US will respond accordingly. This could be valuable to demonstrate the changing US perception of China, motivated by their fear of communist expansionism. However, this could also be less valuable considering Acheson also professes friendship with China in this statement.

Content and argument

- Dean Acheson is suggesting that the new Chinese government is serving the USSR’s interests and therefore US policy towards China will change. Indeed, China had signed the Treaty of Friendship with the USSR in June 1949 and therefore his concerns are not unfounded
- the source also suggests that if China engages in aggression towards its neighbours, then the USA will have no choice but to respond with force. This is valuable because the USA had shifted its focus to an Asia-first policy and was committed to protecting other areas in the region, such as Japan and Korea. However, it could be less valuable as there was no immediate evidence that there was any threat to China’s neighbours
- Dean Acheson further suggests that the USA will continue to try and protect China’s independence and integrity, in line with the principles of the United Nations. This could be valuable to justify future actions in Asia and define US policy; as there was already growing domestic discontent about intervening in this area.

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

Provenance and tone

- this is a comment made to a Chinese news agency by the Premier and Foreign Secretary of the newly created Communist China. It is an official view of the Chinese communists and is valuable to study their perception of the relationship with the USA in 1950, when US intervention was beginning to escalate in this region
- the purpose of this source is to declare to the Chinese public that the USA has been responsible for the atrocities of the civil war in China and the negative effects this has brought onto the Chinese people. This could be less valuable to understand relations between the two powers as he could be protecting China's neighbours from unwanted US involvement
- the tone is aggressive and inflammatory, blaming the USA for millions of deaths and the squashing of Chinese freedom and rights. This could be less valuable as the comments are clearly from a place of aggression; suggesting that US involvement with China was simply intended to crush communism, not to protect the freedoms and rights of the people.

Content and argument

- Enlai is arguing that the USA has provided aid to Jiang Jieshi to support an unwarranted civil war against the 'official' Chinese government. This is valuable because the Americans did send financial and military aid to support Jiang Jieshi's government; all in the name of defending against communism
- the source also argues that the USA's involvement has resulted in millions of deaths and loss of freedom for the Chinese people; however, it was the harsh treatment in the nationalist army and Jieshi's economic policies which meant that the Chinese lived in extremely poor conditions. Truman's administration became so disillusioned by Jiang Jieshi that they withdrew aid; therefore, the source is less valuable to show the reality of US relations with China
- the source also argues that Americans are imperialists and they should not involve themselves further in Asia. This is valuable because it demonstrates changing US attitudes towards China and Asia in general – they were doubling their efforts to roll-back communism, for example the Defensive Perimeter Strategy in 1950 and the reconstruction of Japan.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might suggest that Source A is valuable to demonstrate official US policy towards China as it comes from the centre of the Truman administration. The source does, however, reflect a harsh domestic agenda increasingly obsessed by the Communist threat and therefore might overstate the intentions of the new Chinese government. Source B is also valuable as despite it being aggressive towards the USA and coming from a hostile regime, it does demonstrate the Chinese perception of US involvement in the region.

Section B

- 0 2** 'Disagreements over Germany were the main reason for the growing division between the USA and USSR in the years 1945 to 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 disagreements over Germany were the main reason for the growing division between the USA and the USSR in the years 1945 to 1949 might include:

- even as early as the Yalta Conference, it was clear that Germany would be a key issue of disagreement between the USA and the USSR. It was agreed that Germany would be divided into four zones along with Berlin; however, Stalin had very different ideas to the Allies about how to recoup his reparations and how much he was entitled to
- the USA and Britain created Bizonia in 1947 with a new currency in 1948, which cemented the idea that the USA wanted to create a Western German state. This consolidated British and American influence into a western European bloc which is exactly what Stalin was concerned about
- Stalin was clearly intent on creating his own German bloc away from the USA and Britain when he cut off all road, rail and canal links to Western Berlin during the Berlin Blockade. This suggested that Stalin had very different ideas on the future of post-war Germany
- the creation of East and West Germany in 1949 showed that Germany would now be fully divided between the USA and USSR and would end up being a microcosm of the Cold War in general. This demonstrates that disagreements over Germany could not be compromised and set the Cold War in full motion.

Arguments challenging the view that disagreements over Germany were the main reason for the growing division between the USA and the USSR in the years 1945 to 1949 might include:

- the Marshall Plan created disagreements between the USA and USSR by providing financial aid to western European countries that may be at risk of falling to communism. The USSR viewed it as a method of American imperialism and were concerned that these states accepting Marshall Aid may commit themselves to capitalism
- the actions of the USSR in establishing pro-communist governments across Eastern Europe after 1945 meant that Churchill's declaration of an 'iron curtain' was plausible – Stalin had successfully engineered his eastern bloc by rigging elections by 1948 and therefore had caused divisions over territory
- inflammatory events such as Churchill's Iron Curtain speech and Kennan's Long Telegram in 1946 only served to further worsen US-Soviet relations and allow the public to realise that there was a clear division of ideologies between the USA and USSR
- the conflicting ideologies of communism and capitalism underpinned the divisions between the USA and USSR and meant that any post-war issues such as Germany, Eastern Europe and future peace would never be agreed.

Students might conclude that whilst disagreements over Germany was clearly the one of the prevailing reasons for divisions between the USA and USSR due to its magnitude and longevity, the underlying reason for these divisions was the difference in ideologies that caused a severe split in all aspects of relations between the USA and the USSR from 1945 onwards. However, any relevant arguments may be credited for the growing divisions between the USA and USSR in this period.

0 3 'In the years 1961 to 1963, US policies towards Cuba ended in failure.'

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 in the years 1961 to 1963, US policies towards Cuba ended in failure might include:

- when the USA imposed economic sanctions on Cuba early in 1961 and reduced their imports of Cuban sugar by 95%, rather than crippling the Cuban economy as intended this just forced Castro to turn to the USSR for economic and military support, heightening the prospect of conflict over Cuba
- the USA conducted the failed Bay of Pigs invasion in August 1961, where 1500 anti-Castro exiles landed on Cuba in attempt to overthrow Castro in a military coup. The invasion failed and confirmed the USA's intent towards Cuba and placed the USSR on the defensive
- authorising Operation Mongoose in 1961 and attempting to use covert operations to destabilise the Castro regime ended in failure. Despite air, land and covert attacks, Khrushchev simply decided to support Castro against the USA and placed nuclear weapons on Cuba in retaliation
- the lack of action even by 26 October 1962 from Kennedy, who was keeping his options open and still considering a military response, meant that Castro grew impatient and started ordering shooting on low-level reconnaissance planes, demonstrating failure to end the crisis by the USA.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1961 to 1963, US policies towards Cuba ended in failure might include:

- Kennedy used diplomacy during the later stages of the Cuban Missile Crisis and suggested to Khrushchev that the US would remove missiles in Turkey as long as the missiles in Cuba were removed. Kennedy's diplomacy with Khrushchev paid off and led to the conclusion of the crisis
- the naval quarantine imposed in 1962 prevented offensive weapons shipments to Cuba and allowed Kennedy to buy time and decide how he was going to deal with Khrushchev. It also succeeded in stemming the constant flow of missiles into Cuba and any further ships after 24 October turned back around to the USSR
- the USA successfully used its military might to threaten the USSR into removing their missiles from Cuba and therefore demonstrated that the use of brinkmanship rather than 'no-warning' attacks and invasions had been much more effective
- Kennedy's efforts to stop the crisis resulted in further developments being made between the USA and USSR that would prevent this type of crisis from happening again, eg the Moscow-Washington hot-line and the Test Ban Treaty, both of which would not have been created if the crisis had not ended peacefully.

Students may conclude that when considering the eventual outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis, it is clear that US policies succeeded in removing missiles from Cuba and reaching a successful outcome, thanks to Kennedy's use of diplomatic strategies. Furthermore, the developments after the crisis led to the USA and USSR attempting to limit the threat of a future nuclear war. However, students may also argue that Kennedy's reactive and defensive actions earlier in the period, such as the Bay of Pigs and Operation Mongoose, were a complete failure and resulted in the Cuban Missile Crisis escalating into a real threat of nuclear war.