

**2011**

**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 8, 7 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.**

Source 7 argues that the cause for the development of the Cold War was primarily due to traditional great power rivalry, however, I think this view can be considered as simplistic. Source 8 gives the view that 'conflict between the socialist and capitalist worlds' to be the main cause whilst Source 9 argues that Stalin's centrality to the Cold War was primarily the cause for its development. However, I believe ideology as conveyed within Source 8 to be the main cause of the development of the Cold War in the years 1945-53.

Will 7

Source 7 offers the over simplistic view that the development of the Cold War between the superpowers in the years 1945-53 was primarily due to traditional great power rivalry. The source states that Kennan, the American diplomat, believed Russia to be a 'backward and barbarous society' ruled by men with a 'traditional and instinctive Russian sense of insecurity'. This can be supported by Stalin's evident insecurities during this period, such as his need to build a buffer zone on the European front of Russia in order to increase defense from any future attack, which he thought to be imminent. This process became known as Stalinisation in which he set up communist rule in multiple Eastern European countries, such as Hungary, from 1945-48. This notion can be supported by source 9 which places significance on the role and paranoia of Stalin. However, the simplicity of the source becomes evident from the beginning of the source when it states 'Confrontation would probably have developed even without ideology'. This is a bold statement to make and is not supported sufficiently by the source. Evidence against the statement includes The extreme anti-communist belief that built up in the US during this period. For example, in 1950 Senator Joseph McCarthy produced a list of 205 people he claimed were communist agents within the US government. His charges, although eventually discredited, spawned a climate of intensive war fever and extreme anti-communism. Despite this the source does state that communism, in Kennan's opinion, 'made Russia more dangerous' which slightly contradicts the initial statement it made. This is further contradicted when the source reiterates the point that tensions would have rose between the two superpowers 'even if Russia had not been communist'. This is, again, a naive comment to make as part of the driving force of the build up in tensions of the Cold war was the fact that in the communist ideology Marx states that communism will eventually overthrow capitalism. Support for the significance of ideology in the development of the Cold War during these years can be found in source 8, which states that the opposing ideologies of the two superpowers provided a 'sure-fire recipe to conflict.' Overall, despite the fact some significance can be placed on the great power rivalry, the source has some major limitations in its attempts to explaining how the Cold War developed during this period, particularly in its undermining of the role of ideology and in the way it relies heavily on the views of George Kennan.

Jess 9

A more plausible view can be found within the view conveyed within Source 9 - Stalin's centrality to the Cold War and authoritarianism in general was the main cause of its development. This can be seen within Stalin's occupation of Europe. No matter what the West did, Stalin was power hungry - he wanted communism to thrive and acted in order to ensure this happened. Source 9 argues that 'one could have removed Roosevelt, Churchill, Truman and others, and a Cold War would still have probably started.' This supports the source as it communicates how Stalin was in fact an aggressor - his authoritarian ways meant that no matter who the leaders of the West were and their actions, Stalin wanted to control countries under worldwide communism and would have acted on this regardless of the opposition. This can also be supported by when Source 7 talks of George Kennan and the policy of 'containment' he wrote about within his long telegram. This shows that America felt the need to protect themselves and others against the plight of communism as it was becoming evident that Stalin had a goal and would not easily be stopped. Nonetheless, this view has some major limitations. Source 8 discusses how 'Americans each saw themselves acting out of noble motives to lead humanity into a grand new age of peace, justice and order.' However, it can be argued that this was Stalin's perspective also. He believed that the rule of communism would better the world and sought to put this into place. An obvious clash took place where in the USA and the Soviet Union both thought they were right and acted upon this belief to stop the other from expanding their ideology into different countries. In addition to this, the expansionist actions of Stalin can in part be explained by the Soviet Union's view that the occupation of Eastern Europe had a defensive rationale, and that Soviet leaders saw themselves as attempting to avoid encirclement by the United States and its allies. The Soviet Union was left so weak and devastated by World War II that perhaps the development of the Cold War may have stemmed in many ways from American Paranoia - America saw that Russia was expanding and acted to put an end to it without taking into consideration the state of the USSR prior to the occupation of Europe. By acting, the USA would have made the Soviet Union feel even more under attack, perhaps leading to, in their eyes, the increasing need for expansionist and totalitarian policies in order to defend themselves against the West. Overall, whilst there is a valid point to be made in acknowledging Stalin's part in the development of the Cold War, solely putting the blame on him remains simplistic.

Rachel 8

The most significant view to how far was the development of the Cold War primarily due to the traditional rivalry of great powers is the opinion of source 8. Ideology had a strong impact to the development of the Cold war, the 'ideology imparted to Soviets and American'. With the Soviet Union's and United States differences in economic systems such as the United States commitment to the 'establishment of freer and more open international economic system' while Stalin was influenced by 'Marxism-Leninism' which only encouraged 'rivalry and conflict'. This can be further supported by the United States Open Door policy and the Strategy of containment of the Soviet Union with the use of the Truman Doctrine of 1947 and the Marshall Plan of 1948. This led to the 'Soviet accusations of 'dollar imperialism' due to the Marshall Plan, the United States give \$13 billion to the Western Europe to give financial support to those after the Second World War. The source argues that the Soviet Union's and the United States 'mirror-opposite ideological values provided a sure-fire recipe for conflict' with each of them 'acting out of noble motives' believing each of them are leading their nation to a 'new age of peace, justice and order'. Stalin in 1948, decide to start the Berlin Blockade, to separate himself from Eastern European influences and belief to help build his Marxism-Leninism influence of communism. This view is supported in source 7, arguing that 'world-conquering ideologies' of the Soviet Union and United States had a large impact of the development of the cold car, due to their 'ruthlessness', 'uncompromising resistance' and each superpower 'crusading' for communism or capitalism. However there is some minor limitations in source 8's. For example source 8 suggests that 'Stalin and the Kremlin elite assumed conflict' and that Stalin's personality can be the main development of the Cold war. This can be supported in Source 9, which argues that 'Stalin in particular' made the cold war 'inevitable' and if Stalin could of been eliminated 'alternative paths [could] become quite conceivable'. This can be future supported by the Berlin blockade of 1948, to stop influences of capitalism to the Soviet union and start spreading the belief of Communism more globally. It can also be supported by the Korean war in 1950, Stalin helping the Korean War for the spread of communism in Korea and China. Source 7 agrees that 'confrontation would have probably have developed even with ideology'. Clearly this view is the most important role in understanding the controversy over the development of the Cold War in 1945-53, but that is not to dismiss the other contributory causes which are apparent in this controversy.

Overall, whilst it is obvious that both Stalin, as shown within source 9, and great power rivalry, as shown within source 7, had their part to play within the development of the Cold War, ideology conveyed within source 8 is the most convincing view. This is because the clash in ideologies almost overtook the events of the Cold War, resulting in both countries believing their cause was the no

2012

**How far do you agree with the view that superpower misjudgements account for the development of the cold war in the years 1945-1953? Explain your answer using sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy (Joseph Powley, Alexander Montague and Samuel Porter)**

The argument made by source 7 that superpower misjudgements are the [primary factor in the development of the cold war in the years 1945-53 is fairly significant as there is substantial evidence or support this view. However there is also some evidence to suggest that source 8's argument may also be correct in that it was the mistakes of Stalin that helped to shape the development of the cold war. As well as the view offered by source 9 which is that it was the USA's and Russia's push for global dominance that shaped the cold war. Fundamentally however there is an abundance of evidence to suggest that while these two other views played a part the most significant factor is still the misjudgments made by the superpowers as argued by source 7.

**Sam (Source 9)**

The overall ideas conveyed in source 9 is that the cold war erupted due to both superpowers looking to grasp power of the world after the shock of world war two. It states 'The United States and the Soviet Union, eager to realise their visions of the post war world and to seize opportunities for extending their respective influence.' As both of the superpowers pledged different ideas, both with 'quite different ideologies' one of the superpowers had to back down, as communism and capitalism were to opposite to function together. The source also states 'By exercising their global power- through military occupations, foreign aid, loans and United Nations- US officials pushed the world toward the American post-war goal of a non-radical, capitalist, free trade international order. This was the worst nightmare of Soviet leader Stalin, who wanted communist states all over the world, with no trade, restricted press and other extreme policies. However, this view also has some major limitations that setback its credibility. Source 8 would disagree with points brought up in source 7 and place blame on Stalin's own moves throughout the years building up to the cold war. A quote that supports this is 'Stalin's road to the Cold War, in the years after 1946, was strewn with miscalculations.' This dismisses the point that the Cold War emerged due to a fight for world domination after the dreadful events of World war two. Clearly this view plays an important role in understanding the controversy over the development of the Cold War 1945-53, but it is arguably not the most significant.

### **Alex (Source 8)**

Source 8 suggest that it was the “miscalculations” of Stalin which lead to the developments of the cold war in the period of 1945-1953. One of the key points put across by source 8 is that Stalin “overreacted” to the American and British imperial powers, undermining their wishes for a free democracy and a free world this can be seen on multiple occasions with the failures and disagreements of the future of Poland in the post war meeting, the yalta conference in particular, as well as the reaction polices referring the the Berlin Blockade in an attempt to Stop any further rebuilding of western Germany. Therefore It can be argued that Stalin’s misjudgements were based on a fear of “american and British imperialism” with his refusal to work with the western democracy’s, which were further perpetuated by the novikov telegram in 46, therefore a lack of discussion and communications between the two powers. Furthermore we can see misjudgements from Stalin’s actions with his interventions in the korean war aiding “kim’s forces” before forcing the Chinese to intervene. So as we can see Stalin also made failures and misjudgements of even his own allies with a lack of support for them. So in this early period of the cold war we see that the actions of Stalin were very reactionary and as source 9 stated a way “to fill the vacuum of power” left by the fall of the nazi’s and imperial japan. However, it is far too simple to just argue that it was the failures and misjudgments of Stalin which lead to the rising tensions and ultimately the cold war, for thought Stalin did miscalculate the american and british post war his actions were all in the name of “soviet security” for his invasion of northern Iran in 46, can be contributed to a direct relation to the American pull of aid in the early period, as source 7 states the “US political and economic system” was much greater and more powerful than the soviet system post war which had suffered greatly with the destruction and murder of 25 million russian and much of their industrial land. Furthermore the Berlin blockade, though it was to halt american growth, it was also to stop the rise of Germany, a great industrial power which had invaded Russian twice in the last 50 years. Therefore though it can be argued that Stalin was the main contributing factor to the rise in the cold war, it is far too simplistic of an argument as he was just a reactionary power who wished to rebuild his nation which had been devastated by war, as well as halt the growth of a superpower which directly threatened his own nation.

### **Joe (Source 7)**

The argument made by source 7 is that it was the misjudgments made by both superpowers throughout the years 1945-1953 that truly helped to shape the conflict and give it its unique form which existed for so many years subsequently is undoubtedly the most significant. One of the key arguments and by source 7 in favour of their argument is that Washington had “greater opportunities to change the post-war world” and yet utterly squandered this chance by instead becoming mired in the standoff politics that dominated this period of time. there is a wealth of evidence to support this assertion including the fact that Truman, cocne he became president following the death of Roosevelt immediately decided to end the lend-lease programme which was providing vital aid to Russia who was still recovering from the immense damage suffered at the hands of the Nazis for no purpose other than to establish their complete power over Russia’s economy and their recovery. However rather than seeing it as a sign of power Stalin interpreted it as a directly threatening action immediately hardening his relationship with the new

president. A second example of where America squandered their opportunity was the lack of consultation with Russia regarding actions which would affect them directly including currency reform within the new german state of Trizonia ;heading into its metamorphosis into Bizonia which once again threatened Stalin by allying states bordering his new sphere of influence without any discussion or consultation which is difficult to be interpreted as anything other than a provocation. This is supported by source 9 as well in its discussion that "US officials pushed the world toward the american post war goal of non-radical capitalist free trade international order" despite the fact this is contrary to the very nature of communism. However as source 7 points out these misjudgments were not completely one sided but rather had been made by both sides, it points out that "soviet security interests in eastern europe" could have been proof of "expansionism" something that the US feared immensely which the Russians were aware of. Making their decision to attempt to occupy both Iran, the Black Sea straits and turkey at various points throughout the later half of the 40s all the more baffling as the only way that america could react to these moves is to harden their lien against them leading to them "refusing to cooperate". This is also supported by several other russian decisions made such as the coup in Czechoslovakia in 1947 which was very clearly the removal of any democratic process in a country controlled by Russia, the lack of any subtlety in this regard is the major problem as clearly Russia felt that by establishing the separate spheres of influence at Yalta in 1945 then they could do whatever they pleased unaware of the fact that if any president accepted that they would face huge opposition from the public and congress both things Stalin did not have to contend with. This is not to say that there are some limitations to this view such as the fact that while it is easy to say that these misjudgments simply 'happened' it does nothing to explain the potential deeper meanings behind these misjudgements. this is where elements of the views made by source 8 as in the case of the Russian mistakes many of them were made expressly by Stalin and therefore it is fair to say that his mistakes did in some way contribute to the overall development of the cold war in this time. Likewise elements of the argument made by source 9 can also help to explain this as it clearly establishes that the US had a desire to exert their power and influence over the world which is why they acted so rashly.

## **Conclusion**

The most significant view in the development of the cold war is undoubtedly that which is put forward by source 7 in that it was the multitude of mistakes and misjudgments made by both the US and USSR that helped to shape the development of the cold war throughout the time period of 1945-1953. However to truly reach a final conclusion on it elements of the views established by sources 8 and 9 must also be accepted as in both cases why they do not fully explain the development of the cold war they do contain important clues as to the deeper reasons behind many of the mistakes made (which I discussed in relation to source 7) and so by taking the main point of the argument made by source 7 and parts of the those made by sources 8 and 9 we can reach a final conclusion on the development of the cold war in this time period. However, this view also does have some major setbacks that limit the sources credibility.

2013

**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.**

*Jamie 7, Ed 8 Ibtisam 9*

*Source X supports this view whilst source Y and Z challenge this view. It is argued that the view has some credibility but it is not the most significant explanation of the controversy over the development of the Cold War 1945-53. The most significant explanation is.....which is supported by source Z*

*Source Y largely supports the more plausible view that*

- *For example source Y suggests “ +S”. Use source as evidence as well as content*
- *This can be further supported by K*
- *Repeat this pattern 2 or 3 times*
- *Finally this is partially supported by sources X and Z*

*However this view has some limitations*

- *For example source Y suggests “ -S”. Use source as evidence as well as content*
- *This can be further supported by -K*
- *Repeat this pattern 2 times*
- *Finally this view is also challenged by sources X and Z that suggest*

*Clearly this view plays an important role in understanding the controversy over the development of the Cold War 1945-53, but it is arguably not the most significant.*

*The most convincing view of this controversy is ...which is supported by Source Z.*

- *For example source Z suggests “ +S”. Use source as evidence as well as content*
- *This can be further supported by K*
- *Repeat this pattern 2 or 3 times*
- *Finally this is partially supported by sources X and Y*

*However this view has some minor limitations*

- *For example source Y suggests “ -S”. Use source as evidence as well as content*
- *This can be further supported by -K*
- *Repeat this pattern 2 times*
- *Finally this view is also challenged by sources X and Z that suggest*

*Clearly this view is the most important role in understanding the controversy over the development of the Cold War 1945-53, but that is not to dismiss the other contributory causes which are apparent in this controversy.*

*Stress the interaction of factors but the significance of the view support by cross referencing with the sources for as final time*

Source 9 expresses the views that development of the cold war was established by both superpowers sharing a common ambition of global expansion but their ideological differences led to confrontation. However, it is not the only factor that led to the cold war's development, But the reactions to the East & a need for American security , argued by source 7 & that both superpowers viewed one another's policies as hostile threat towards security of the opposing superpowers also played an influential role in the development of the cold war. This view is interpreted by source 8 and fundamentally best describes the reasons as to why the cold wars emergence occurred.

Source 9 suggests it wasn't mainly US and Soviet security needs that lead to development of the cold war. It argues that it was mainly due to diametrically opposite interests between the two superpowers. 'they had opposing ideologies' This is true as they were run completely differently Russia was communist and America was capitalist. They also both had very different intentions for Germany, The Us and the east wanted to rebuild the german economy in order to use its trade to grow american exports, They furthered this idea by changing the German currency. On the other end USSR wanted to economically cripple germany so that they could get revenge for the events of ww2. They both failed to co-operate well with each other meaning that they had little accurate information as to how each country was run, and future political plans each superpower had as supported by source 7 'They knew little about the politicians and societies of the other side'. However This view has major limitations, it seems to be a more opinionated source with very little factual evidence present within it, The source is presented as a list. It can not just have been due to different interests there is stronger evidence to suggest from sources 8&9 that they actually had something in common. One of the both of their main interests was to build up their security needs to become stronger nations source 9 backs this up 'Both states aimed to expand their global power and were not too scrupulous about the methods they used' Suggesting that They did have something in common and that there was more too it just opposing ideologies

Source 7 supports the more plausible interpretation that America's conception of national security played a major role in the development of the Cold War. For instance, Source 7 implies that "challenges to this concept of national security" provoked a "firm American response". Indeed, the "Marshall Plan" was created in response to the establishment of Soviet satellite states in Eastern European countries, which was seen to threaten an expansion into Western Europe and subsequently threaten America's security interests. Furthermore, the "North Korean attack on South Korea" led to an "intensified perception of a national security threat". Certainly, South Korea was of enormous strategic and economic value to America's influence in Asia, and thus an attack from a communist nation threatened the basis of capitalism. This view is partially supported by Source 8, which notes that the Americans regarded "Eastern Europe as the first step towards Western Europe", and that a Soviet takeover of Eastern Europe threatened the security of America's major Western allies. Likewise, Source 9 suggests that the Soviet Union "depended much more directly than its rival upon militarism, terror and injustice", as evidenced by the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia, which would understandably raise American concerns. However, this view has some limitations. For example, Source 7 claims that the



“Soviet detonation of an atomic bomb” only raised the “national security threat”. Yet the Soviet Union did not have the technological capabilities to launch a missile that could reach America by 1949. Likewise, the “the North Korean attack on South Korea” was not necessarily part of a plan to destroy capitalism. Rather, it was North Korea’s leader Kim Il-Sung’s desire to govern the Korean Peninsula under his leadership, and his support from Stalin was on the basis that China could support the North Koreans and do most of the fighting. Finally, this view is also contested by Sources 8 and 9. Source 8 claims that “the Russians saw no choice but to consolidate their security in Eastern Europe”, whereas Source 9 claims that America’s “domination of Western Europe” was centered around “financial and political persuasion as manipulation and force”, rather than the idea of national security. In this sense, Source 7’s view is overly simplistic. Clearly, this view plays an important role in understanding the controversy over the development of the Cold War 1945-53, but it is arguably not the most significant.

Source 8’s argument that the development of superpower relations between 1945 and 1955 was ‘the product of a dilemma’ offers the most convincing interpretation. The source clearly argues that hostility between the two nations grew out of their equal interest to ‘adopt policies which the other could only regard as a threat’. For instance, the US pursued an open door economic policy in Europe that would suggest western capitalist expansion. At the same time this was equalled by Russia’s Comecon plan demonstrated an equal desire to develop economic strength in Europe. Source 8 further states that as a result the nation’s felt compelled to undertake ‘defensive measures’ by spreading a sphere of influence. And so when Soviet Russia strengthened support in the east with the Molotov plan in 1947, it was countered by USA’s establishment of the Marshall plan in 1948, because America regarded Russia’s spread into ‘Eastern Europe as the first step toward Western Europe’. Furthermore, any movement by either country that showed an interest of strengthening its position in neighboring countries was ‘confirming the others fear that it was bent on aggression’. In 1946, Russia’s refusal to withdraw from Iran out of economic interest was scrutinised by Britain and USA as imperialist aggression. In 1949 the Soviet detonation of the Atomic bomb confirmed the US fears of Soviet military developments. Source 7 confirms that America similarly was seeking ‘nuclear superiority’. In essence, the pursuit for influence in Europe, and economic strength in Asia from the Korean war, made by both countries only confirmed one and others belief that the other ‘was bent on aggression’. Although source 8 is limited in addressing some of the individual countries faults in aggression of for example Stalin and the Berlin Blockade and America with entering Korea, it remains convincing in its analysis of the war that with the countries ‘pursuing its own deeply held principles, was only confirming the other’s fear that it was bent on aggression’.

Conc:

Overall, the cold war developed by a variety of means in which source 9 is correct in stating that the cold war developed as a result of the superpowers being anti-pragmatic in order “to expand their global power”, but this view is very simplistic and undermined by the significance of other factors which are presented by source’s 7 & 8. But that the US’s reactions to the

Eastern front in order to defend its own security needs , argued by source 7, led to a more significant reason to the development of the cold war as it led to notions of hostility between the two superpowers. This follows onto source 8 in which the policies in which both superpowers appeared to have hostile intentions which was felt to threaten their opponent, this by far is the most plausible reason for the cold wars development in the years 1945-1950.