

Paper 3 – Interpretations Question

In Paper 3 the distinction between responses of a high level and upper middle level are significant. This distinction relates to a sharp qualitative difference in the marking criteria which we feel would be helpful to illustrate. As such in this section, some responses are organised into high, upper middle and low level. Others follow the usual pattern of high, middle and low level.

Question 1: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850-1939

- 1 Read the extract and then answer the question.

Faced with the prospect of foreign acquisitions of tropical territory hitherto opened to British merchants, the men in London resorted to one expedient after another to evade the need of formal expansion and still uphold British paramountcy in those regions. British policy makers in the late-Victorian, as in the mid-Victorian, period preferred informal means of extending imperial supremacy rather than direct rule. Throughout the two alleged periods the extension of British rule was a last resort - and it is this preference which has given rise to the many 'anti-expansionist' remarks made by Victorian ministers. What these much quoted expressions obscure is that in practice mid-Victorian as well as late-Victorian policy makers did not refuse to extend the protection of formal rule over British interests when informal methods had failed to give security. The fact that informal techniques were more often sufficient for this purpose in the circumstances of the mid-century, than in the later period when the foreign challenge to British supremacy intensified, should not be allowed to disguise the basic continuity of policy. Throughout, British governments worked to establish and maintain British paramountcy by whatever means best suited the circumstances of their diverse regions of interest. The aims of the mid-Victorians were no more anti-imperialist than those of their successors, though they were more often able to achieve them informally; and the late-Victorians were no more 'imperialist' than their predecessors, even though they were driven to annex territory more often. British policy followed the principle of extending control informally if possible and formally if necessary. To label the one method 'anti-imperialist' and the other 'imperialist' is to ignore the fact that, whatever the method, British interests were steadily safeguarded and extended. The usual summing up of the policy of the free trade empire as 'trade not rule' should read 'trade with informal control if possible; trade with rule when necessary'. This statement of the continuity of policy disposes of the over-simplified explanation of involuntary expansion inherent in the orthodox interpretation based on the discontinuity between the two periods.

Thus the mid-Victorian period now appears as an era of large-scale expansion, and the late-Victorian age does not seem to introduce any significant novelty into that process of expansion. The annexations of vast undeveloped territories, which have been taken as proof that this period alone was the great age of expansion, now pale in significance. That the area of direct imperial rule was extended is true, but is it the most important or characteristic development of expansion during this period? The simple historical fact that Africa was the last field of European penetration is not to say that it was the most important. It is our main contention that the process of expansion had reached its most valuable targets long before the exploitation of so peripheral and marginal a field as tropical Africa. Therefore, the historian who is seeking to find the deepest meaning of the expansion at the end of the nineteenth century should look not at the mere pegging out of claims in African jungles and bush, but at the successful exploitation of the empire, both formal and informal, which was then coming to fruition in India, in Latin America, in Canada and elsewhere. The main work of imperialism in the so-called expansionist era was in the more intensive development of areas already linked with the world economy, rather than in the extensive annexations of the remaining marginal regions of Africa.

What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the British Empire to explain your answer. [40]

Mark scheme

- 1 **What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the British Empire to explain your answer.** [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that there was a continuity of imperial policy through the 19th century, and that this policy consistently showed a preference for informal methods of control, rather than the formal acquisition of territory. Showing understanding of the Big Message will involve coverage of both these aspects. The extract argues that the increase in territorial acquisitions in the later part of the century actually obscures the real successes of imperial exploitation, which lay in places other than Africa.

This interpretation is in direct contrast to the **traditional** view which assumes a discontinuity in imperial policy between mid-Victorian indifference towards empire and the ‘new imperialism’ of the latter part of the 19th century, which saw the expansion of the formal empire.

Candidates might discuss the debate of whether imperialism was driven from Britain itself (the metropole) or by the men and women ‘on the spot’ (the periphery) – this extract is focused on the metropole.

Example candidate response – high

1) With focus on the Metropole 'the men in London' the extract argues that there was 'a basic continuity of policy' throughout the period of British Imperialism c.1850-1939. In justification of this overarching interpretation, the historian takes an unorthodox approach analysing 'informal' as well as formal Empire like Robinson and Gallagher. Further a critical approach is adopted to oppose the theory of 'New Imperialism' and discontinuity in Imperial policy.

The historian begins with the argument of informal Empire. 'British policy makers... preferred informal means of extending Imperial policy'. This goes against traditional analysis of Empire by its formal colonies. This approach allows the historian to give a greater volume of evidence on Empire most commonly explored by Gallagher and Robinson. Similarly they argue that there was an underlying continuity in Imperial policy and this is concluded from the study of informal Empire.

The 'ice-berg' theory they created states the bulk of Empire was 'below the surface' or informal.

The extract similarly in the extract the historian argues that the period dubbed as 'New Imperialism' or the 'era of large expansion' is 'pale in significance' when compared to informal acquisition.

The historian takes a critical approach arguing against 'New Imperialism' and the New Imperialism was the period 1875-1939 where European countries rapidly acquired formal colonies mainly characterised by the 'Scramble for Africa'. The historian criticises the theory of discontinuity as an 'over-simplified explanation'.

Example candidate response – high, continued

↓ Rather it is argued 'Government worked to maintain and establish British paramountcy', 'whatever the method', British interests were steadily maintained safeguarded and extended.' This implies that the motive and policy of imperialists did not change, only the method.

But 'informal means of extending' were preferred therefore the bulk of Empire is in the informal. Such as Egypt. Even when intervention was necessary due to the 1870's financial crisis, the British preferred to impose a 'veiled protectorate' rather than formal acquisition to protect interests in the Suez Canal.

'British rule was a last resort' as demonstrated in the case of Hong Kong. Britain had to formally annex it after as its leaders resisted trade and banned opium.

The ~~is~~ Throughout the extract, the historian compares a 'mid Victorian' Imperialism to 'late Victorian' Imperialism to display the continuity of Imperial policy. The theory of discontinuity distinguished between mid and New Imperialism as 'anti-imperialist' and 'imperialist' respectively' however this historian argues this is 'oversimplified' British interests remained constant and were constantly 'safeguarded and extended'

Further the historian argues against that the 'expansionist era' traditionally awarded to late-Victorian Imperialism should be the mid-Victorian imperialism where the 'more intensive development of areas linked with world economy' was there, and therefore should be the Mid-Victorian period where 'most valuable targets' had already been exploited

Example candidate response – high, continued

1 In conclusion, the extract argues that was not only made up of its formal parts but informal spheres of influence as well and in fact the 'informal' was 'more valuable' than the formal. Further this is to support the overall interpretation that there was continuity in imperial policy. This goes against the orthodox theory of discontinuity that distinguished between mid-Victorian imperialism and late-Victorian imperialism. Rather it is suggested 'British interests were steadily safeguarded'

Examiner comment – high

The factor that determines whether or not a candidate achieves a high level on this paper is the ability to demonstrate a *complete* understanding of the interpretation advanced in the extract (as opposed to a *sound* understanding or understanding of *aspects*). In the first two paragraphs of this answer there are clear indications of complete understanding. First, the continuity of imperial policy, and second, the preference for informal rather than formal empire are both identified. The ability to focus upon and synthesise the essential aspects of the interpretation, and to state these as an introduction, is the most effective way of starting an answer. The rest of the answer can then explain the interpretation, illustrating and commenting upon its different aspects.

A particularly strong feature of this answer is the way in which it maintains a consistent focus on the extract. The question asks '*What can you learn from this extract?*' which indicates that only material directly related to the extract can be regarded as relevant. This answer avoids the trap of writing about the topic rather than the extract, though background knowledge is still used effectively; for example, in showing awareness that this extract runs counter to traditional interpretations that have stressed the discontinuity of nineteenth-century imperial policy.

The sense that the candidate has firmly grasped the essential points of the interpretation is shown by the focus, relevance and brevity of the answer. There is no attempt to consider everything in the extract; rather, sections of the extract are quoted as needed to support points made about the interpretation. This evidence that top-quality answers do not have to be lengthy indicates that candidates would be well advised to spend at least 15 minutes at the start of the examination reading and thinking about the extract before they start to write.

The final quality in this answer that indicates complete understanding is the consistency of the arguments and points made. Nothing is contradicted elsewhere in the answer, and the conclusion serves to reaffirm and summarise what the candidate has seen as the overall interpretation.

Mark awarded = 34 out of 40

Example candidate response – high

1.) Throughout the extract, the historian presents puts forward a predominantly economic interpretation of motives of the British Empire, largely through the revisionist interpretation of Gallagher and Robinson's 'Formal & Informal' ~~an~~ assessment of Empire. The historians' approaches, including the assessment of colonial policy and case study examples, enable him to arrive at the conclusion that there existed ~~more~~ 'a basic continuity of policy'.

The historians overarching argument centres on the idea that trade, and more specifically, 'free trade', was the main motive of British officials in the metropole. The 'men in London', according to the historian, were most interested in 'safeguarding and extending' British interests by 'upholding British paramountcy' informally and, 'if necessary, formally'. The historian states British policy makers 'preferred' the 'indirect', informal approach to empire. This is supported by the views of influential British figures such as Disraeli and Palmerston, as well as ~~affluent~~ powerful businessmen such as Cobden, who (intelligently) preferred this approach, seeing acquisition of ^{formal} empire as unnecessary and a great cost. Additionally, the argument put forward by the historian holds this view as British policy towards South Africa, though not directly and formally controlling, involved 'informal paramountcy' as they controlled the ports and other trading routes, resulting in a dependency on these resources by the Boer population.

The historian further this economic interpretation by challenging the 'alleged' orthodox interpretation of 'New Imperialism'. The word 'alleged' suggests the historians disagreement with this interpretation, terming it 'obscure' and 'oversimplified'. This interpretation aligns with the idea of the 'ice-berg' theory put forward by Gallagher and Robinson, thus showing the historian in this extract ~~is~~ interprets imperial policy as one of free trade being constant

Example candidate response – high, continued

factor. ~~with~~ As stated in the second paragraph, the historian using the approach of ~~was~~ analysing imperial economic history which compares trade with ~~the~~ 'formal colonies' was much less profitable than that of the 'large-scale expansion' of mid-victorian era. Evidently, the British East African Company is infamous for never having paid dividends to investors.

The historian arrives at his economic interpretation also ~~from~~ the analysis of British policy through the 1850's – 19 mid and late victorian ~~er~~ periods, concluding that ^{the} British adopted the most convenient policy at the time. He argues 'informal techniques were more often sufficient for this purpose in the circumstances of the mid-century' and argues the changing European diplomatic climate and rise in 'foreign challenge to British supremacy' therefore led to a necessary change in approach. The example of 'gun-boat diplomacy' and 'indirect rule' predominant in the mid-century, is ~~evident~~ as British naval supremacy ~~and the fact~~ allowed them to coerce nations to trade freely, while ~~the~~ one third of India was controlled by princely states, ~~shows~~ ~~but~~ suggests the British preferred this policy, and it was most convenient due to the little challenge from European rivals. The historian however points to the increasing rivalry after the unification of Germany and Italy as well as the rapid industrialization of those nations, France and Russia, which ~~could~~ ~~be~~ uses to explain the changing approach. Evidently, the Berlin Conference (1884) symbolised the need for formal agreements to prevent conflicts between states. Nevertheless, as suggested by the historian's comment that 'whatever the method', the main aim was to safeguard British interests, evident in the ~~the~~ intense ~~the~~ protection of British trading routes from the 'two-power standard' policy adopted by the British.

Example candidate response – high, continued

Finally, the historian strengthens his ~~argu~~ economic interpretation on the ~~if~~ significance of free-trade, using rhetoric as he questions whether mere extension of direct rule was really 'the most important or characteristic development of expansion during this period?'. He presents the interpretation that 'the most valuable targets' had been reached 'long before the exploitation of... ~~so far~~ Africa'. Indeed, Africa, being the least profitable territory, increases the reliability of this extract. The examples of 'India, Latin America and Canada' as well as China and Egypt, which ~~consisted~~ is effective as it considers both ~~the~~ formal and informal, strengthens ~~this~~ the historian's overarching argument. The fact that foreign investments increased by ~~147%~~ 147%, with majority in informal ~~territories~~ regions further ~~agrees~~ agrees and strengthens the ~~view that~~ interpretation that there was ~~continuity~~ greater continuity than change, as there was a 'more extensive development of areas already linked with the world economy' rather than

To conclude, ~~the one can~~ one understands that the predominantly economic interpretation serves to highlight the discrepancies of orthodox interpretations, by placing greater emphasis on the ~~if~~ consistency of free trade policy in empire.

Examiner comment – high

The first paragraph identifies one of the essential elements of the historian's overall interpretation – that nineteenth-century imperial policy showed a basic continuity. So, to decide whether or not this candidate shows 'complete' understanding of the interpretation, the other essential element – that there was a preference for informal rather than formal control – must be identified and supported elsewhere in the answer. In the second paragraph, this aspect is indeed raised, though in the context of what is essentially a sub-message – that trade was the main motive for empire. By the end of this paragraph there is still some doubt as to whether this second aspect of the overall interpretation is integrated sufficiently with the first, and therefore could be seen as a single interpretation. The fourth paragraph again briefly identifies the issue of the preference for informal empire, but does not discuss this as a central aspect. The final paragraph before the conclusion again focuses mainly on the sub-message of economics/trade, but the candidate does return to the aspect of continuity at the end. The conclusion itself does not totally clarify exactly what the candidate thinks the elements of the 'predominantly economic' interpretation actually are.

This answer is therefore a good example of scripts that find themselves close to the high level/middle level borderline. It demonstrates awareness of the essential aspects of the interpretation, but suggests rather than clearly demonstrates complete understanding. What helps this answer reach the upper middle level is its awareness of the interpretation being revisionist, in that it rejects both the traditional view of discontinuity in nineteenth-century imperial policy and the significance of 'new imperialism', and asserts the paramount importance of the maintenance of British interests *by whatever means*. Understanding this demonstrates how an overall interpretation can be developed from the extract.

Mark awarded = 33 out of 40

Example candidate response – middle

This historian does not vary much from the more modern understanding of Empire and imperialism. Though this is the case there are two interesting anomalies that can be seen in their extract. These anomalies can help lead to an understanding of this historians approach and interpretation of empire and imperialism. The first of these is that throughout the extract the historian makes no effort to explain why imperial expansion occurred only that it did. Secondly the historian, in their only break from modern views, is that imperial policy was in fact relatively continuous. The following essay seeks to learn from the given extract how well it fits as an accurate understanding of the empire and imperial policy.

The blatant lack of explanation for the reasons behind the rise in imperial expansionism, can be seen as the one major failing of the extract. As it denies the reader many chances to gain deeper understanding into the authors biases and interpretations of historical situations. The historian gives us a brief chance to see into his interpretations, when he mentions that, 'the fact that informal techniques were more often sufficient for this purpose in the circumstances of the mid-century, than in the later period when the foreign challenge to British supremacy intensified should not disguise the basic continuity of policy.' This tells us that the historians understanding of why imperial expansion occurred in the late nineteenth century occurred was because of the increase in the imperialist activities of other powers, the historian does not directly state European powers but they were the main culprits in this rise of imperial activity. This is not particularly surprising, as most historical evidence suggests that the reason for the 'Scramble for Africa' as well as the explosion of imperial activity across the world was the settling down of the European nations after the unification of Germany. As such can be seen from this the historians interpretations are not anything particularly new. But this still gives no evidence for their approach to the historical understanding for the reasons behind empire. As such a different tactic must be taken to understand the historian.

It can be seen from the historians extract that the historian has little faith in the pushing power of settlers at the periphery on imperial policy. This is shown in a number of ways. For a start, the historians minor obsession with the 'anti-expansionist' remarks of a number of late Victorian ministers and their statement that, 'British interests were steadily safeguarded and extended.' These give the impression that imperial policy and expansion was a very controlled thing, debated in parliament between rival parties and eventually acted upon through the colonial office. This was not the case, for the simple reason that due to the technological advancement of the late

Example candidate response – middle, continued

nineteenth century Victorians, communication between the metropole and the colonies was a labourious process and by the time a parliamentary decision was reached and passed onto the settler population, the situation on the ground would have totally changed. As such parliament left many of the decisions of imperial expansion to 'the man on the spot' who was able to react and adapt to local situations better giving Britain greater chances of retaining the empire. The historian fails to account for these factors in pushing imperial policy. Though this is the case the historian manages to maintain a relatively accurate and interesting narrative.

Their belief that the British government, 'worked to establish British paramountcy by whatever means best suited the circumstances' is quite accurate in describing the changes in policy throughout the late nineteenth century. Though it was the case that British imperial policy was adapted to fit the realities of most situations, the importance the historian puts on it is too high. This is because though Britain was fairly adaptable, it cannot be forgotten that parliamentary democracy was a major factor in the changes in British imperial behaviour. With the more traditionally imperialist Conservative party and the more 'anti-imperialist' Liberal party changing who controlled the government and thus the runnings of the empire every 4-10 years imperial policy went through dramatic shifts and changes in how it was expressed. The historian discounts that this was a major factor when they state, 'this[...] disposes of the the over simplified explanation [...] based on discontinuity between the two periods.' It can be seen from the above, that the historian does not totally conform to the modern narrative of empire and imperialism.

From these points, one can see from the extract that the historian, though mostly following the orthodox accepted view of empire and imperial expansion does vary in some sections. It cannot be deduced from the evidence the totality of the authors interpretations of empire. The author also does not clearly state how he reaches these conclusion, their approach. Though this is the case it can be understood that the historian is sufficiently moderate in their understanding of empire and seems to follow a mostly economic and political approach to the forces acting upon imperialism. As such we can conclude that the author is relatively recent and of the more revisionist school of thought, though they do vary slightly from the accepted view, and that they are of a more heavy view.

Examiner comment – middle

The answer definitely works on the extract, and perceives it as including a historian's interpretation. However, can the answer be perceived as having a 'sound' or 'complete' understanding of what that interpretation is? Clearly not: to show that would mean detecting, supporting and consistently arguing aspects of the historian's overall interpretation. The answer lacks the focus, precision and consistency to do that. Nevertheless it does understand aspects of the interpretation, which is the requirement for achieving a Level 3 mark.

The strength of the answer is that it identifies the continuity of imperial policy as an aspect of the interpretation. Though this is actually part of the overall interpretation, this answer does not see it as such, referring to the historian giving us 'a brief chance to see into his interpretations' (i.e. there is more than one of them). Indeed, the answer does deal with other perceived messages, such as the historian having 'little faith in the pushing power of settlers at the periphery', even though it is sometimes hard to discern these in the extract.

The answer shows a tendency to write about context, rather than focusing consistently on the extract. It fastens on a sentence in the extract – 'the British government worked to establish British paramountcy by whatever means suited the circumstances' – but instead of attempting to relate this to the interpretation, simply illustrates the sentence through contextual examples. This kind of unfocused use of context casts no light on what the question asks for, namely the interpretation and approach of the historian.

The candidate seems to believe that part of the task of answering the question is to evaluate the extract. This occurs first near the start of the answer where the historian is described as having made 'no effort to explain why imperial expansion occurred', and there are other instances of this throughout the answer. This is not necessary, and does not help to answer the question.

To sum up, this answer shows sufficient understanding of aspects of the interpretation to achieve a Level 3 mark, but also possesses characteristics would prevent the candidate from demonstrating 'sound' or 'complete' understanding.

Mark awarded = 20 out of 40

Question 3: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941–1950

- 3 Read the extract and then answer the question.

The Cold War had now begun. It was the product not of a decision but of a dilemma. Each side felt compelled to adopt policies which the other could not but regard as a threat to the principles of the peace. Each then felt compelled to undertake defensive measures. Thus 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 deemed vital to their security. The Russians concluded that the West was resuming its old course of capitalist encirclement; that it was purposefully laying the foundation for anti-Soviet regimes in the area defined by the blood of centuries as crucial to Russian survival. Each side believed with passion that future international stability depended on the success of its own conception of world order. Each side, in pursuing its own clearly indicated and deeply cherished principles, was only confirming the fear of the other that it was bent on aggression.

So the machinery of suspicion and counter-suspicion, action and counteraction, was set in motion. But, given relations among traditional national states, there was still no reason, even with all the post-war jostling, why this should not have remained a manageable situation. What made it unmanageable, what caused the rapid escalation of the Cold War and in another two years completed the division of Europe, was a set of considerations which this account has thus far excluded.

Up to this point, the discussion has considered the split within the wartime coalition as if it were entirely the result of disagreements among national states. Assuming this framework, there was unquestionably a failure of communication between America and Russia, a misperception of signals and, as time went on, a mounting tendency to ascribe ominous motives to the other side. It seems hard, for example, to deny that American post-war policy created genuine difficulties for the Russians and even assumed a threatening aspect for them. But the fundamental explanation of the speed with which the Cold War escalated lies precisely in the fact that the Soviet Union was not a traditional national state. The Soviet Union was a phenomenon very different from America or Britain: it was a totalitarian state endowed with an all-explanatory, all-consuming ideology, committed to the infallibility of government and party, equating dissent with treason, and ruled by a dictator who, for all his quite extraordinary abilities, had his paranoid moments.

Stalin and his associates, whatever Roosevelt or Truman did or failed to do, were bound to regard the United States as the enemy, not because of this deed or that, but because of the fact that America was the leading capitalist power and thus, by Leninist belief, unappeasably hostile, driven by the logic of its system to oppose, encircle and destroy Soviet Russia. Nothing the United States could have done in 1944-45 would have abolished this mistrust, sanctified as it was by Marxist gospel. So long as the United States remained a capitalist democracy, no American policy, given Moscow's theology, could hope to win basic Soviet confidence, and every American action was poisoned from the source. So long as the Soviet Union remained a Marxist state, ideology compelled a steady expansion of Communist power.

What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer. [40]

Mark scheme

- 3 **What can you learn from this extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it? Use the extract and your knowledge of the Cold War to explain your answer.** [40]

Interpretation/Approach

The main interpretation is that, whilst both sides in the Cold War share the blame for the mutual suspicion which characterised relations after WW2, the reason why this suspicion escalated so rapidly into the Cold War is explained by the nature of the Soviet state. The interpretation thus has features both of the traditional and post-revisionist views (and might be seen as post-post-revisionist). Demonstrating understanding of the Big Message will involve discussion of both these aspects. The extract argues that Marxist ideology was what made the difference in that, whilst the US remained a democracy, the Soviets would inevitably see it as an enemy.

Glossary: *Traditional/Orthodox* interpretations of the Cold War were generally produced early after WW2. They blame the Soviet Union and Stalin's expansionism for the Cold War. *Revisionist* historians challenged this view and shifted more of the focus onto the United States, generally through an economic approach which stressed the alleged aim of the US to establish its economic dominance over Europe. *Post-revisionists* moved towards a more balanced view in which elements of blame were attached to both sides. Since the opening of the Soviet archives post-1990, there has been a shift to attributing prime responsibility to Stalin – a *post-post-revisionist* stance which often seems very close to the traditional view. What counts is how appropriate the use of this kind of terminology is in relation to the extract, and how effectively the extract can be used to support it. In reality, even *within* each of the interpretations summarised above, there are great differences between the views of different historians.

Example candidate response – high

SECTION C: Topic 3

The Origins and Development of the Cold War

The source begins by putting forth the idea that the Cold War was not the fault of either the US or the Soviet Union, ~~but~~ rather, it was the inevitable consequence of conflicting ^{ideologies} ~~ideologies~~. However as the writer goes on it becomes ~~apparent~~ ~~then~~ apparent that in his/her point of view it was Soviet ideology that posed the greater problem, and thus Soviet ideology that was the main driving force behind the ~~escalation~~ development and escalation of the cold war. The writer, while subtle in his/her attack, by the end of the extract has made it starkly clear that the United States was more or less helpless in the face of Soviet paranoia and ~~Stalin~~ Moscow's "all consuming ideology," ~~and~~ and thus I believe that the writer is traditionalist in his approach towards the cold war. In other words the writer considers the Soviet Union's actions and/or beliefs chiefly responsible for the crisis ~~that~~.

The writer begins by ~~is~~ talking about the machinery of 'suspicion and counter suspicion, action and counter action' that was set in motion following the Second World

Example candidate response – high, continued

War. A key element of this machinery, the reader is told, was its inevitability. Given that 'each side felt compelled to adopt policies which the other could not but regard as a threat to the principles of the peace'. Up until this point the reader is under the impression that the writer holds neither the US nor the Soviet Union chiefly accountable for the cold war, in other words the writer seems to have ~~a~~ be presenting a post revisionist view point; that the cold war was circumstantial and inevitable. However, the writer's true traditionalist persuasions soon become ~~very clear~~ apparent. It is made clear to the reader that when talking about the machinery of ~~to~~ suspicion and counter suspicion the writer is not in fact talking about the cold war, rather ~~the~~ is referring to 'post-war jostling.' ~~It seems that the writer views a post war jostling~~ In the writer's opinion this post war jostling should have remained a 'manageable situation.' The writer then segways into the main discussion of what actually made these conditions unmanageable, and this is where his true approach is revealed.

Initially the writer concedes to some post revisionist interpretations of the cold war by stating that there was 'unquestionably' a failure of communication

Example candidate response – high, continued

between America and Russia and a misperception of signals. However the writer of ~~that~~ ~~seem to~~ formerly insinuated that this framework was narrow as it excludes a 'set of ~~such~~ considerations'. This indicates to the reader that the writer's approach is divergent from post-revisionism. The fact that the approach is traditionalist in nature becomes clear when the writer states that the 'fundamental explanation' of the speed with which the cold war escalated lies precisely in the fact that the Soviet Union was not a traditional national state. The use of the phrase 'fundamental explanation' is very important here. It indicates that the writer, is for a moment leaving aside other considerations mentioned formerly, and treating this one as the prime consideration. The writer goes on to attribute the escalation of the cold war to the inherent nature of the Soviet regime. The unflattering description of the Soviet regime serves in and of itself as an indictment of the Soviet Union by the historian. The Soviet Union is described as having an "all-consuming ideology"; being totalitarian and paranoid. While these statements may be correct the fact that the historian is referencing the weaknesses of Soviet government, and not the weaknesses of US government, of which

Example candidate response – high, continued

there were some, is again indicative of the writer's traditionalist approach. ~~The writer~~ The last paragraph further strengthens the traditionalist view point. The writer states that whatever Roosevelt or Truman did, Stalin was bound to see the US as 'the enemy'. In saying this the writer is again indicting the Soviet Union while at the same time insinuating that the United States could not have done much to remedy the situation. In other words the Soviet Union is portrayed as being responsible as a consequence of its inherently mistrustful ideology. The writer states that this mistrust was 'Marxist gospel.' In saying that 'no American policy' could have won over Soviet confidence, the writer is in part absolving the ~~same~~ U.S of blame by asserting that whatever they could have done, or in part did, would not remedy the situation as Soviet ideology would simply not accommodate for the United States. The US is made out to be the power that was perhaps willing to compromise, while the Soviet Union is made out to be rigid, uncompromising and driven solely by ideology. It is because of these reasons that the writer places the blame on the Soviet

Example candidate response – high, continued

Union. The last line serves as an indication that the writer did in fact view Soviet ideology to be inherently expansionist. The writer states that as long as the Soviet Union remained a 'Marxist state', ideology compelled a steady expansion of power. The writer makes no similar reference to US ideology and ~~where~~^{whenever} it too was ~~expansionist~~ or asserted on other states by the Americans. Thus the writer portrays the Soviet as ideologically driven aggressors and the Americans as helpless politicians and diplomats.

I believe that the writer has ignored several key facts in his account particularly with regard to the role of the US in contributing to the development of and escalating the cold war.

The first point of note is that of Soviet paranoia. The writer claims Soviet paranoia was a leading cause of the cold war. However the writer seems to ignore that the US was just as if not more paranoid when it came to Soviet intentions. This was made clear in George Kennan's Long Telegram published in February 1946. In this telegram it is claimed that the Soviet Union will always be hostile to the United States, and is bent on world

Example candidate response – high, continued

domination. Truman was quickly won over by the telegram. However, it is important to remember that at this point there was no solid evidence that the Soviet Union wanted to take over all of Europe, or assert Soviet style government. In fact democratic government still continued in Hungary and democratic elections were held in Czechoslovakia in early 1946. It seems that the Long Telegram was then a consequence of US paranoia, not Soviet paranoia. The fact that paranoia existed in the US political elite became even clearer when Truman began sacking all those who did not buy into the idea that the Soviet Union was a hostile aggressor. For instance, secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace was sacked for speaking out against the US policy to get tough with the Soviet Union. Further examples of paranoia include the ~~setting up of the~~ passing of the National Security Act in 1947 at a time when war with the Soviet Union in Europe was not even considered a possible reality. The national security act greatly expanded America's war making capacity and

Example candidate response – high, continued

Set up the CIA. It seems that America was jumping the gun and not the Soviet Union.

Furthermore in reference to Soviet expansion, from 1945-1947, it seemed that the Soviet Union was pursuing mostly defensive policies on its periphery in an attempt to consolidate its borders after a dreadful war. While the writer refers to Soviet expansion and Soviet ideology, he makes no reference to American ideology/expansion. In many ways the US was also attempting to establish an informal sphere of influence in Europe through the Marshall plan, the creation of a West German state in 1949 and the North Atlantic Treaty organization of April 1949. The US was also attempting to export its ideology of 'Americanism' to Europe through the vast flow of US dollars to nations in the region.

Examiner comment – high

This script has an excellent introduction which immediately identifies the main elements of the historian's interpretation. The candidate identified that the extract saw the Cold War as the fault of neither side. They concluded their opening by stating that the ideology of the Soviet Union meant there was nothing the USA could do to resolve the hostility between them and so allocating primary blame to the USSR. It summarises all this by concluding that the historian was a traditionalist, which is consistent with the extract, though it could be argued equally, that the historian must be a post-post-revisionist.

Having included the overall interpretation in the introduction, the answer moves on to illustrating it. In the next paragraph the candidate deals with the first aspect of the interpretation, showing how the historian sets up the eventual traditionalist conclusion by first considering how both sides were tied into 'the machinery of suspicion and counter-suspicion', and then into the competitive relationship normal between nation states, a situation that should have remained manageable. However, this is eventually turned on its head by the historian's view that the 'fundamental explanation' for the escalation of the Cold War was the nature of the Soviet Union. The candidate meticulously charts and supports this argument from the extract.

What prevents this answer from achieving full marks is the lengthy lapse into evaluation and the unfocused content which comes at the end of the answer. None of this adds anything to answering the question '*What can you learn from this extract?*' Although it does not undermine the judgement that the candidate has a 'complete' understanding of the interpretation, a higher mark within Level 5 would have been achieved without it.

Mark awarded = 37 out of 40

Example candidate response – middle

3

The historian in the given extract adopts the post-revisionist approach, which, to summarize the approach as well as the extract briefly means that he does not place the blame on either the USA or the USSR. Instead he states various reasons why the Cold War developed as a result of both nations actions and the misunderstandings that erupted from those actions.

The historian begins the extract right away by inducing the thought of conflict. There was a 'dilemma'. A dilemma of both the US and USSR taking steps to ensure the best for their own countries and wordlessly accusing each other for going a step too far. These wordless accusations were actually made very clear through actions. The Yalta Conference (1945) was quite joyous as each power was struck by momentary happiness of winning the war soon, but just like the historian mentions, there was a dilemma. Tensions were already brewing under the surface as a decision on Poland could not be made. One of the promises made during this conference, however, was to give free and fair elections - something Stalin outrightly dismissed as he called

Example candidate response – middle, continued

the shots later in the invasion of Poland and the setting up of a Communist Government. Everyone was wary of this, especially the Western World, having been gripped in fear ~~for~~ of communism for so long. As the historian continues to say that both sides 'felt compelled' to undertake their own defense measures. Since the Americans believed the Soviets were expanding they decided to do so too. Russian expansion was extremely frightening to the West because they thought the more places Stalin occupied and turned Communist then they were next in line for a possible communist take over.

The situation, however, took a heavy turn when both Roosevelt and Churchill were replaced with new leaders (president Harry Truman from the US). Roosevelt and Churchill were relatively more passive / ~~accepting~~ tolerant when it came to communism, though they may not have been so tolerant behind closed doors – as shown in Churchill in response to Stalin's apparently "misquoted" ~~quotes~~ speech in 1946 stating that The West and the East could never be allies as it was

Example candidate response – middle, continued

a fight against each other regarding which school of thought would dominate. Churchill responded by stating that an iron curtain had descended over the East and West, separating them.

When Harry Truman came into the picture, he was very suspicious of Communism and definitely not as tolerant or understanding like Roosevelt was. To escalate tensions he had confided in Britain about the atomic bomb hitting Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of the war, and purposefully left Russia out, which modern historians take as a sign from Truman warning Stalin of the damage he could do if he ever came after the West with his Communism. The historian believes that the state of misunderstanding between the two was now 'set in motion', especially after the US introduced ~~her policy~~ the Truman doctrine which offered help to all countries in East who were being pressured by Stalin to turn Communist. The Marshall plan was an extension

Example candidate response – middle, continued

of this and provided the financial support for it to be carried out. Despite the high levels of tension though, the historian argues that "there ~~was~~ was no reason why this should not have remained a manageable situation" suggesting that at some point in the late 1940's there was still time to clear up misunderstandings.

The historian blames "the failure of communication between Russia and America" as one of the reasons for the situation getting more out of hand than it already was – this includes the many mis-interpretations both sides made about each other, especially ones concerning expansion. Stalin's apparent motive was to make 'friendly relations' with his surrounding neighbours to strengthen ~~Russia~~ ^{the Soviet Union}, but to America, no matter what, Stalin was ~~expanding~~ spreading ~~it~~ communism, and by force too.

At this point the historian outlines the main and most important cause of the development of the cold war. It was simply because ~~Russia~~ the Soviet Union was communist. Communism, the idea that basically

Example candidate response – middle, continued

wealthy ~~inhabitants~~ populations in the west strongly disliked proved to be THE major threat. It is actually worth questioning whether the Cold War would have developed at the rapid state that it did or if ~~it~~ the Cold War have even existed, if the Soviet Union was ~~capitalist~~ capitalist instead of Communist.

As mentioned before, the speech made by Stalin in 1946 claiming that the West and the East would never be friends due to the clash in ideology (one would have to defeat the other), further emphasizes the terror the Western powers were consumed with allowing them to further dwell in their panic and continuously regard the Soviet Union with a totally paranoid mindset.

The historian concludes the extract by going on to outline exactly how impossible relations between the East and West would remain so long as the clash in ideology continued. The development of the Cold war was a result of multiple misunderstandings and misconceptions

Example candidate response – middle, continued

created by different ideologies which threatened each others existence. They simply could not co-exist. One had to go. The historian maintains a post-revisionist stance.

Examiner comment – middle

Almost all answers on the Cold War use labels to identify the nature of interpretations – traditional, revisionist, etc. These labels are useful as shorthand, though not sufficient in themselves to earn much credit unless properly supported from the extract. It should also be stressed that perfectly good answers can be written about the extracts with no use of labels at all. Labels can also be dangerous – nothing betrays lack of understanding more than incorrect material used to exemplify a label. They can also be limiting, since, if used in a conclusion, they signify an overall judgement on the interpretation, regardless of what has been said elsewhere in the answer. This script is a good example of how labels work.

Right from the start the candidate states that the extract is post-revisionist. Unless the argument makes it very clear otherwise, this will always be taken as a statement that the historian blames both or neither side for the Cold War, as this answer states. It is true that the extract contains a lot of material that can support this conclusion – indeed this is one aspect of the overall interpretation. However, it also has some material that does not support it. By consistently arguing that the interpretation is post-revisionist the answer can only demonstrate understanding of *part* of the interpretation, but not *all* of it. This is regarded as showing ‘sound’ but not ‘complete’ understanding. Throughout the answer the extract is used to support this view: ‘the historian (says) that both sides felt compelled to undertake their own defence measures’; ‘the historian believes that the state of misunderstanding between the two was now set in motion’, and so on.

However, eventually the answer identifies the other aspect of the overall interpretation: ‘At this point, the historian outlines the main and most important cause ... it was simply because the Soviet Union was communist’. Yet the candidate makes nothing of this; it is seen merely as an adjustment or a refinement of the post-revisionist interpretation. The conclusion makes the candidate’s post revisionist stance clear: ‘The development of the Cold War was a result of multiple misunderstandings’.

Thus, even though both elements of the overall interpretation are identified in the answer, they are viewed as elements of a post-revisionist interpretation. It is the label that removes any doubt and so this cannot be ‘complete’ understanding.

Mark awarded = 29 out of 40

Example candidate response – low

3 Cold war was one of the most brutal one where both both America and Soviet union were trying to succeed from the other. The Historians who wrote this approach was traditionalist one where Russia was blamed for the start ~~was~~ of the coldwar causing a clash of ideologies as well as methods. where America favoured capitalism on the otherhand Stalin and the Soviet union were inclined to spread communism. In the first text the historian talks about ~~the~~ that the cold war has started. America had the notion that Russia was a dictatorship. Each side wanted to cripple the other for their policies had an clash

Russians were regarded as fanatics by the Americans according to the NSC-68 document developed in 1949 during the time Harry Truman which stated that Russians were fanatics who would stop at nothing to spread communism in every nuke of the world.

Example candidate response – low, continued

During the world war II in 1945 according to the lend lease program Roosevelt was inclined to trust Stalin sending war materials of every kind making it possible for Russia to play an active part.

The relations of Russia and America deteriorated in 1945 when the world war II was at the brink of ending and The three powers ~~met~~ Russia, America and Britain met at Yalt, Ukraine to decide ~~on~~ what was to become of Germany after the war ended. At that time Russia had a monopoly controlling Poland ~~at~~ from the eastern side even though both Winston Churchill and Roosevelt were not happy at that time but they could not do anything regarding the ~~a~~ fact that Russian had risen to develop modern ideas that it was possible to challenge the Red army which controlled Russia.

With the coming of Harry S Truman America's ideology completely changed since Harry Truman himself viewed Russia and especially Stalin with suspicious look. & He after

Example candidate response – low, continued

the development of dropped atomic bomb on Russia Japan making him Stalin realize what might happen if Russia crossed his limit and even thought about trying to develop a fight with USA.

During the Iron curtain speech made by Winston Churchill in Fulton, Missouri; stated that Germany was divided into four zones. While the west tried every attempt to modernize their zones. Russia felt that it was better if Stalin kept the Russian zone separate. The speech criticizing Stalin that he was taking whatever he needed from his zone. causing Stalin to get angry due to which he captured Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia.

Even though capturing of these states created a great peril in the western states but this was not enough. America specially Harry S Truman believed that according to the Domino theory if one country falls prey to communism the

Example candidate response – low, continued

nearby one will also. Due to this he gave Turkey 8 and an add of 10 million to stop it from becoming communist. They even introduced the Marshall law which would countries that had been liberated from go Germany to be provided with economic aid to help boost their economies but this was not enough.

The Russia of Stalin was quite different from the Russia before with the development of communism the government became more strong influenced by the teachings of Karl Marx. Stalin believed that everything in their Russia was the property of the government who had immense control over every political or no political aspect of Russia.

On the other hand Britain and USA were liberals allowing free elections in their own countries as well as the countries they had won were allowed free election and a government of their choice.

The interests of both Soviet Union and USA had been in clashing with each other. Berlin as well as was divided equally among the four

Example candidate response – low, continued

powers but Berlin belonging to the west was quite better than the one belonging to Russia. When the west zones of Berlin introduced a new currency Stalin felt it as a humiliation causing all roads between east Berlin and west zones of Berlin to be blocked. Stalin believed that starvation would cause the western powers to surrender but Harry S Truman threw an aid of 20 million tons comprising of wheat and other products keeping west Berliners safe from Russia. Harry S Truman also ordered B-29 bombers to be placed on British airfield in case they events take an bad turn.

According to the Historians Stalin and Russian officials regarded Roosevelt and Harry S Truman as anti-communists even though they had helped each other win the war with Germany. Every policy given by the USA government including Truman doctrine as well as Marshall aid were not able to please Russia but caused a greater sense of hatred

Example candidate response – low, continued

due to which Russia developed its own form of policy which mirrored those of USA including Cominform which aimed to put a strong control on eastern Europe while Molotov plan provided aid to the satellite state also known as Eastern Europe.

The relationship even further deteriorated between these two countries when in 1949 Russia had made an atomic bomb of its own.

They also developed Nato known as North Atlantic Treaty Organisation which was joined by 16 other Nations with every Nato officer being an American due to which Russia developed the Warsaw pact in 1955 mirroring that of Nato.

Even countries like Czechoslovakia even though contained less amount of communist control in government where Klement Gottwald was their leader who feared they were going to lose picturing themselves on what Stalin had done in Russia caused them to murder President Benes and foreign minister Masaryk

Example candidate response – low, continued

while President Baines fled in order to save his life and yet another country using Karl Marx ideology and ~~the~~ Stalin inspiration ~~the~~ developed into an communist state. Only ~~the~~ Yugoslavia was taken out of communism since their leader Marshall Tito did not conform well to the ideas of Stalin causing it to be excluded.

According to the Historian both countries having ~~fiere~~ extraordinary love for their country resented each other but it was considered that America's policy helped several countries to rise up while Russia drained it's zones of vital sources reducing the countries in his grasp to poverty since in a subtle way Stalin ~~it~~ was the only dictator of ~~east~~ Eastern Europe where nobody had the right to stand in front of him and those who tried met their ~~death~~ death in a brutal way but his Russias immense power and control caused no action to be taken against Russia as well as Stalin.

Example candidate response – low, continued

A Historian also means to say that Stalin aim of spreading communism weakened his relationship with USA otherwise if he had left this aim relation might have not deteriorated causing the policies like lend lease to continue even further, but this could not happen. The cold war ~~was~~ caused ~~severe~~ several fierce events to happen ~~due~~ due to which several people lost their life or became handicapped by the fierce fights that took place in different countries in which both countries had an influence of some kind causing territories to be divided into Russianes as well as American ones

Examiner comment – low

Almost at the start of the answer the candidate identifies the nature of the interpretation: it is traditionalist, with Russia blamed for the Cold War. This is a valid way of viewing the extract. Thereafter the answer is an essay on the Cold War. There is an occasional point that might be taken from the extract, but nothing of any consequence until the conclusion, which returns to the historian's point of blaming Stalin.

The issue is whether this answer has demonstrated any understanding of aspects of the interpretation, since this is a requirement for a Level 3 Mark. The answer has identified one aspect of the overall interpretation, and only because of this was it awarded the minimum mark in Level 3.

Almost all of this answer consists of unfocused content. It is relevant to the topic, but has no bearing on answering the question, which requires analysis of the extract.

Mark awarded = 18 out of 40