**Past Papers, Marks Scheme indicative content and examiners Report comments**

**June 2010**

**A)** How far did ‘peaceful coexistence’ ease Cold War tensions between the Soviet Union and the USA in the years 1953–61?

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of ‘peaceful coexistence’ in the period 1953-61. Developments which helped to ease Cold War tensions might include: the end of the Korean War (1953); Soviet settlement of border disputes with Turkey and Iran (1953) and recognition of Israel (1953); Austrian independence and improved Soviet-Yugoslav relations (1955); the ‘Geneva spirit’ based on east-west summit diplomacy and Khrushchev’s visit to the USA in 1959. Developments which sustained Cold War tensions during the period might include: US attitudes towards communism in the 1950s (domino theory, ‘roll back’, Eisenhower doctrine); Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence based on long-term victory of communism; the impact of the Hungarian Rising (1956) and the launch of Sputnik (1957); the U2 spy plane incident (1960) and the issue of Germany (1958-1961). At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about peaceful coexistence with either only implicit reference to the extent tensions were eased or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent tensions were eased but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of US-Soviet relations under peaceful coexistence with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report:**

This proved to be a very popular question. Most candidates were aware of the main features of, and the major developments under, peaceful coexistence. Consequently, the majority of responses offered some assessment of the extent to which peaceful coexistence eased cold war tensions between the USA and the Soviet Union. Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth. Having said this, a number of responses mistakenly treated this as a ‘stated factor’ question by also offering other explanations for improved US-Soviet relations (such as the death of Stalin and the consolidation of ‘spheres of influence’). Some weaker candidates went outside the date range, typically producing lengthy accounts of US-Soviet relations under Stalin or the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. A few confused peaceful coexistence with 1970s détente.

**2010**

**A)** To what extent was the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations in the years 1958–69 due to personal rivalries?

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge of how personal rivalries contributed to deteriorating Sino-Soviet relations between 1958 and 1969 (e.g. the legacy of Mao’s poor relationship with Stalin and Mao’s rivalry and disagreements with Khrushchev/Brezhnev). This question also requires candidates to consider other factors which help to explain the growing Sino-Soviet rift including: competing Soviet and Chinese claims to the leadership of international communism; China’s reaction to de-Stalinisation; PRC rejection of the Soviet Union’s ‘peaceful coexistence’ with the West; Sino-Soviet tension over the nuclear question; Mao’s rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine in 1968 over Czechoslovakia. Candidates are required to show how personal rivalries and other factors caused Sino-Soviet relations to deteriorate and may make reference to: Mao’s concerns over Soviet de-Stalinisation (seen as veiled criticism of Mao’s own leadership and giving ‘encouragement’ to anti- communism in eastern Europe); the failure of Khrushchev’s visit to China (1958); tension over Taiwan (1958); Soviet criticism of China’s ‘Great Leap Forward’ (1959); Sino-Soviet rivalry over Albania and China’s walkout from the 1961 Moscow Conference; the impact of the Sino-India War (1962); China’s criticism of Soviet handling of the Cuban Missile crisis (1962); Soviet ‘peaceful coexistence’ versus Mao’s commitment to ‘continuing revolution’; Sino-Soviet differences over the Test Ban Treaty (1963); China’s developing nuclear programme (1964 – atomic bomb, 1967- hydrogen bomb); Mao’s rejection of the Brezhnev doctrine (1968); Sino-Soviet border disputes such as Damansky/Chenbao (1969). At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide only implicit reference to reasons or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis why Sino-Soviet relations broke down but the detail may undeveloped in parts and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis about personal rivalries with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘to what extent’. At Level 5, ‘to what extent’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed, with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report:**

On this question, the majority of candidates were able to offer an explanation for the deterioration in Sino-Soviet relations which examined the impact of personal rivalries and other key factors, such as ideological differences and competing national interests. The strongest candidates also paid close attention to the date range (1958-69). Lower scoring responses tended to exhibit three main weaknesses - (1) an over-concentration on the Khrushchev-Mao rivalry which ignored Sino-Soviet relations after 1964 (2) extensive accounts of Sino-Soviet relations between 1949 and 1957 (particularly Stalin’s relationship with Mao) which went far beyond setting the context (3) extensive accounts of Sino-US ‘ping-pong’ diplomacy in the early 1970s which ignored the 1969 cut-off point.

**2010**

**B)** How far do you agree with the view that the development of the Cold War in the years 1945–48 owed more to Soviet expansionism than to the USA’s economic interests? Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

**Mark Scheme:**

Source 7 gives a clear exposition of the orthodox ‘Soviet expansionism’ argument and good candidates may pick up on the point about Western acceptance of a Soviet sphere of influence in central and eastern Europe. Source 8, revisionist in tone and content, emphasises US economic concerns and the rise of the American ‘military-industrial complex’ in starting the Cold War. Source 9 stresses that Soviet economic inferiority prompted Stalin to adopt a defensive stance behind the ‘iron curtain’ based on security considerations. Fear of capitalist penetration also led Russia to reject Marshall Aid. Candidates’ own knowledge of 1945-48 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the ‘Stalinisation’ of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US ‘Open Door’ policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-48) which led to Soviet accusations of ‘dollar imperialism’ ; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-48), including the early stages of the Berlin Blockade. The focus of good answers should be on these two interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions. Level 2 answers should include some own knowledge. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, candidates will sustain their argument about the relative importance of Soviet expansionism and US economic aims on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge. They might be able to challenge arguments from the sources. For example, they could take issue with Source 7 by arguing that Soviet actions were defensive – a point clearly made in Source 9.

**Examiners’ Report:**

Most candidates found this question accessible. Overall, the sources were used effectively and appropriate own knowledge was included to develop argument. Having said this, candidates were generally more confident when discussing the case for Soviet expansionism than US economic interests. Stronger responses offered sustained analysis based on the cross-referencing of extracts and integration of source material and own knowledge. The best responses used sources to go beyond the anti-US and anti-Soviet arguments and consider how far the cold war was the product of misinterpretation and misunderstanding. Low- scoring candidates tended to exhibit three main weaknesses – (1) relying on memorised ‘perpectives’ (covering orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interpretations) inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) extensive unnecessary accounts of the provenance of sources (3) poor or non-existent integration of source material and own knowledge.

SOURCE 7

**(From Robert Wolfson and John Laver,** Years of Change: European History 1890**–**1990**, 3rd edition,**

**published 2001)**

**The USA and Britain accepted that, because of the role of the USSR in defeating**

**Nazi Germany, much of Central and Eastern Europe was within the Soviet sphereof influence. The problem for the West was that no-one was sure of the USSR’s intentions. It was recognised that, at the very least, Russia wanted friendly governments on its western borders as a buffer against future attacks from the West. However, particularly as the Cold War developed, many in the West assumed that the USSR had a much more ambitious aim of consolidating Communist control in its sphere of influence and then seeking to extend Soviet influence into Western Europe itself. By 1948, Western attitudes had hardened as the USSR tightened its grip over the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.**

SOURCE 8

**(From Terry Morris and Derrick Murphy,** Europe 1870**–**1991**, 2nd edition, published 2001)**

**There were important economic advantages for the USA in starting a cold war. US policy-makers feared another economic depression once the Second World War was over. To prevent this from taking place, the US government hoped to keep high levels of military and government expenditure. As a result, the USSR was portrayed as aggressive and threatening. To prevent the spread of communism to western Europe, the US government launched the European Recovery Programme in 1947. Known as Marshall Aid, billions of US dollars were used to bring economic recovery to western Europe as the best means of limiting communist influence. Truman was responsible for creating the ‘military-industrial complex’ where big business in the USA supported conflict with the USSR in order to keep high levels of military spending.**

SOURCE 9

**(From Michael Lynch,** Stalin and Khrushchev: The USSR, 1924**–**64**, published 1990)**

**Since the USSR could not hope to compete on equal economic terms with the USA immediately after the Second World War, Stalin concluded that the only policy available was to withdraw the Soviet Union behind its new defensive east European barrier. Germany became the new front line in this defensive system. This explains why Stalin became so sensitive and uncooperative on the German question, always regarding Western suggestions for a settlement as the thin end of the wedge being driven into Soviet security. The USSR’s economic plight made Marshall Aid a sorely tempting offer, and Stalin for a brief period considered accepting it. But, in the end, he felt he could not risk allowing the Eastern bloc to become economically dependent upon the USA. The political dangers were too great.**

**June 2011**

**A)**’Us-Soviet relations did not fundamentally improve in the 1970s’ How far do you agree with this view?

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of détente in the 1970s. Developments which sustained US-Soviet tensions during the period might include: Soviet refusal to link détente to further concessions and Brezhnev’s commitment to the long-term victory of communism; the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s: the impact of US withdrawal from Vietnam on both sides; the Helsinki Accords (1975) and Soviet human rights issues; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979) and the scrapping of SALT 2. Developments which helped to improve US- Soviet relations might include: the Nixon Doctrine and ‘triangular diplomacy’; Soviet fears of isolation due to growing Sino-US rapprochement; desire to control the spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; growing Soviet-US trade in the early 1970s.

At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will provide simple or more developed statements about detente with either only implicit reference to the extent US-Soviet relations were improved or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent relations were improved but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of US-Soviet relations under détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report:**

This proved to be a popular question. Most candidates were aware of the main features of, and the major developments under, detente. Consequently, the majority of responses offered some assessment of whether or not US-Soviet relations fundamentally improved in the 1970s, with particular emphasis placed on SALT I and II, the Helsinki Accords and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth in precisely focused answers. Weaker candidates tended to (1) write extensively about the causes or origins of detente (2) produce lengthy accounts of Ostpolitik (3) confuse 1970s detente with 1950s peaceful coexistence.

**2011**

**A)**To what extent was the nuclear arms race a stabilising factor in the Cold War between 1949 and 1963?

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of the nuclear arms race in the period 1949-63. Developments which helped to destabilise Cold War relations might include: Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) which precipitated a spiralling arms race (e.g. hydrogen bomb (1952-53), ICBM (1957), SLBM (1960)); fears about the nuclear superiority of the other side, e.g. the Gaither Report and the ‘missile gap’ (1957); nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. US doctrine of ‘massive retaliation’ (1950s), Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA’s ‘nuclear option’ during the 1961 Berlin crisis. Developments which stabilised the Cold War might include: the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons, e.g. US non-intervention over Hungary (1956); superpower cooperation to regulate the nuclear threat, e.g. removal of missiles from Cuba and Turkey, the Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow ‘hotline’.

At Levels 1 and 2 candidates will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the nuclear arms race with either only implicit reference to the extent it destabilised the Cold War or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent it destabilised the Cold War, but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the nuclear arms race with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report:**

This was another popular question. Most candidates were able to explain how the concept of MAD, the substitution of the nuclear arms race for armed conflict, and the acceptance of limited war had a stabilising effect. They also pointed to the destabilising impact of the spiralling arms race, fears about the nuclear 'superiority' of the other side, and nuclear brinkmanship. The best responses were able to analyse the Cuban missile crisis as an example of increased stability (due to the measures taken afterwards) and as a case study of the dangers created by the nuclear arms race. Weaker candidates tended to (1) produce a chronological narrative of the nuclear arms race with little or no reference to the stabilising-destabilising debate (2) offer general statements in place of detailed supporting evidence (3) focus almost exclusively on the Cuban missile crisis (4) adopt a 'stated factor' approach to the question.

**2011**

**B)** How far do you agree with the view that the development of the Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union in the years 1945–53 was primarily due to traditional great power rivalry? Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

**Mark Scheme:**

Source 7 gives a ‘great power rivalry’ view of the origins of the Cold War based on Kennan’s assessment of Russia’s long-term conduct in international affairs. Candidates may note the source also makes two specific references to the importance of ideology. Source 8 locates the start of the Cold War firmly in an ideological context by stressing the USA’s commitment to free trade capitalism and the Soviet Union’s adherence to Marxism-Leninism. These opposed ideological positions encouraged a sense of mission and made conflict inevitable. Source 9 emphasises the role played by authoritarianism and, more particularly, Stalin. The Soviet leader’s hard-line ‘cold war’ mentality, which was previously evident in his handling of domestic affairs, informed his approach to international affairs after 1945. Candidates’ own knowledge of 1945-49 should be added to evidence of sources and may include: the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the ‘Stalinisation’ of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US ‘Open Door’ policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of ‘dollar imperialism’; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; role of key personalities, Stalin, Truman & Roosevelt. The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be some attempt to discuss relative strength of arguments on the basis of confident use of presented sources and good understanding of issues under debate. At Level 5, sustained argument about the relative importance of traditional great power rivalry & ideological conflict on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources & own knowledge.

**Examiners’ Report:**

Overall, sources were used effectively and appropriate own knowledge included to develop argument. However, candidates were generally more confident when discussing the role of ideology and specific individuals such as Stalin, and less confident when assessing the impact of traditional great power rivalry. Stronger responses offered a sustained analysis based on cross- referencing of extracts and integration of source material & own knowledge. Low- scoring candidates tended to exhibit three main weaknesses - (1) relying on a memorised perspectives essay (covering orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interps) which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) poor or non-existent integration of source material & own knowledge (3) assuming that traditional great power rivalry and ideological conflict were the same thing.

SOURCE 7

(From Eric Hobsbawm, Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914–1991, published 1994)

Confrontation would probably have developed even without ideology. George

Kennan, the American diplomat who in early 1946 formulated the USA’s ‘containment’ policy, did not believe Russia was crusading for communism. He was an expert of the old school of diplomatic power politics. He saw Russia, Tsarist or Bolshevik, as a backward and barbarous society ruled by men with a ‘traditional and instinctive Russian sense of insecurity’, who saw ‘security’ only in the total destruction of rival power. Communism, in Kennan’s opinion, made Russia more dangerous because it was the most ruthless of world-conquering ideologies. But the implication of Kennan’s view was that the only ‘rival power’ to Russia, namely the USA, would have to ‘contain’ its pressure by uncompromising resistance, even if

Russia had not been communist.

SOURCE 8

(From Robert J. McMahon, The Cold War, published 2003)

US planners viewed the establishment of a freer and more open international economic system as indispensable to the post-war order. Closed trading blocs and national economic barriers encouraged only rivalry and conflict. Marxism-

Leninism influenced the outlook and policies of the Soviet Union. Stalin and the

Kremlin elite assumed conflict between the socialist and capitalist worlds to be inevitable, and were certain that proletarian revolution would prevail. Ideology imparted to Soviets and Americans alike a strong faith in the world-historical roles of their respective nations. On each side, leaders and ordinary citizens saw their countries acting for much broader purposes than the mere advancement of national interests. Soviets and Americans each saw themselves acting out of noble motives to lead humanity into a grand new age of peace, justice and order. Married to the overwhelming power each nation possessed, those mirror-opposite ideological values provided a sure-fire recipe for conflict.

SOURCE 9

(From John Lewis Gaddis, We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History, published 1997)

Stalin’s centrality to the origins of the Cold War is clear. For all their importance, one

could have removed Roosevelt, Churchill, Truman and others, and a cold war would

still have probably started. If one could have eliminated Stalin, alternative paths

become quite conceivable. For, with the possible exception of Mao, no twentieth

century leader imprinted himself upon his country as Stalin did. And given his

tendency to conduct ‘domestic’ cold wars, once Stalin was in control and once it

was clear Russia would survive the war, then it looks equally clear that there was

going to be a Cold War whatever the west did. Who was responsible? The answer

is authoritarianism in general, and Stalin in particular.

**June 2012**

**A)** **‘In the years 1953–60, President Eisenhower’s cold war diplomacy was based on confrontation rather than coexistence.’ How far do you agree with this view?**

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of Eisenhower’s cold war diplomacy in the years 1953-60. Developments which support a confrontational US approach might include: Eisenhower’s hard line ‘New Look’ foreign policy (based on the ‘roll back’ of communism, the doctrine of ‘massive retaliation’ and nuclear brinkmanship etc.); declaration of the Domino Theory (1954) and the Eisenhower Doctrine (1957); the use of covert operations, e.g. Iran (1953) and Guatemala (1954); the U2 spy plane programme; confrontation with China over Quemoy and Matsu (1954 and 1958); leadership attitudes, e.g. Eisenhower ‘same old girl’ and Khrushchev ‘We will bury you’. Developments which support the coexistence view might include: settlement of the Austrian issue (1955); summit diplomacy in the 1950s and the ‘Spirit of Geneva’ and the ‘Spirit of Camp David’; US acceptance of Soviet sphere of influence, e.g. East Germany (1953) and Hungary (1956); Soviet recognition of West Germany (1955); exchange visits for Russian and American scientists. At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about Eisenhower’s cold war diplomacy with either only implicit reference to the extent it was based on confrontation or coexistence, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent cold war diplomacy was based on confrontation or coexistence but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of US cold war diplomacy under Eisenhower with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation. This proved to be a popular question.

**Examiners’ Report:**

Most candidates were able to explain how Eisenhower's cold war diplomacy exhibited both 'confrontation' and 'coexistence' features in the years 1953 to 1960 (e.g. Domino Theory, Eisenhower Doctrine, confrontation with China, the Austrian Treaty and summit diplomacy). The best responses analysed the confrontation/coexistence issue either in terms of the practical limitations of the hardline 'New Look' foreign policy, or the enduring tensions and suspicions which underpinned any US commitment to coexistence. Weaker candidates tended to (1) produce a chronological 'peaceful coexistence' narrative with little or no reference to the Eisenhower confrontation/coexistence debate, or (2) offer general statements in place of detailed supporting evidence.

**2012**

**A)** **‘The improvement in Sino-US relations was the main factor promoting détente between Russia and America in the years 1969–75.’ How far do you agree with this view?**

**Mark Scheme:**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main reasons for the easing of US-Soviet tensions in the 1970s. Developments which suggest that improving Sino-US relations fostered US-Soviet détente might include: the Nixon Doctrine and ‘triangular diplomacy’ in the early 1970s; the impact of the US-Sino Shanghai Communique (1972); growing tension between China and the USSR in the late 1960s (e.g. 1969 Ussuri River incident); Soviet fears of isolation due to growing Sino-US rapprochement. Developments which suggest that other factors promoted US-Soviet détente might include: desire to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; wider US and Soviet economic considerations (e.g. to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to western technology); the impact of the Vietnam war on America; the pressure for détente generated by Ostpolitik in opening up channels between east and west Europe.

At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about improving Sino-US relations with either only implicit reference to the extent they promoted US-Soviet détente or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent Sino-US relations promoted US-Soviet détente but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the causes of détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report:**

This was another popular question. Most candidates were aware of the main causes of US-Soviet detente in the 1970s, including improved Sino-US relations. Consequently, the majority of responses offered some assessment of the relative importance of improved Sino-US relations in promoting detente. Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth in precisely focused answers which considered not only the stated factor but also others such as the desire to control the arms race, the impact of Vietnam on the US, and Soviet economic motives. Weaker candidates tended to (1) write largely narrative accounts of detente, or (2) produce a success/failure analysis of detente. A few confused 1970s detente with 1950s peaceful coexistence.

**2012**

**B) How far do you agree with the view that superpower misjudgements account for the development of the Cold War in the years 1945–53? Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

**Mark Scheme:**

Source 7 argues that the US misread Soviet security needs in Europe as communist expansion. In turn, the American hard line response led the Soviets to regard US policy as capitalist imperialism. These polarised positions created a ‘vicious circle’ in superpower relations. This interpretation can be supported by material from Source 8 which focuses on Stalin’s miscalculations after 1946. According to this extract the Soviet leader overreacted on east European and German issues and was also guilty of misjudgements over Korea. Source 9 emphasises the conflicting aims and objectives of the USA and the USSR in the years after 1945. It also contends that the USA was in a much stronger position to shape the post-war international order. Candidates may note that, according to Source 9, these competing visions of the post-1945 world were ideologically driven. Candidates’ own knowledge of 1945-53 should be added to the evidence of the sources and may include: the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the ‘Stalinisation’ of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US ‘Open Door’ policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of ‘dollar imperialism’; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the role of key personalities particularly Stalin, Truman and Roosevelt; the formation of the People’s Republic of China (1949); the impact of the Korean War (1950-53). The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Levels 1/2 most candidates will see differences in the arguments produced by the sources and draw basic conclusions, including some own knowledge. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, sustained argument about the relative importance of superpower misjudgements and conflicting national interests on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources & own knowledge.

**Examiners’ Report:**

Most candidates found this question accessible. Overall, sources were used effectively and appropriate own knowledge was included to develop argument. Stronger responses offered sustained analysis based on cross-referencing of extracts and integration of source material & own knowledge. These typically examined the role of superpower misjudgement and ideological motivation, and the actions of Stalin and Truman. Low-scoring candidates exhibited three main weaknesses - (1) relying on a memorised 'perspectives' essay ( orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interps) which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) poor or nonexistent integration of source material & own knowledge (3) developing analysis to 1948/49 rather than 1953.

Source 7

(From Martin McCauley, The Origins of the Cold War 1941–1949, published 2008)

The greater strength of the US political and economic system, compared with that of the USSR, gave Washington greater opportunities to change the post-war world.

Had they so desired, the Americans could have recognised the Soviet sphere of influence in eastern and south-eastern Europe, drawn the Soviets into joint control of atomic weapons, and contributed to the reconstruction of the Soviet economy.

American decision-makers misread Soviet security interests in eastern and southeastern Europe as proof of Soviet expansionism and refused to cooperate. This, in turn, led the Soviets to see US policy as aggressive capitalist expansionism and to harden their own attitude in their own sphere of influence. A vicious circle thus came into being and it could not be broken after 1945.

SOURCE 8

(From Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov, Inside the Kremlin’s Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev, published 1996)

Stalin’s road to the Cold War, in the years after 1946, was strewn with miscalculations.

He did not want to provoke American and British ‘imperialism’, yet he overreacted to any perceived threat in Germany and in Eastern Europe. In response to the

Marshall Plan, Stalin began to consolidate a Soviet security zone in Eastern Europe by ruthless police methods and intensive Communist propaganda. Trying to stop

Western separatist policies in Germany, he triggered the Berlin blockade crisis. By sanctioning North Korean aggression, Stalin subjected the Koreans, his Chinese ally, and the rest of the world to a bloody and protracted war that contained the real danger of a global conflict.

SOURCE 9

(From Thomas G. Paterson, On Every Front: The Making and Unmaking of the Cold War, published 1992)

Two nations with quite different ideologies emerged from the rubble of World War Two to claim high rank. The United States and the Soviet Union, eager to realize their visions of the post-war world and to seize opportunities for extending their respective influence, tried to fill vacuums of power. Although handicapped by its economic wreckage, Russia held predominant post-war power over its East European neighbours. Still, the Soviet Union was a regional, not a global, power before the early 1950s. The United States had more opportunities and resources than other nations to shape the post-war system. By exercising their global power – through military occupations, foreign aid and loans, and United Nations – US officials pushed the world toward the American post-war goal of a non-radical, capitalist, free trade international order.

**June 2013**

**A 3 ‘The nuclear arms race did little to restrain the actions of the USA and the Soviet Union in the Cold War in the years 1949–63.’ How far do you agree with this view?**

**Indicative Content**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of the nuclear arms race in the period 1949-63. Developments which encouraged a lack of restraint might include: Soviet acquisition of a nuclear capability (1949) which precipitated a spiralling arms race – e.g. hydrogen/lithium bomb (1952-54), intercontinental bombers, ICBM (1957) and SLBM (1960); fears about the nuclear superiority of the other side, e.g. the Gaither Report and the ‘missile gap’ (1957); nuclear brinkmanship, e.g. US doctrine of ‘massive retaliation’ (1950s), Cuban missile crisis (1962) and the USA’s ‘nuclear option’ during the 1961 Berlin crisis. Developments which encouraged superpower restraint might include: the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons, e.g. US non-intervention in Hungary (1956) and Soviet promotion of ‘peaceful coexistence’; superpower cooperation to regulate the nuclear threat, e.g. removal of missiles from Cuba and Turkey, the Test Ban Treaty (1963) and the Washington-Moscow ‘hotline’.

At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about the nuclear arms race between 1949 and 1963 with either only implicit reference to the extent it discouraged or promoted superpower restraint, or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent the nuclear arms race discouraged/encouraged restraint but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the nuclear arms race and superpower restraint with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report**

This was a very popular question. Most candidates were able to explain how the concept of MAD, the tacit recognition of respective spheres of influence in the nuclear age (e.g. US non-intervention in Hungary in 1956), and superpower efforts to regulate the nuclear threat (e.g. the Test Ban Treaty of 1963) had a restraining effect on US and Soviet actions. They also pointed to the lack of restraint inherent in the spiralling arms race, fears about the nuclear 'superiority' of the other side, and nuclear brinkmanship. The best responses were able to analyse the Cuban missile crisis as an example of increased restraint (due to the measures taken afterwards) and as a case study of the increased dangers created by the nuclear arms race. Weaker responses tended to (1) produce a chronological narrative of the nuclear arms race with little or no reference to the restraint- lack of restraint debate (2) offer general statements in place of detailed supporting evidence.

**2013**

**A 4‘Neither the USA nor the Soviet Union were seriously committed to Détente in the**

**1970s.’ How far do you agree with this view?**

**Indicative Content**

Candidates should have knowledge about the main features of détente in the 1970s. Developments which suggest a lack of superpower commitment might include: Soviet refusal to link détente to further concessions (e.g. over Vietnam and USSR’s anti-Israel stance) and Brezhnev’s adherence to the long-term victory of communism; the Third World continued as an area of superpower competition in the 1970s (e.g. Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia); the Helsinki Accords (1975) and Soviet human rights issues; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979); the scrapping of SALT 2. Developments which suggest superpower commitment might include: desire to control the risks and spiralling costs of the arms race leading to SALT 1; US promotion of the Nixon Doctrine; wider US-Soviet economic and trade considerations (e.g. to enable the USSR to develop consumer industries and gain access to Western technology); genuine Soviet desire not to be diplomatically isolated by the growing Sino-US rapprochement.

At Levels 1 and 2 simple or more developed statements will provide either only simple or more developed statements about US-Soviet relations in the 1970s with either only implicit reference to the extent they were committed to détente or argument based on insufficient evidence. At Level 3, students should provide some sustained analysis related to the extent the USA and the Soviet Union were committed to détente but the detail may be hazy in places and/or the material unbalanced chronologically or thematically. At Level 4, there will be sustained analysis of the commitment to détente with some attempt to reach a reasoned judgement on ‘how far’. At Level 5, ‘how far’ will be central in an answer which will be well informed with well selected information and a sustained evaluation.

**Examiners’ Report**

This proved to be another popular question. Most candidates were aware of the main features of, and the major developments under, Detente. Consequently, the majority of responses offered some assessment of how seriously committed the USA and the Soviet Union were to Detente, with particular emphasis placed on SALT I and II, the Helsinki Accords and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth in precisely focused answers which offered reasoned assessments of superpower commitment. Weaker candidates tended to (1) write extensively about the causes or origins of Detente (2) confuse 1970s Detente with 1950s Peaceful Coexistence.

**2013**

**B How far do you agree with the view that, in the years 1945–50, the Cold War developed as a result of US and Soviet security needs? Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

**Indicative Content**

Source 7 argues that the USA had a broad conception of its national security interests and, in responding forcefully to Soviet challenges in these ‘vital’ areas, America was acting in defence of her perceived security needs. Such a view can be cross-referenced with Source 8 which maintains that both superpowers viewed the other’s policies as hostile to their security and took action which, in turn, was regarded as aggressive. Candidates may note that Source 8 indicates that this ‘vicious circle’ in superpower relations was driven by ideological factors. Source 9 also mentions ideological conflict but stresses that both superpowers were determined to expand their global power and were prepared to act aggressively to achieve this. It contends that the USSR relied more heavily on force and coercion and therefore bears greater responsibility.

Candidates’ own knowledge of 1945-50 should be added to evidence of sources and may include: the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as **the** two great powers after World War Two; the consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences (1945); the ‘Stalinisation’ of eastern Europe (1945-48) and growing Western fears of communist expansion; the US ‘Open Door’ policy and the strategy of containment, including the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid (1945-49) which led to Soviet accusations of ‘dollar imperialism’; the divisive issue of Germany (1945-49), including the Berlin Blockade and the creation of separate German states; the formation of NATO; the role of key personalities particularly Stalin, Truman and Roosevelt; the formation of the People’s Republic of China (1949); the early impact of the Korean War (1950-53).

The focus of good answers should be on these interpretations of the origins of the Cold War, although other factors may be considered. Well-handled, maximum marks can be awarded to candidates who confine their responses to these aspects of the controversy. At Level 3 a clear conclusion will be reached and the sources will be used with some confidence. At Level 4, there should be at least some attempt to discuss the relative strength of the arguments on the basis of confident use of the presented sources and good understanding of the issues under debate. At Level 5, sustained argument about the relative importance of US-Soviet security needs and superpower aggression on the basis of precisely selected evidence from both sources and own knowledge.

**Examiners’ Report**

Overall, sources were used effectively and appropriate own knowledge was included to develop argument. However, candidates were generally more confident when discussing the role of ideology and perception, and less confident when assessing the impact of security needs. Stronger responses offered a sustained analysis based on the cross-referencing of extracts and the integration of source material and own knowledge. Low-scoring responses tended to exhibit three main weaknesses - (1) relying on a memorised perspectives essay (orthodox, revisionist and post-revisionist interps) which was inadequately linked to the sources and question provided (2) poor or non-existent integration of source material and own knowledge (3) assuming that competing security needs and ideological conflict were the same thing.

**SOURCE 7**

(From Melvyn P. Leffler, *The American Conception of National Security and the Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945–48*, published 1984)

The dynamics of the Cold War are easier to understand when one grasps the American conception of national security. This included a strategic sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere, domination of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, access to the markets and resources of Eurasia, and nuclear superiority. Challenges to this concept of national security were certain to provoke a firm American response. This occurred initially when decisions were made in favour of the Truman doctrine, Marshall Plan, military assistance, Atlantic alliance, and German and Japanese rehabilitation. The ‘loss’ of China, Soviet detonation of an atomic bomb, and the North Korean attack on South Korea intensified the perception of a national security threat. Truman responded with military assistance to southeast Asia, a decision to build the hydrogen bomb, direct military intervention in Korea, a commitment to station troops permanently in Europe, expansion of the American alliance system, and a massive US rearmament programme.

**SOURCE 8**

(From Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *Origins of the Cold War*, published 1967)

The Cold War was the product of a dilemma. Each side felt compelled to adopt policies which the other could only regard as a threat. Each then felt compelled to undertake defensive measures. The Russians saw no choice but to consolidate their security in Eastern Europe. The Americans, regarding Eastern Europe as the first step toward Western Europe, responded by asserting their interest in the zone the Russians regarded as vital for their security. The Russians concluded the West were planning capitalist encirclement and laying the foundations for anti-Soviet regimes in this key area. Each side, in pursuing its own deeply held principles, was only confirming the other’s fear that it was bent on aggression.

**SOURCE 9**

(From Robert Service, *A History of Modern Russia: From Nicholas II to Putin*, published 2003)

The USA and the USSR had diametrically opposite interests. Both states aimed to expand their global power and were not too scrupulous about the methods used. They also had opposing ideologies. Each was armed to the teeth. Each knew little about the politicians and society of the other side. Was the balance of responsibility equal? No, because the USSR depended much more directly than its rival upon militarism, terror and injustice to get its way. There was as much financial and political persuasion as manipulation and force at work in the American domination of Western Europe. But manipulation and force was the predominant method of the USSR in Eastern Europe.